INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/5438

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

Daniel Boone Wilderness Therapeutic Camping Program: A Restrospective Study of Beliefs, Attitudes, and Values of Selected Innovators and Change Agents

A Dissertation

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

by

Samuel B. Hendrix III
Norman, Oklahoma
1997

UMI Number: 9721058

UMI Microform 9721058
Copyright 1997, by UMI Company. All rights reserved.

This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

UMI
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48103

Daniel Boone Wilderness Therapeutic Camping Program: A Restrospective Study of Beliefs, Attitudes, and Values of Selected Innovators and Change Agents

A Dissertation APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

BY

Jay C. Smith, Ph.D., Chairman

Connie G. Dillon, Ph.D.

Barbara A. Greene, Ph.D.

Paul F. Kleine, Ph.D.

Raymond B. Miller, Ph.D.

c Copyright by SAMUEL B. HENDRIX III 1997
All Rights Reserved.

Table of Contents

Chapter One - Introduction 1

The Research Problem and its Significance 1

Purpose of the Study and the Research Questions 2

The Context of the Study 4

The Agency 9

The Students 10

The Staff 11

The Community 12

The Method 14

Summary 15

Chapter Two - Literature Review 16

Beliefs and Belief Systems 16

Types of Beliefs 19

The Structure of Belief Systems 21

The Formation of Belief Systems 25

Attitudes 27

Values 29

Beliefs/Attitudes/Values and Behavior 30

Beliefs/Attitudes and Motivation 36

Change and Belief Systems 39

Change/Innovation/Diffusion 43

Adoption and Adopter Categories 48

Innovators 49

Change Agents 53

Summary 54

Chapter Three - Methodology 57

The Sample 60

Data Analysis 63

Summary 64

Chapter Four - Data Analysis 65

New Beginnings 70

Teach Your Children 116

Start A Revolution 161

I Remember You 183

Summary 211

Chapter Five - Conclusions and Implications for Further Research . . 215

Conclusions About the Beliefs, Attitudes, and Values of the Innovators 216

Recommendations 224

Concluding Statement 225

Bibliography 226

Appendix A - Interview Guide 232

Appendix B - Consent Form 234

Appendix C - Agency Research Proposal 236

Appendix D - My Story 243

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A project of this nature cannot be completed in isolation and there are many people I need to thank for their advice, counsel, and support. Dr. Jay C. Smith was the able captain of my ship and I am grateful for the steady hand he provided as we encountered each shoal and reef on this long journey. Thank you.

I am indebted to the other members of my committee: Connie Dillon, Barbara Greene, Paul Kleine, and Ray Miller for pushing me to do my best. Paul was central to my conducting a qualitative study and shared with me his wisdom, experience, and technical expertise in this field of research. I could not have had a better committee. Thank you one and all.

I am grateful to the men and women who served as the informants for this study. Their stories enabled me to explore the beliefs, attitudes, and values of innovators and change agents. To Jack, Richard, Rhett, Ian, Sue, Kim, Manny, Dylan, William, and Jed, you are "true believers".

I am indebted to wife Joan for her patience and assistance in all elements of the doctoral process. Not only did she suffer through my "angst" but she carried her own as she completed her doctoral degree in the same field.

Finally, I would like to thank Ina Mae for her faith in me and her belief in education. This one is for you.

DANIEL BOONE WILDERNESS THERAPEUTIC CAMPING PROGRAM: A RETROSPECTIVE STUDY OF BELIEFS, ATTITUDES, AND VALUES OF SELECTED INNOVATORS AND CHANGE AGENTS

BY: SAMUEL B. HENDRIX III

MAJOR PROFESSOR: JAY C. SMITH, Ph.D.

The purpose of this qualitative study is to identify the beliefs, attitudes, and values of a select group of innovators and change agents who participated in one therapeutic camping and experiential educational program during the years 1975-77 and what they are doing now. This study was conducted by using qualitative research methods gathering life histories through individual interviews of a select group of innovators and change agents who participated in the Boone Wilderness Therapeutic Camping Program. Document reviews when available and appropriate were integrated within the study. Initially, the beliefs, attitudes, and values that this group of innovators and change agents brought to the program were explored. The impact of participation in the wilderness and experiential education program on their beliefs, attitudes, and values was probed and the stability of these beliefs, attitudes, and values was assessed as informants moved into

other innovative programs and other professional dimensions. The data was analyzed and themes reflective of their beliefs, values, and attitudes are reported.

The findings of this study are consistent with many of those reported by Smith, Kleine, Prunty, and Dwyer in Educational Innovators: Then and Now (1986). Further, the findings of the study extend the knowledge of the change and diffusion processes by exploring the beliefs, attitudes, and values of innovators and change agents which have received minimal concentration.

Daniel Boone Wilderness Therapeutic Camping Program: A Retrospective Study of Beliefs, Attitudes, and Values of Selected Innovators and Change Agents

Chapter 1

Introduction

Imagine for a moment that you are sitting in the middle of hundreds of thousands of acres of primitive wilderness. Around you is a mixture of pine, hickory, walnut, and oak trees. It is February, the temperature is thirty degrees, and an ice storm has just passed covering your campsite, your gear, the log you're sitting on, and you with a thin sheet of ice. You've been sitting in "huddle-up" with twelve adolescents, ages 14-17, for over four hours discussing why it is important for Terry to complete his team job of firewood cutting. Who are you, where did you come from, and why are you there? Who is Terry? What is a huddle-up? What beliefs, values, and attitudes did you bring to this environment? I attempt to address these and other questions in this retrospective study of the Daniel Boone Wilderness Therapeutic Camping Program.

The Research Problem and its Significance

As a student of the change process, I am specifically interested in the beliefs, values, and attitudes of individuals who participate in

innovations. While the literature abounds with discussions of the diffusion of innovations, perceived need, adoption, characteristics of adopters, characteristics of innovations (Rogers, Harvey, et al), there exists a paucity of literature on the beliefs, values, and attitudes of individuals who are the innovators. I believe it is these people and their beliefs, values, and attitudes that are paramount to the success or failure of innovations. As we move into the twenty-first century and new solutions to old and new problems are sought, it will be important, as we design and define new strategies to address our educational and social problems, to ensure the human element in innovation is understood and addressed. It is not programs that make differences in peoples lives but the people who are the program. This study is focused on the commonalities of individuals who participated in one therapeutic camping and experiential educational program, the Boone Wilderness Therapeutic Camping Program.

Purpose of the Study and the Research Questions

The purpose of the study is to identify beliefs, values, and attitudes of individuals who participated as innovators in one therapeutic camping and experiential educational program and through the vehicle of life histories

how these beliefs, attitudes, and values have persisted over time or changed and whether they have been transferred to other programs.

The research questions addressed by this study are: Where the innovators, leaders, and participants came from? What philosophies and events prompted their involvement? What beliefs, attitudes, and values did they bring to the program? How do they remember it? What are their perspectives of the alternative program and its effectiveness? What did they learn or experience from their involvement in the program? Were their belief systems changed as a result of the Boone experience? Where have they gone? What have they done? What are they are doing now? What influence did the experience have on other aspects of their lives and belief systems? Would they participate in the program again? Have these themes continued into involvement in other programs, careers, interests, beliefs?

This study is not an attempt to evaluate the effectiveness of the innovation on the adolescents who participated in it nor does it seek to evaluate the program's success or failure in relation to its stated goals or objectives. There has been no systematic attempt to compare the recidivism rates of youth committed to the Boone program with those adjudicated to the more traditional institutional settings of the agency. Due to the

confidentiality provisions under which juvenile offenders are subject no effort was expended in attempting to locate former students and assess their reactions to the Boone program.

The Context of the Study

This qualitative research study was conducted by interviewing a select group of innovators and change agents who participated in the Boone Wilderness Therapeutic Camping Program during the years 1975 through 1977. The program, an element of the agency, was established in 1975 as an alternative educational/treatment program for youth adjudicated or remanded under the laws of State. The principal setting for educational/treatment programs within the agency at this time consisted of "schools" which involved a campus setting with varying degrees of control and security. Resident, certified educational programs and treatment regimes were integrated within each "school" or facility. The catalyst for the wilderness therapeutic camping program was a realization on the part of agency administrators, who were then operating under a court order supervised by John Law, U.S. District Judge, that new approaches and alternatives to the education and treatment of children must be developed. The Boone Wilderness Therapeutic Camping Program was one of the first

of several innovations that have been used by the agency in the intervening years.

The establishment of the Boone Wilderness Therapeutic Camping Program in 1975 represented a major innovation in the education and treatment of juvenile and status offenders in the State. (I did not know then nor am I aware now of any comparable state-funded program of this type.) The program was supported by the agency from 1975 thorough 1980. Located in the woods of deep East State, in the National Forest, the program was established as an alternative educational/treatment program for adolescents (ages 14-17) who had experienced minimal success in conventional settings. Fashioned, to a degree, after programs such as Outward Bound and Salesmanship Club, Inc. of Dallas, Texas, the underlying philosophy was centered on therapeutic camping and experiential learning. There were no fences, no locks. The only deterrent to escape was hundreds of thousands of acres of primitive forest. The treatment philosophy was centered on personal responsibility, natural consequences, group process and positive peer culture with an indeterminate program length dependent on progress through phases of the program. In the first phase, groups of ten to twelve (10-12) male/female adolescents were

organized into groups and located in the woods of the National Forest, approximately 25 miles from the main campus in Boone. Under the supervision of groupworkers, the group was required to build living structures using only natural materials (canvas excepted) and hand tools, collect wood, build fires, cook meals, build trails, establish hygiene facilities, and participate in educational and recreational activities. The first priorities of every group were water (hand carried in five gallon containers), food preparation, and shelter. The group progressed as one unit through the program culminating in a 30 day adventure trip. This represented the epitome of the program, an adventure trip planned and organized by the members of the group. Thirty days of hiking, camping, canoeing, rock climbing, and surviving, as a group. Their adventures took them to such places as South Rim, Desert Wilderness, and White River. Following the successful completion of the wilderness adventure, the members of the groups graduated and returned to their communities-places such as Big Town, Midtown, and Metropolis.

The innovations (i.e., therapeutic camping, natural consequences, and experiential education) were employed in individual camping areas with groups of 10-12 adolescents. These individual camping areas were deployed

around a central area where some meals were served, supplies were distributed, showers taken, and formal classes in reading and mathematics were conducted.

A typical day consisted of getting up at daybreak, attending to personal hygiene, camp maintenance, and breakfast. Often a "huddle-up" was held to review individual and team jobs and outline the activities for the day. Following breakfast, students would embark on individual and team jobs such as firewood cutting, water carrying, trail raking, and others.

Educational activities were conducted either in the individual camps or at the central area. Certified teachers were challenged to use experiential education methodologies. A science lesson might consist of students taking water samples from the river or creeks around the camp and analyzing them to identify their composition. A mathematics class on geometry might require them to estimate the height of trees using triangulation methods. Social studies and reading might be combined into a lesson in which students were driven down the back roads of east State (rich in Spanish history). At each historical marker, a student would be required to read it and at the end of the trip, each student would be required to write an article which would be compiled into a newspaper that

would be distributed to the other groups. Lessons in civility and respect for each other were integrated in all daily activities and the words "check yourself" were used by all members to call attention to inappropriate behavior.

Often these daily activities were interspersed with "huddle-ups". A "huddle-up" could be called by any member of the group to resolve interpersonal or other issues that might arise throughout the days activities. These group problem-solving sessions could take a few minutes or hours and in some instances days. Members were required to either stand or sit in a circle, discuss the issue, and come to consensus resolution. Members were not allowed to leave the "huddle-up" until the problem was resolved. Students were encouraged to use positive peer pressure to get other members to own problems, to discuss them, and to come to collaborative solutions. The groupworkers role was to facilitate these sessions.

The afternoons were occupied initially by structure building. A team effort, the group would first identify and fell the trees necessary to construct their living areas. This was followed by stripping the trees of limbs and bark and transporting them to the camp area. Following the completion of this arduous task, the actual construction (i.e., traditional,

tepees, etc.) could begin. Time permitting and if the days scheduled tasks were completed, the groups could swim, canoe, or participate in other recreational activities. There were no radios and no televisions.

The evening meal was prepared and eaten in camp followed by a quiet hour in which students could read, meditate, or nap, they could not interact with one another. Shortly after dark, the group would go to "pow-wow". The "pow-wow" was the culminating activity of each day. Located in an area separate and apart from the rest of the camp, it was the place where the days activities, good and bad, were reviewed by the group. One member of the group was assigned the job of preparing the "pow-wow" area each day. A fire was built after the group entered the area and for a period of time members sat and watched the fire. Then, in turn, each member talked about the day. After the fire burned down, the group would return to the camp area and retire for the night. It was within this context and routine that the innovations which made up Boone were practiced.

The Agency

The agency in the years 1974 - 1975 had come under scrutiny from both the leadership of the state and the judicial system. In this period of

time, the director was replaced with Rob Mason, a former ward of the agency and new leadership was recruited and brought in from North State and other areas of the country. In 1974, the year Jack Knight came to the agency, riots had broken out in Maysville, buildings had been set ablaze, and both staff and juveniles injured as youth within the system rebelled. Investigations conducted at the time found some staff had been engaged in non-professional and inappropriate behavior in their interactions with juveniles. The agency was placed under court order by U.S. District Judge John Law. The stage for innovation and change was set.

The Students

The students who participated in the Boone experience were adolescents ages 14-17 who had either been sentenced as juveniles or had been remanded as status offenders by the Courts to the agency. As such, two distinct groups of adolescents participated: 1) juvenile delinquents (male) convicted for car thief, burglary, drug sales and possession, and, in a few cases, rape, assault and homicide; and 2) status offenders (males and females) remanded for truancy, runaway, minor drug use, and an assortment of lesser offenses. Students, male and female, were ethnically diverse, with an even split among whites, Chicanos, and blacks. Most were educationally

disadvantaged, however, tests of intelligence evidenced normal and below normal ranges. As a group they were in many ways indistinguishable from the other inter-city youth of State.

The Staff

The staff consisted of approximately 100 groupworkers, caseworkers, administrators, educators, and support personnel working with approximately 150 students, juvenile delinquents and status offenders, a 3:4 staff to student ratio.

Collectively, the staff possessed a high degree of education, bachelors and masters degrees, with all having graduated in the late 1960s and early 1970s. A study of staff characteristics revealed that 76% possessed bachelor of arts or science degrees and 9% masters of arts or science degrees (Bailey, Faherty, Selman, Spencer, 1977). There were not just from east State, in fact few were, but from Connecticut, Mississippi, Oregon, Oklahoma, North Carolina, Minnesota, and all places in-between. They were not therapeutic campers but came from education, social work, and business backgrounds; few knew about experiential education, natural consequences, or positive peer culture. They were young adults, predominately white and predominately male (73%). Bailey et al (1977)

identified 67% between the ages of 21-25; 23% between the ages of 26-29; and 10% aged 31 years and above. It is a select group of this staff that will serve as the informants of this study.

The Community

While the actual program took place in the national forest, the staff lived in Boone or other rural areas surrounding the national forest. These communities whether it be Boone, Tola, Kinney, shared much in common.

Settled in the early 1800's, the individuals who came to east State were not so much searching for something but rather escaping from something. The early settlers of this area came seeking independence, to escape authority, and to extend slavery. The town of Boone in 1975-77 was approximately 75% black, however, an apartheid existence was maintained between blacks and whites in the community. In sum, Boone experienced little of the civil rights or social consciousness movements of the 1960's. It was common for a white person to go unpunished for acts committed against blacks, however, blacks who committed similar offenses against whites were summarily sentenced to the Department of Corrections.

I perceived the people of east State as clannish, suspicious of strangers, and having a disdain for government or people connected to

governmental organizations. They had little tolerance for alternative lifestyles and liberal politics. Education levels were low and the people parochial in the views of life. Even today, a refrain of "save your Confederate money; the South's goin' rise again" can be imagined echoing through hallowed halls of the County Courthouse.

The staff of Boone represented in many ways an anathema to the quiet, rural communities of east State. College educated, young, liberal in both politics and lifestyle, long-haired men, and idealistic, they descended upon Boone and the other rural communities surrounding the wilderness programs.

They drove ratty old Volkswagens with peace signs, high performance cars at their nadir, imports, and motorcycles. True there were a few pick-ups with campers (universally accepted east State rides) but they were made by Toyota, Nissan, and Datsun. Staff members were affluent in comparison to the other people in the area who relied on logging and agriculture for their livelihoods. They wore jeans, work shirts, and Buck knives with scabbards upside down for easy access but somehow they were different. They talked different, they thought different, they acted different - they were not of east State and everyone knew it.

The Method

The method used to conduct this study is qualitative with an naturalistic inquiry perspective which views each phenomenon as different that must be studied holistically (Borg and Gall, 1989). Naturalistic inquiry is a process through which to study human life and processes. It includes techniques such as interviews, document reviews, and participant observation. The aim of this study is to create for the reader, a unique, detailed picture of the shared beliefs, practices, attitudes, and behaviors of some group of people - in this case, the individuals who made up the experience that was Boone. Design of a naturalistic inquiry study requires investigatory strategies which assist in the construction, or in the case at hand, reconstruction of the culture being examined. The strategies produce phenomenological data, represent the world view of the participants, and use participant constructs to guide the research. Participant interviews were used in the main to acquire accounts of the events as they occurred at Boone and beyond. Importantly, naturalistic inquiry methods are holistic and I will attempt to generate from the descriptions of informants, the beliefs, values, and attitudes of the Boone innovators. Emphasis on the study of the whole setting is central to the qualitative model (Borg and

Gall, 1989). This requires that the study attempt to understand the historical, cultural, and social setting that was Boone.

Summary

This chapter has presented the broad ideas that form the basis of this research study. These ideas lead to a statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the research questions, the context, and the method. Chapter Two, Literature Review, reviews the literature related to beliefs, values, and attitudes, as well as, change, innovation and diffusion. Chapter Three, Methodology, covers the methodology used and describes the sample selected and the procedures used to collect the data. Chapter Four, Data Analysis, presents the data resulting from the analysis. Chapter Five, Conclusions and Recommendations, presents the conclusions drawn from data, recommendations for further research, and a concluding statement. The Appendices contain the interview guide used to collect the data (see Appendix A), a sample of the disclosure letter informants executed (see Appendix B), and the proposal to the agency for permission to examine documents (see Appendix C), and "My Story" an attempt to reveal the bias of the researcher (see Appendix D).

Chapter 2

Literature Review

The literature related to beliefs, attitudes, and values as well as innovations, change, and innovators must be explored in order to provide a context for the present study. The literature specific to the beliefs, attitudes, and values of innovators is limited. In order to develop the background for this study of beliefs, values, and attitudes of innovators, references from the disciplines of philosophy, psychology, social cognition, and sociology are used to supplement materials from change and innovation literature.

Beliefs and Belief Systems

Rokeach (1968 contends that individuals have thousands if not tens of thousands of beliefs concerning their physical and social environments and their self and self identity. These beliefs are organized into systems which have structural properties that can be measured and that have behavioral manifestations. The study of beliefs and belief systems is important to a full understanding of how individuals behave and respond to their environments and changes in those environments. Numerous questions about beliefs and belief systems must be addressed to achieve this

comprehension. Central are questions regarding: 1) what are beliefs and what is a belief system; 2) what is the structure of belief systems; 3) how do beliefs and belief systems develop; 4) how are they related to attitudes and values; 5) what influence do they have on behavior and motivation; and 6) how are they changed or modified.

Numerous definitions of belief are found in the literature (Black, 1952; Ellis, 1979; Frank, 1977; Levine and Lighthurn, 1989; Rokeach, 1960, 1968); the one selected for examination is from the work of M. Rokeach (1968). He defines belief in the following manner:

> "A belief is any simple proposition, conscious or unconscious, inferred from what a person says or does, capable of being preceded by the phrase, "I believe that...." The content of a belief may describe the object of belief as true or false, correct or incorrect; evaluate it as good or bad; or advocate a certain course of action or a certain state of existence as desirable or undesirable." (1968, p. 113)

In addition, Black (1952) points out that there are degrees of belief, ranging from indifference to unshakable conviction. One's beliefs on any area of scrutiny are often validated by an individual's declarations; however,

it is important that we not totally rely on statements of individuals. The most reliable test of a belief's existence is the individual's action or conduct.

Belief systems are defined partially as individually constructed, interlocking interpretations of reality. Self-esteem is a belief system about the self, a family myth is a belief system about the family, and culture is a belief system shared by members of a society (Levine and Lightburn, 1989). A belief system represents the entire universe of an individual's beliefs about one's physical and social world and about one's self. Rokeach (1960) defines it as "all the beliefs, sets, expectancies, or hypotheses, conscious and unconscious, that a person at a given time accepts as true of the world he lives in." (p.33) Belief systems are envisioned as being organized or structured along several dimensions (Rokeach, 1960). A belief system can often be studied in terms of subsystems; an attitude is one form of subsystem (Rokeach, 1968).

According to Rokeach (1968) belief systems are organized along central and peripheral parts, with the central parts being more important, resistent to change, and impacting most other beliefs when modified or changed. Not only are there belief systems, but there are also disbelief

systems. The disbelief system consists of subsystems and contains all the disbeliefs, sets, expectancies, conscious or unconscious, that a person rejects as false (Rokeach, 1960). The disbelief system is not a duplicate of the belief system and contains many series of subsystems that are rejected and the varying intensity with which they are rejected.

Types of Beliefs

Black (1952) distinguishes between two types of beliefs based on their reason or causality. Derived beliefs are those that have reasons and basic beliefs are those which have no reason. The term reason applies only to situations in which the belief questioned is derived from other beliefs by inference or those propositions an individual would offer in defense of that belief. Basic beliefs may also be called direct beliefs. Many of our derived beliefs are based on deductive argument; however, deduction only provides relative or conditional justification of the belief. Black (1952) continues by pointing out that many basic beliefs are determined by testimony. Much of what we learn as children comes from what others (adults) say is so. As adults, reliance on testimony increases with our need for information and reliance on multiple media. Other

sources of basic beliefs include: 1) experience; 2) self-evidence; and 3) ungrounded beliefs.

Janoff-Bulman (1992) proposes that at the core of our assumptive world are abstract beliefs about ourselves, the external world, and the relationship between the two. Further, the three fundamental assumptions of our existence are: 1) the world is benevolent; 2) the world is meaningful; and 3) the self is worthy. These assumptions are at the core of our existence. They are not narrow beliefs and they do not exist isolated from emotions; these beliefs are the first assumptions established in our internal world (Janoff-Bulman, 1992).

Rokeach (1968) distinguishes among three types of beliefs. The first type may be referred to as a descriptive or existential belief (I believe the moon circles the sun); the second type may be called an evaluative belief (I believe that all men are good); and the third type called prescriptive or exhortatory belief (I believe that it is desirable that citizens obey the laws of the country). In addition, Rokeach (1968) identifies five classes of beliefs within the belief system that are ordered on the defining attribute of importance along a central-peripheral dimension. The five classes within Rokeach's (1968) belief system conception are: 1) primitive beliefs with 100

percent consensus; 2) primitive beliefs with 0 percent consensus; 3) authority beliefs; 4) derived beliefs; and 5) inconsequential beliefs.

The Structure of Belief Systems

Central to an understanding of the structure of belief systems are the three dimensions postulated by M. Rokeach (1960): 1) belief-disbelief; 2) central-peripheral; and 3) time. Rokeach views the belief systems as organized into two parts belief-disbelief that are interdependent. The disbelief system consists of several subsystems which vary in their similarity to the belief system.

The belief-disbelief dimension is viewed as having several properties which vary from individual to individual. The first of these properties is isolation. Reluctance to view beliefs that are intrinsically related is the degree to which they are isolated. Indicators of isolation include: 1) the coexistence of logically contradictory beliefs within the belief system; 2) the accentuation of differences and the minimization of similarities between belief-disbelief systems; 3) the perception of irrelevance; and 4) denial of contradiction (Rokeach, 1960). The second property identified is differentiation or completeness of detail. In investigating a belief-disbelief system it is important to know the degree of differentiation within the

entire system and within each of the component parts. Indications of differentiation would include: 1) the relative amount of knowledge and 2) the perception of similarity between adjacent disbelief subsystems (Rokeach, 1960). The final property to be considered is the comprehensiveness or narrowness of the system. This property is concerned with the range of disbelief systems within a specific belief-disbelief system.

The second dimension considered is the organization of the belief system along a central-peripheral dimension. This consists of three layers: 1) the central region which represents primitive beliefs; 2) an intermediate region which contains an individual's beliefs related to authority; and 3) a peripheral region which represents derived beliefs from authority (Rokeach, 1960).

The central region provides us with an insight into the functional and dynamic properties of belief-disbelief systems. This region contains an individual's primitive beliefs which contain one's specific view of the physical and social world to include one's self and one's view of others. It is assumed the content within the central region influences the organization of the belief-disbelief system. These beliefs are similar to those postulated by Black (1952) as basic beliefs.

The intermediate region contains those beliefs considered to be non-primitive. These beliefs are concerned with authority, positive and negative, that round out one's view of the world. Authorities are individuals and sources from which one seeks information to augment that which one has obtained independently. Within the intermediate region are other types of beliefs regarding people in general. The beliefs about people in general are the result of evaluations of them, and the beliefs and authorities with which they align themselves.

The peripheral region contains all non-primitive beliefs and disbeliefs flowing from positive and negative authority. The content of peripheral beliefs and disbeliefs vary from one individual to another. It is the specific content that is examined when we identity one's ideological position. Of interest are the structural interconnections among peripheral beliefs and their relationships to beliefs of the intermediate and central regions. Through the function of processing-coding (thinking) beliefs-disbeliefs are either accepted into the system or rejected. This processing-coding activity is visioned as involving an initial screening for compatibility with existing primitive beliefs which results in acceptance, rejection, or narrowing of the information so that no further processing must occur.

Even if new information is compatible with primitive beliefs, it may not be with intermediate (authority) beliefs. Narrowing that occurs may be achieved at either the institutional (screening by authority) or noninstitutional (restriction of exposure) level in order to avoid information that may threaten an individual's belief system (Rokeach, 1960). The final step in this processing-coding activity is filing the information into the peripheral region where it is represented as either belief or disbelief.

The structural interconnections among the central, intermediate, and peripheral beliefs that provide the total belief-disbelief system are integrated, holistic, and systematic in nature (Rokeach, 1960). Those factors which characterize the primitive region are reflected in the intermediate region and those of the intermediate are reflected in the peripheral. The belief-disbelief system is viewed as an organized system with structural relations among its components.

The third dimension of Rokeach's (1960) belief-disbelief system structure is the time perspective. It is related to one's beliefs about the past, present, and future and their interrelationships. The time perspectives vary among individuals from narrow to broad. A broad time perspective is one in which an individual's past, present, and future are represented

within the system. A narrow perspective is one in which the individual fixates on the past, present, or future.

Collectively, these dimensions provide a theory on the organization and structure of belief-disbelief systems. This theory views all such systems as having a belief-disbelief dimension, 2) a central-peripheral dimension and 3) a time-perspective dimension. Theories about the structure of belief systems are frameworks in which we can study not only the stabilities, but also the personality changes of the individual (Rokeach, 1985).

The Formation of Belief Systems

A belief system represents the total universe of an individual's beliefs about the physical world, the social world, and the self (Rokeach, 1968). They are individual interpretations of reality that are interconnected with other belief systems. These systems not only define the individual's view of reality but also connect feelings to behavior and link behavior to feelings (Levine and Lightburn, 1989).

From birth, individuals are engaged in developing unique belief systems. First, one assimilates belief systems regarding one's immediate physical world, social world, and one's self. Further, these belief systems are developed around questions such as: what is, and what will be, the self

in relation to others and things. Beliefs may exist independently of one another or may be linked by attributes or relationships. When linked, they are a belief system. Changes in one belief within the system may change others dependent on the degree of their isolation, differentiation or interconnectivity (Rokeach, 1960).

Belief systems are developed initially from individual experience, from what one has felt or perceived directly from the object or from the experience of others (e.g., parents, teachers, significant others) who are viewed as having knowledge or authority. Environmental reality and exposure to key elements and events are central to the development of beliefs (Smith, Kleine, Purty and Dwyer, 1986). Whatever the source, the belief system must make logical and intuitive sense to the individual or uncertainty and conflict develop (Kagan, 1978). Initial belief systems are influenced by a myriad of factors both cognitive and experiential (Levine and Lightburn, 1989). The early beginnings of beliefs and belief systems occur in infancy with the majority of contact being the family. Within this framework, basic or primitive beliefs are formulated (i.e., Mother is good, life is safe, my family loves me). In childhood shifts occur in the thought processes that transform new information into new belief systems. Cognitive development into adulthood, and beyond, both limits and expands

one's belief systems and their development, causes one to re-evaluate previous beliefs and make revisions where appropriate.

As cognitive development matures, changes in belief systems are often slowed. The hundreds or thousands of beliefs within belief systems that exist serve as filters (processing-coding) for incoming information. A sign of this increasing stability and integration of belief systems is that one's social action becomes consistent with the value priorities (Rokeach, 1985).

This process of belief system maturation is captured in the concept of the experiential funnel (Smith, Kleine, Purty, and Dwyer, 1986). Beginning with opportunities, constraints and developmental tasks, the individual progress through a series of intervening variables (i.e., chance, unconscious influences, culmination of life experience, trauma) through purposive action to the origination, maintenance and transformation of belief systems. This leads to further action which provides opportunities, constraints, involvement, and beyond.

Attitudes

The relationship between beliefs, attitudes and values is important to our understanding of beliefs. As with beliefs, there are numerous

definitions of what constitutes an attitude. Contemporary social cognition (Fiske and Taylor, 1991) defines attitude in part as: "A hypothetical mediating variable assumed to intervene between stimulus and response". Continuing, Fiske and Taylor (1991) assert that attitudes are considered to be central features in the field of social cognition that are evaluative in nature and that include or are linked to cognitions (beliefs).

Attitudes are typically defined as predispositions to respond in a particular way toward a specified class of objects (Rosenberg and Hovland, 1960). There are three common indices used in the study of attitudes: 1) affective, 2) cognitive, and 3) behavioral. Rokeach (1968) defined attitude as "a relatively enduring organization of beliefs around an object or situation predisposing one to respond in some preferential manner" (p.112). Within this paradigm, Rokeach asserted that each belief within an attitude organization has three elements: 1) a cognitive element which represents an individuals's knowledge, with varying degrees of certainty, about what is good or bad, true or false; 2) an affective element because given conditions the belief can arouse varying affect intensity which centers around the object of the belief, other objects, taking a positive or negative position relative to the object of the belief, or of the belief itself when its validity

is challenged; and 3) a behavioral element due to the fact that beliefs have a response predisposition which leads to action when activated. Using this definition, attitudes consist of a number of beliefs which are represented in a predisposition to action.

Values

The concept of value is often not clearly defined when used in the literature and they are often used interchangeably with concepts such as beliefs, attitudes, and ethics. It is assumed that the concept is clearly understood by the reader. However, values, as with the concepts of attitude and beliefs, are often presented in a confusing and contradictory manner.

The word value adds to the difficulty due to its having several usages and meanings. Baier and Rescher (1969) distinguishes between uses of the word,

> The "value" possessed by things must be distinguished from the "values" held by people. The former is an evaluative property whose possession and magnitude can be ascertained in appraisals. The latter are "dispositions" to behave in certain ways which can be ascertained by observation. The former are "capacities" of things to satisfy desiderata. The latter are "tendencies" of people to devote

their resources (time, energy, money) to the attainment of certain ends (p.40).

Rokeach (1968) views values as a type of belief located within a belief system. They are abstractions representing one's ideas about how one should act or for what one should strive to become. Examples of these could include ideals of conduct such as honor, loyalty, and professionalism. Some examples related to becoming could be independence, serenity, and respect. Values can be organized into several categories. Examples may include: 1) social; 2) political; 3) religious; 4) economic; 5 theoretical; and 6) aesthetical. Further, values are viewed as central to the belief system and are differentiated into two forms: instrumental values related to how one acts or behaves, and terminal values dealing with a goal or "end state of existence" considered desirable (Rokeach, 1968).

Beliefs/Attitudes/Values and Behavior

In order to address the issue of beliefs and behavior, it is important to first review the relationship between belief and attitude. Previously, we defined attitude as a "relatively enduring organization of beliefs around an object or situation predisposing one to respond in some preferential manner"

(Rokeach, 1968). In addition, we proposed an interdependent relationship between beliefs, attitudes, and values. Historically, there have been attempts to distinguish attitude from beliefs by attributing evaluative functions to attitudes and the cognitive component to beliefs, however, most theorists hold all beliefs are conceived to have both evaluative and cognitive components. Further, beliefs which represent a predisposition to respond preferentially to the object of the belief are also conceived as having an affective component (Rokeach, 1968). Given these considerations, an attitude is, in part, an organization of interrelated beliefs around a common object, and as a result, our discussion of beliefs and behavior will incorporate attitude and behavior as well.

At the outset, research on the relationship of attitudes/beliefs to behavior was limited and those studies that have been conducted have produced mixed results. Some reported relatively low relationships while others maintained that correlation was high between the attitude/beliefs and behavior dimensions. Part of the difficulty in establishing correlations between attitude/belief and behavior may reside in the possibility that attitudes other than those studied or measured are mediating the behavior. Another element may be an absence of accurate attempts to identify and

measure behaviors which may be most likely to be influenced by attitude/beliefs.

Rokeach (1968) proposes that how individuals behave to objects within situations depends on the particular beliefs that are activated by the situation. A person's social behavior, therefore, is mediated by two types of attitudes; one activated by the object, the other activated by the situation. Further, behavior may be determined, not by one attitude, but by a number of attitudes, beliefs, and situational conditions. Another perspective of this relationship between attitude/belief and behavior is that behavior is the result of the interactions between attitude-toward-object and attitude-toward-situation (Rokeach, 1968). This view recognizes that these types of attitudes will interact cognitively and that they will have differing degrees of importance with respect to each other, thereby, resulting in a behavior that is influenced by two kinds of attitudes.

Whether an attitude/belief predicts behavior regarding any member of a category was studied by Lord, Lepper, and Mackie (Fiske and Taylor, 1991). They argue that when people hold stereotypes about specific groups, they will express that attitude in specific iterations with the group member only if that member meets their prototype of that group. Two experiments

conducted supported the hypothesis. When the individual was related to the group (prototypical), general attitudes toward the group predicted behavior toward the individual. The unprototypical group member was dismissed as atypical and behavior did not reflect the attitude toward the group. Additionally, dismissing the unprototypical member as atypical left the prototype intact as a source to guide future behavior (Fiske and Taylor, 1991). Inferentially, it could be concluded that effect on behavior may be highest when objects and situations support the attitude/belief.

Another issue in studying the attitude/belief and behavior is the way in which both attitudes/beliefs and behaviors are measured (Fiske and Taylor, 1991). Often inconsistencies between attitude/belief and behavior are observed. These seeming incongruencies are the result of inadequate measurement or measurement of differing specificity. One solution suggested is to measure behavior along a multiple-act criterion which enables generalized predictions of behavior. This type of measurement has been found to produce higher correspondence when behaviors are compared to attitude/beliefs (Fiske and Taylor, 1991). The relationship between attitudes and behavior are greatest when both are measured at the same level of generality. General attitudes predict general behavioral intentions

fairly well, and specific attitudes predict specific behaviors (Fiske and Taylor, 1991).

Another consideration in the examination of attitude and behavior is the situation in which one can change the attitude without a resultant change in behavior. The factors causing this are varied. Ubiquity often causes problems of consistency in studying the relationship of behavior and attitudes. One of the factors that determines whether attitudes will influence behavior is the manner in which they are formed. Attitudes formed from direct experience are more specific, more stable, and predict behavior better, than those based on indirect experience (Fazio and Zanna, 1981). A second factor is vested interest. The degree to which an attitude is involved with self-interest, the more likely it is to influence behavior. Another factor is involved with the amount of an individual's reflecting on the reasons for an attitude. The type of behavior (e.g., consummatory, instrumental) is a factor that influences the attitude-behavior relationship. Attitudes influence behavior to the degree that attitudes are easily accessible. Individuals able to access their attitudes easily have been found to evidence substantial agreement between attitudes and behavior, where those with limited access show markedly less attitude-behavior consistency (Kallgren and

Wood, 1986). Self-schemas can also influence the relationship between attitude and behavior. Milburn (1987) reports that individuals whose attitudes represent self-schematic attributes behave more consistently with those attitudes than those who do not hold attitudes central to self-schemas.

Additional evidence of the relationship between beliefs and behaviors is found in the concept of cognitive cluster orientation (Kreitler and Kreitler, 1990). Studies have provided evidence that individual meaning preferences were correlated to a matrix of beliefs identified as central to a procedure for behavior prediction. The matrix was identified as the cognitive orientation cluster and consists of four types of beliefs held by the individual: 1) beliefs related to an individual's goals; 2) beliefs related to norms, standards, and rules; 3) beliefs related to self; and 4) general beliefs about others and the environment (Kreitler and Kreitler, 1990). These beliefs orient one toward acts of overt behavior that are effected when the conditions of the cognitive orientation cluster are present.

Attitude function has also been studied to determine when values will be important predictors of attitudes and behavioral intentions. Maio and Olsen (1994) manipulated attitude function to test the hypotheses that attitude function moderates (a) the strength of relations between values and

attitudes, (b) the pattern of relations between values and attitudes, and (c) the role of values in predicting behavioral intentions. Attitude functions are identified as: 1) the utilitarian; 2) ego-defensive; 3) value-expressive; and 4) knowledge. Results provided evidence that attitude function may be an important element to use in predicting when values will be important indicators of attitudes and behavioral intentions.

It would appear that attitudes formed from direct experience, that are stable, held confidently, are of interest to the individual, and are accessible have greater consistency with behavior. The relationship between attitude/beliefs and behavior is complex and not fully understood. However, on the whole people act in accordance with their beliefs/attitudes/values more often than in opposition to them.

Beliefs/Attitudes and Motivation

Cognitive consistency theories provide a motivational basis for examining beliefs and attitudes. Within these theories, inconsistency is viewed as aversive, causing individuals to resolve the inconsistency by various methods including attitude/belief change. Human beings have a proclivity toward maintaining consistency among their cognitions (i.e., attitudes, beliefs, values, and opinions) and this influences behavior (Reeve,

1992). Inconsistencies cause discomfort and motivate the individual to eliminate the basis of this incongruency. In cognitive dissonance theory, Festinger (1957) speculated that individuals will pursue one of four courses of behavior: 1) change the original belief; 2) change the behavior; 3) change the environment; and 4) add new cognitive elements. In sum, cognitive dissonance creates a motive to restore consistency and that motive is manifest in these four ways (Reeve, 1992).

Maehr (1984) stresses that the study of motivation begins and ends with the study of behavior and suggests five types of behavior patterns on which motivational inferences are based. These are: 1) behavioral direction; 2) persistence; 3) continuing motivation; 4) variation in activity level; and 5) performance. The concept of personal investment is used to capture the collective meaning of these different patterns to motivation. Personal investment is in large part the product of the meanings an individual brings to a situation. Three basic elements of meaning are viewed as important in determining an individual's personal investment in relation to a situation: 1) beliefs about self; 2) goals of behavior in the situation; and 3) alternatives for pursuing goals (Maehr, 1984).

The sense of self is defined as a collection of beliefs and feelings about who one is. Inherent in the sense of self is one's feelings of competence or efficacy. Further, this sense of self and competence is a determiner of whether an individual will invest themselves in a task or activity (Maehr, 1984). Another construct of Maehr's personal investment is goals which is defined as the motivational focus of the activity (p.127). Individuals operate in terms of what a situation will provide them and have knowledge of what they hope and expect from these situations (Maehr, 1984). These beliefs affect their behavior in predictable ways. In general, the relationship between beliefs, attitudes, and values can be treated in this way. Individuals strive for what they believe is good and right. Thus motives and values (type of belief located within a belief system) are closely associated because what individuals strive for must have worth equal to the physical and psychological effort required to attain them. Further, value may describe a belief that is central to a group or individual. These values are associated with motives (Barry and Wolf, 1965). The concept of value can replace the needs theory of motivation and modify its orientation from one of fulfilling a perceived need (want) to one that is goal oriented based on positive value. Values are learned as a result of

either direct experience or derived from others. As the child matures, the processes of value-modification and value-reinforcement continues throughout life as information input and interaction with one's environment continues. Values have a strong influence on the motives, actions, and emotions of each individual. The individual strives for things which have value and are worth the effort necessary to achieve them.

Change and Belief Systems

Rokeach (1985) contends that in studying belief systems one must consider not only the conditions fostering change but also those which foster stability and integration. There is a proclivity to describe change and resistance to change using concepts such as flexibility, independence, conformity, rigidity, and extremeness of belief (Rokeach, 1960). These value-laden descriptors leave little room for the possibility that there may be different types of change and resistance to change. The reason for investigating both are similar, a better understanding of how the system works (Rokeach, 1985). It is expected that the more central beliefs (on a scale of central, intermediate, peripheral) will be resistent to change. This is due to the greater number of connections and more consequences for other beliefs within the total belief system (Rokeach, 1968). The greater

the number of consequences, the greater the effort required to reorganize the various beliefs. The greater the effort required, the greater the individual's motivation to resist pressures to change (Rokeach, 1968). One aspect of stability of an individual's belief system is that the social action of the individual becomes more consistent with value priorities (Rokeach, 1985).

Change begins in belief systems when the individual becomes aware of differences, discrepancies, and dissonances (Levine and Lightburn, 1989). We all tend to be drawn to information that alters that which we currently know or believe, and mastery of uncertainty and reducing dissonance are primary human goals. Kagan (1978) proposes that whenever an experience disturbs one's understanding of what ought to be, he is motivated to confront that disturbance and resolve it. The new, the conflicting, and the inconsistent are major sources of belief system disturbance. As new information is received some of it conflicts with existing belief systems. Other conflicts manifest themselves as the consequences of numerous ambiguous events, and it follows that dissonance is experienced by the individual. When these events can be integrated into the existing belief system the individual experiences certainty. When events or information

cannot be integrated, dissonant or uncertain feelings are experienced and change is initiated.

One model of belief system change views it as a three-staged process involving: 1) denial; 2) feeling; and 3) acceptance (Levine and Lightburn, 1989). Initially, the individual may attempt to deny the dissonance or uncertainty of the new belief. This is followed by abandonment of denial, and a feeling stage occurs as one seeks to accommodate the new information within the existing belief system. The intensity of the response in this stage is dependent on degree and nature of the change. The final stage occurs when the new belief is assimilated and accommodated and shifts are made in related belief systems. At this point, integration or resolution of the discrepancy occurs and dissonance is resolved (Levine and Lightburn, 1989). Some of the sources precipitating change in belief systems include: 1) new information; 2) new experience; 3) conflicting experience/data; 4) trauma; and 5) conversion.

Rokeach (1985) proposes that all persisting effects (changes) on social cognition or behavior are induced by self-confrontation. Using a method of self-confrontation, individuals are made aware of their value priorities. Then due to self-introspection and discovery, they discern whether their

value priorities and their social attitudes and behaviors are compatible with their attempts to maintain and enhance their conceptions of themselves as competent and moral beings. This realization leads to either personal satisfaction or dissatisfaction with self (Rokeach, 1985). To the degree that self-satisfaction is present, the self is affirmed and the stability and integration of the belief systems and behavior is increased. The extent to which self-dissatisfaction is experienced, a process of change in belief systems and behavior is initiated (Rokeach, 1985). Through this self-confrontation, the processes of unfreezing, movement, and/or refreezing, and stability are effected. In sum, the persistence of stability and change in belief systems and behavior are joint and interacting manifestations of the psychological processes of satisfaction/dissatisfaction and of group-based processes of social control (Rokeach, 1985).

Beliefs, attitudes, and values are not static. Those which are primitive and have a strong element of connectivity are more resistant to change than those which are derived and have little connectivity (Rokeach, 1960). However, in a dynamic environment, the individual finds his/her beliefs, attitudes, and values continually challenged with new data, new elements to consider, reject, or integrate. As one matures beliefs held in

childhood are replaced by those of the adult. The process of integration, modification, and expansion of beliefs, attitudes, and values is continuous. The process of change of beliefs, attitudes, and values in most cases is not immediate and often takes many years. A number of variables have been identified which influence the capability to establish new belief systems. These variables include: 1) the ability to recall all of the new elements to be incorporated; 2) a willingness to accept new systems; 3) past experiences; 4) presentation of new beliefs (all at once or gradually); and 5) the degree of isolation or connectivity between individual beliefs (Rokeach, 1960).

Change/Innovation/Diffusion

In order to discuss innovators, one must have an understanding of change, the change process and diffusion. Additionally, characteristic features must be presented to ensure a holistic understanding.

Change involves the realization of new action possibilities (i.e. new policies, new behaviors, new methods, etc.) based on reconceptualized patterns within an organization (Kanter, 1983). Change without reference to an object is meaningless. Zaltman et al. (1973) define change as an alteration in the structure and functioning of a social system. The pressures

for change in our ever-increasingly complex society consist of a myriad of factors including: 1) a global community with instant communications and super-sonic travel; 2) technological advances in almost every aspect of our existence; 3) increased interdependence; 4) changing beliefs and value systems; 5) shared economies; 6) shared environmental issues; and 7) mutual health concerns. Vehicles facilitating the change process are technology, law, education, planning, change agents, and communication (Smith, 1992).

Harvey (1990) points out that there a number of truisms about change that cannot be ignored. Four are central to the integration of changes. First, resistance to change is inherent in people. The tendency to maintain homeostasis is as natural as breathing. Second, change requires stress and strain. Third, collaborative strategies involving the people within the change process are critical to success. And fourth, change is best introduced in small increments.

The change process consists of six distinct stages: 1) initial disturbance created by internal or external forces; 2) a feeling of need is created and a decision to do something about it; 3) diagnosis of the need as a problem; 4) search for solutions; 5) application of the possible solution to the need; and 6) satisfaction that the problem is resolved or

dissatisfaction resulting in a recycling of the process (Smith, 1992). Critical to the change process is the involvement of people; it is through them that change is realized. Further, it is important to understand that effective change occurs in an information rich environment.

Innovation is an idea, object, or practice that is viewed by the individual as new (Rogers, 1983). The perceived newness by the individual determines their reaction to it rather than the actual or real newness. Definitions concerned with technology define innovation as a technology new to a given setting or organization. It is important to distinguish between innovation and change. Innovation is any idea, practice, or artifact seen as new by the unit of adoption. The innovation is the object of the change. All innovations imply change. Not all change involves innovations since not everything a unit adopts is viewed as new (Zaltman, Duncan, and Holbeck, 1973).

One of the principal approaches taken in the discussion of the innovation process has been a concern with characteristics or those attributes that appear related to adoption. Some characteristics of innovations are central to the rates of adoption by individuals. Rogers (1983) identifies these characteristics as: 1) relative advantage (the degree to which an

innovation is viewed as better than the idea it replaces); 2) compatibility (the degree to which an innovation is viewed as being consistent with existing values and experiences of adopters); 3) complexity (the degree to which an innovation is viewed as difficult to understand and use); 4) trialability (the degree to which an innovation can be experimented with on a limited basis); and 5) observability (the degree to which the results of an innovation are visible to others). It should be recognized that many innovations undergo re-invention during implementation or adoption. This is particularly evident in the integration of new automated technology systems. A related concept innovativeness is defined as the degree to which an individual is earlier in adopting new ideas than other individuals within a system (Rogers, 1983).

Stages of the innovation process contain two primary divisions: 1) initiation and 2) implementation (Rogers, 1983). Within these two divisions are a total of five stages. In the initiation division, the first stage is agenda-setting. In this stage, problems which create a perceived need for innovation are generated and innovations within the environment are identified. The second stage consists of matching in which an organizational problem and innovation are analyzed to determine if there is

a fit among them. At this juncture of the process, the decision to adopt is made by the unit. In the implementation division there are three additional stages. Within the redefining/restructuring stage the innovation is modified and re-invented to meet the requirements of the organization, the problem, and the structures relevant to the innovation (Rogers, 1983). The next stage is clarifying in which the innovation and the organization relationship is defined more precisely. The final stage, routinizing, is the period in which the innovation is integrated into ongoing activities.

Diffusion is the process by which an innovation is communicated over time among members of a system (Rogers, 1983). Communication is defined as the process in which members of the social system create and share information necessary to understand things in common (Rogers, 1983). Diffusion is a special type of communication and in this context, a kind of social change. When new ideas are invented, diffused, adopted or rejected, leading to results, social change is the resultant (Rogers, 1983). There are four central elements in the diffusion of innovations: 1) innovation; 2) communication channels; 3) time; and 4) social system (Rogers, 1983). Innovations as defined earlier are ideas, practices, or objects that are viewed as new. Technology and innovation are often used interchangeably. A

technology is considered to be any tool or technique by which the human capability is extended (Schon, 1967). Sometimes a technology consists of hardware and software and at other times may be comprised of information (Rogers, 1983). It is often difficult in studying innovations to determine where one stops and another begins.

Adoption and Adopter Categories

Rate of adoption is the speed with which an innovation is integrated by members of the social system (Rogers, 1983). Most innovations have a s-shaped rate of adoption. Initially, only a few individuals adopt the innovation but after time, as more individuals adopt the curve begins to climb. The rate of adoption levels off as fewer individuals remain who have not adopted. Finally, the curve reaches asymptote and the diffusion process concludes (Rogers, 1983).

Rogers (1983) has identified five categories of adopters. These categories are: 1) innovators; 2) early adopters; 3) early majority; 4) late majority; and 5) laggards. Characteristics of the adopter categories represent ideal types. That is, they are conceptualizations based on observations and designed to enable comparisons.

Innovators

Rogers (1983) defines "innovativeness as the degree to which an individual is earlier in adopting new ideas than other members of a social system". Adopter distributions closely approximate normality. This is important due to the fact that normal frequency distribution has characteristics useful in classifying adopters (Rogers, 1983). If a normal frequency distribution is divided into categories of adopters using the mean and standard deviation statistics, the area lying left of the mean time of adoption minus two standard deviations includes the first 2.5 percent to adopt - the innovators (Rogers, 1983).

Innovators among other things are described as visionary and creative. They often perceive the needs of the organization and others and have a vision of what innovations are required to achieve the ideal. They are viewed as risk takers who have the courage to try new ideas, new technologies, and new approaches to problems. Innovators are seen as flexible and are willing to modify innovations to meet unanticipated or changing requirements. Innovators are noted by observers for their venturesomeness and are eager to try new ideas. They are active information seekers about new ideas and they have a high level of exposure

to mass media (Rogers, 1983). There are several prerequisites to being an innovator: 1) control of resources necessary to absorb losses incurred by an unprofitable innovation; 2) the ability to understand and apply complex technical knowledge; and 3) the ability to cope with uncertainty at the adoption event (Rogers, 1983).

Havelock (1995) views innovators as possessing the following characteristics: 1) a degree of understanding and sophistication in using an innovation; 2) representing or typical of the client system; 3) possessing influence (opinion leadership) on other members; and 4) contact and influence with the formal and informal leadership of the system. Innovators are the easiest to identify in that they have been involved and have given support to the change effort (Havelock, 1995).

Kirton (1976) in his development of the Kirton Adaption-Innovation Inventory developed a list of statements descriptive of the adaptive-innovation typology. A sample of the statements representative of the innovator are presented. Innovators are viewed by other members of the social system as undisciplined and as individuals who think tangentially and who approach tasks from unsuspected angles. They often serve as a catalyst to settled social groups and are irreverent of their consensual views

(Kirton, 1976). They are seen as abrasive and as formenters of dissonance within the group. Additionally, they are viewed as unsound, impractical and often the innovator shocks others with his views and statements. Innovators tend to take control in unstructured situations and often challenge existing rules with little respect for past tradition. Further, the innovator appears to have little self-doubt when generating new ideas and does not have a need for consensus to maintain certainty in the face of opposition. They are often viewed as insensitive to other members of the social group and often poses a threat to group cohesion and cooperation. Innovators often play a prophetic role which affects their acceptability to the social unit both before and after the innovation is adopted (Kirton, 1976). A better understanding of their roles within the social group may help to make better use of them.

Innovators viewed from another perspective are those individuals who are willing to commit to an innovation and nurture it in its infancy until it is ready for diffusion. Smith et al. (1986) found that innovators who participate in educational innovations had other characteristics than those identified by either Rogers (1983) or Kirton (1976). Their observations of these innovative individuals viewed them as "true believers" who possessed

an almost fanatical belief in a cause. Further, they are described as avant garde and change the world types. These individuals possessed humor, intelligence, creativity, and true belief. These individuals were proactive rather than reactive. They sought places where they could do what they believed should be done (Smith et al., 1986). A significant characteristic of this group of innovators was the persistence of their belief systems over time and their ongoing involvement in innovation and innovative ideals.

Wangen (1982), in her study of receptivity to change in small schools, found significant differences between innovators and teachers in six variables. These variables included: 1) receptivity to change; 2) perceptions of power to influence decision-making; 3) response to specific innovations; 4) professionalism; 5) age; and 6) experimenting. Innovators favored more choices of specific innovation such as curricular and instructional changes. Innovators felt more power to influence administrative decisions and district policies related to teaching. Innovators were more involved in professional activities related to teaching activities. These included pursuit of graduate degrees, course attendance, memberships in professional organizations, attendance at conferences, publications, and receipt of grants. In this study, innovators were older and reported more teaching experience. Results

showed they were more experimenting and analytical. Further, these innovators were more well-informed, more interested in leading others, and more inclined to experiment with alternate solutions to problems (Wangen, 1982).

In his study of diffusion related to computer technology, Stewart (1982) observed that innovators tend to vary by product class and possess few significant personality characteristics. In general, innovators tend to be more knowledgeable, more venturesome, possess positive attitudes toward change, possess higher achievement motivation, are more cosmopolitan, and frequently are more mobile (Stewart, 1982). Satisfaction with life, dogmatism, and rigidity are likely to decrease innovation proneness (Engel and Blackwell, 1982). Social status and higher education appear to be related to innovative proneness.

Change Agents

Havelock and Zlotolow (1995) define a change agent as someone who deliberately tries to bring about change or innovation in a social organization. A change agent is one who influences innovation decisions in a direction deemed desirable by a change agency (Rogers, 1983). Rogers (1983) further defines change agents as professionals with university

degrees in technical fields. In most instances, change agents seek to secure the adoption of new ideas but in some cases they may attempt to slow the diffusion process and prevent adoption of some innovations (Rogers, 1983). Change agents come from a wide variety of occupations but all provide a communication link between a resource system and a client system. Rogers (1983) contends that they are seven roles that can be identified for the change agent: 1) developing a need for change; 2) establishing an information-exchange relationship; 3) diagnoses of problems; 4) creating an intent to change; 5) translates intention into action; 6) stabilizes adoption and prevents discontinuance; and 7) achieves a terminal relationship with the client. Egan (1985) views a change agent as anyone who plays a central role in the designing, redesigning, running, or improving of any system. There is a growing need for change agents of all types: resource linkers, catalysts, solution givers, and process helpers in our society (Havelock and Zlotolow, 1995).

Summary

In this chapter, we have defined the constructs of belief and belief systems using the works of Black, Janoff-Bulman, and Rokeach. The relationship of beliefs, attitudes, and values was examined and the

interdependent relationships between them are considered important factors in understanding human behavior and motivation and, although not treated, personality. We found that belief systems are formed developmentally from a myriad of sources and there exists, according to M. Rokeach, a structure which consists of central, intermediate, and peripheral beliefs. The effect of beliefs, attitudes, and values on behavior and motivation was discussed. We found that people tend to act more in accordance with their beliefs, attitudes, and values than in opposition to them. Finally, we addressed the issue of belief system stability and change. The more central a belief and the more it is connected with other beliefs, the greater the resistance to change. Primitive or basic beliefs are highly resistent to change, however, belief systems, as a whole, are not static, rather they are dynamic processes engaged in continuous life-long refinement, modification, and development.

Further, this chapter has reviewed the change, innovation, and diffusion processes, and adopter categories within diffusion with special emphasis on the innovator and the change agent. The factors driving unprecedented change in the late twentieth century were reviewed, truisms regarding change, and the stages of the change process were discussed. The difference between innovation and change is presented and the

characteristics of innovations central to adoption were outlined. The stages of the innovation process and the central elements within diffusion are addressed. Three dimensions of the innovator are provided: 1) within technological change and diffusion; 2) with social change; and 3) as a pioneer in new methods and approaches to education. Characteristics, both facilitating and negative, to the client system are offered. In the final analysis, innovators and change agents provide the dynamics necessary to bring about periodic change without which organizations stagnate.

Chapter 3

Methodology

The principal goal of this research is the identification of beliefs, attitudes, and values of innovators who had participated in the Daniel Boone Wilderness Therapeutic Camping Program during the years 1975-77. Qualitative research methods will be used to accomplish this end. Naturalistic inquiry is a process through which to study human life and processes. It includes techniques such as interviews and participant observation. My purpose is to create for the reader, a detailed picture of the shared beliefs, practices, attitudes, and behaviors of some group of people. In the case at hand, it will be used to examine the beliefs, values, and attitudes of a group of individuals who participated in a singularly unique educational and treatment program.

The value of a study of this nature is four-fold: 1) it contributes to the limited data available on beliefs, values, and attitudes of educational innovators; 2) it captures for the historical record the experience of these innovators which may assist others in developing future innovations in education and the treatment of adolescents; 3) it extends the utilization and sophistication of important qualitative research methods; and 4) it provides

a reflective analysis of important dynamics that does not occur typically in the midst of implementing change and innovation.

Glesne and Peshkin (1992) point out that qualitative research methods seek to understand and interpret the perspectives of the participants in the event. Its epistemological roots reside in the philosophy of rationalism which views the origin of knowledge as logic. The assumptions of qualitative inquiry are: 1) primacy of subject matter; 2) variables are complex and interwoven and are difficult, if not impossible, to measure; and 3) an Emic (insiders) view is preferred. Its purposes are contextualization, interpretations, and an understanding of the participants perspective.

The qualitative approach varies from quantitative research methods in that: 1) it ends with hypotheses rather than begins with them; 2) it focuses on the emergence of variables rather than their manipulation, control, and measurement; 3) it is naturalistic rather than experimental; 4) it views the researcher as a primary instrument; 5) it seeks patterns; 6) it investigates complexity and pluralism; and 7) the findings of qualitative research are descriptive not abstract (Glesne and Peshkin, 1992). The absence of pre-

specified focus allows for the emergence and discovery of unique phenomena such as that which occurred at Boone.

In initiating this study of the Boone innovation, attention was first focused on the needs and requirements of a study of this nature. Much of my interest in beliefs, values, and attitudes of educational innovators was generated as a result of my reading of "Educational Innovators: Then and Now" (Smith, Kleine, Prunty, and Dwyer, 1986). The question of focus for my study results in a specification of my interest in the beliefs, values, and attitudes that individuals bring to an innovations. The identification of Boone as the innovation in my examination of innovators came from my own experience as a member of the Boone program. I went to work at Boone in July 1976 as an educational diagnostician following a two year tenure as an administrator and adjunct faculty member at a large community college. I would remain at Boone for period of 15 months serving as both diagnostician and as a teacher in the camps. I believed then and I believe now that Boone was a unique program in the education and treatment of adolescents and further that it is an appropriate context in which to study innovator beliefs, attitudes, and values.

The Sample

In addressing the issue of who could participate, I have established a service time requirement of one year for informants to be included in the study. This effectively reduces the number of potential informants to approximately 50 individuals. Of the remaining potential informants, my ability to contact and involve them is a primary selection factor. With few exceptions, I have maintained no contacts over the years with the innovators who gathered at Boone twenty plus years ago. The search began with Richard Peng, a former Boone teacher and continuing agency employee, with whom I had maintained contact over the intervening years. Discussing the study with Richard has generated an initial list of four potential informants: Jack Knight, former Superintendent; Rhett Wilkes, caseworker and probation and parole coordinator; Ian Martin, caseworker and caseworker supervisor; and Richard. I began by contacting Jack Knight, who I felt was one informant central to the study. During our conversation of the study and whether Jack would participate, he mentioned that Kim Daniels was with him at Maryville and that she might like to participate, a fifth potential informant. I then called Rhett and as we discussed the study and his involvement, he suggested that I include Sue

Smith, former caseworker, caseworker supervisor, and assistant camp director at Boone, a sixth. During my call to Ian related to the study, he suggested William McCarthy, former caseworker who is living in the Big City area, a seventh informant. Three additional informants, Manny Moore, Dylan Jones, and Jed Walker were interviewed as the pilot study was expanded. Thus, informal networking became the principal investigatory tool by which the group was defined. While other former staff have been suggested during the course of interviews, I have chosen these ten to represent the initial beliefs, attitudes, and values of the Boone innovators. One of the ten informants, Jed Walker represented the training staff who in the beginning were the core therapeutic campers. It was this core group of individuals who carefully interviewed and selected the staff members of Boone which make up the study informants.

Importantly, based on my experience in the program, it was not the core group of therapeutic campers that gave substance to this innovation but the early staff who adopted, formed, and maintained the essential character of the wilderness therapeutic camping and experiential education program.

The specific vehicles used to conduct this study were life histories and document reviews. Life history data was gathered from each informant during the conduct of interviews.

Using an interview guide, I asked each informant who they were and where they had come from prior to Boone. What experience they had with kids and similar programs? What attitudes or beliefs did they have about kids when they got to Boone? I continued by asking them for their perceptions of the program, its philosophies, treatment strategies, and, most importantly, its people. I asked about their feelings after their first experience in the woods and after six months. Further, I asked if they felt the program was a success? I asked what they thought kids took with them from Boone and what they (the study participants) took from Boone when they left in terms of beliefs, values, and attitudes.

The interviews continued with where they had gone and what they have done since Boone? Involvement in other programs/innovations, things from Boone they initiated in other programs were be explored. The interviews concluded with two questions. Would you do the Boone experience again? And finally, a global question, compare yourself with the person you were at Boone with the person you are today in terms of

beliefs, values, and attitudes. While these questions comprised the core asked of all informants, responses and themes from the informants were used when appropriate.

Documentation of the Boone Wilderness Therapeutic Camping Program was limited, however, some documentation and training manuals were available for review and analysis. These were secured by filing a research proposal (Appendix C) with the Director of Research and Planning for the agency.

Data Analysis

As interviews were completed, they were reviewed immediately after by a listening analysis of the tapes. Much of this was done following the interview and during the hundreds of miles of travel required between informants. Following a listening analysis, tapes were transcribed into electronic media, Word for Windows, converted to WordPerfect 5.0 and formatted. Line numbering was used for ease in handling the data during analysis. Due to the relatively small sample (ten), specific software applications such as Ethnograph were not employed. However, a computerized data management tool such as Ethnograph would have facilitated coding and grouping of the data. Each response of the informant

was analyzed separately, noting similarities, trends, and contrasts. These themes were identified using major code names to identify areas as the data was reviewed in hard copy transcripts. Following initial coding and transfer to electronic media, search capabilities were used to group responses with similar themes. Due to the fact that some themes overlapped across interview items, the data was sub-coded to note the occurrence of themes which were supported by other data. The actual findings are discussed in the following sections.

Summary

This chapter discussed the methodology and the value of a study of this nature. A discussion of the sample and how selections of the informants were made is addressed. The data analysis procedures were discussed.

Chapter 4

Data Analysis

Before beginning to discuss the themes of this retrospective study on beliefs, values, and attitudes, I feel it is important for the reader to be aware of how values, beliefs, and attitudes were defined.

I begin with the concept of belief. It is, I believe, the grand paradigm under which values and attitudes appropriately fall. After reviewing numerous sources searching for a definition of beliefs, I choose this one by Rokeach to provide the criteria I used in identifying the beliefs, values, and attitudes of the staff who were the Boone Wilderness Therapeutic Camping Program.

> ... A belief is any simple proposition, conscious or unconscious, inferred from what a person says or does, capable of being preceded by the phrase "I believe that..." The content of a belief may describe the object of belief as true or false, correct or incorrect; evaluate it as good or bad; or advocate a certain course of action or certain state of existence as desireable or undesirable. The first kind of belief may be called descriptive or existential (I believe the sun rises in the east); the second kind of belief may be called an

evaluative belief (I believe this ice cream is good); the third kind may be called prescriptive or exhoratory belief (I believe that it is desireable that children obey their parents). (1968, p.113)

Further, I define attitudes and values and attempt to show the interrelations between belief, values, and attitudes. First, I define attitude, for which there are a variety of definitions in common usage. Attitudes are a learned and generally persistent tendency on the part of persons to respond positively or negatively to a given premise, event or other phenomena. Sociologists view attitudes in relation to social values; psychologists see them in a relationships between attitudes and other elements of personality. I have chosen to view them from both perspectives. Values are defined for the purpose of this study as any phenomena that has some degree of worth to the members of a group. It is distinguished from belief in that values are preferences and beliefs are not. Values are general standards that are independent of specific situations. Sometimes value is used interchangeably with opinion.

I accept the concept of belief systems as defined by Rokeach:

When the totality of one's beliefs are considered in their context and structure one has a belief system: "The belief system is conceived

to represent all the beliefs, sets, expectancies, or hypotheses, conscious and unconscious, that a person at a given time accepts as true of the world he lives in."

I would continue that conception by adding values, attitudes, opinions, hopes, concerns, loves, hates, fears, and others are also parts of one's belief system. I have treated belief, value, and attitude in this study with no hard and set attempt to distinguish clearly between them. I have not sought to classify them. It is my position that their are interdependent and that they should be viewed holistically within the context of the Boone study.

Themes related to beliefs, values, and attitudes emerging from the interview data have been organized into four sections identified as: 1) New Beginnings; 2) Teach Your Children; 3) Start A Revolution; and 4) I Remember You. Any aficionado of contemporary 1960's and early 1970's music will recognize these as songs, lines from songs, or phrases representative of the late 1960s and early 1970s. I chose them because I believe they reflect the common themes that emerged from the informants and from the data they provided to the study.

The first theme developed, **New Beginnings**, is reflective of the reasons many of the staff who participated in the Boone experience came there and involves who these people were, where they came from, and what they believed in before they came to Boone. It is a reflection of the generation that emerged from the 1960's and many of the beliefs, values, and attitudes are consistent with my perception of the philosophy of that era. Also this theme reflects the same new beginning for many of the students who were unable to make it in traditional institutions. The informants told stories of being at times in their lives when they were searching for meaning, for new beginnings. It was summed best by Richard Peng when he said; " I found Boone when I needed Boone and when Boone needed me." "I was ready for a change."

The second theme, **Teach Your Children** is one consistent throughout the data, a genuine concern by the people of Boone for kids and a belief in the goodness of humanity wherever it exists. This theme is ever present as informants talk about kids and the things that kids took from Boone but it is also reflected in the ways they talked of their compatriots and the things they took from Boone.

Theme three, **Start a Revolution**, deals with the transfer of Boone philosophies, beliefs and practices to other programs. Many of the informants when asked what they took from Boone responded with a litany of other programs they had been involved in which they integrated Boone strategies, philosophies, and beliefs.

To conclude, theme four, **I Remember You**, is a collection of individual's remembrances of the Boone experience, whether they would do it again, and how the experience has affected their lives and their beliefs, attitudes, and values.

New Beginnings

Gathering together. Success,
The king approaches his temple.
It furthers one to see the great man.
This brings success. Perseverance furthers.
To bring great offerings creates good fortune.
It furthers one to undertake something.
I Ching

The purpose of this section is to briefly describe how each of the informants came to be involved in the BWTCP and in part, how Boone State School became the Daniel Boone Wilderness Therapeutic Camping Program. Further, it seeks to identify the basic beliefs, attitudes, and the values that informants brought with them. I chose **New Beginnings** to represent a common theme in both the stories of the informants and in the development of the therapeutic camping and experiential education program.

As stated earlier, the innovators of Boone were young adults, aged 24-34, mostly white and mostly male. They were college educated with many possessing advanced degrees which varied from the traditional masters of education in English, counseling and guidance, masters of social work to the unconventional master of arts in theater. Bachelors degrees were common in sociology, psychology, English, and physical education with very

few degrees in experiential education and therapeutic camping. These were not the products of east State but of Oregon, Connecticut, Mississippi, Oklahoma, West Virginia, South Carolina, and India (yes, India) to name a few. They were cosmopolitan to use Rogers terminology in describing innovators (Rogers, 1983). They were not the originators of the concepts that were to become Boone but they were the first to adopt them and through practice give them substance and meaning.

These people who came to participate in this innovation were indeed the children of the sixties. I suspect many of their first impressions of death were associated with the assassination of John F. Kennedy on November 22, 1963. In their teens or early 20's, they experienced the assassination of Martin Luther King Jr. in April of 1968 and then of Robert F. Kennedy in June of that same year. The Vietnam war was replayed every night on the news. In the streets, both minorities and middle class white kids protested and rioted against authority. In searching for words that typified this group, I first thought of John F. Kennedy famous words, " Ask not what your country can do for you, but rather, what you can do for your country", to Martin Luther King's, " I have a dream." I settled on the words of Robert F. Kennedy, "Some people see

things as they are and ask why, I dream of things people have never thought of and ask why not?"

Innovators among other things are described as visionary and creative. They often perceive the needs of the organization and others and have a vision of what innovations are required to achieve the ideal. They are viewed as risk takers who have the courage to try new ideas, new technologies, and new approaches to problems. Innovators are seen as flexible and are willing to modify innovations to meet unanticipated or changing requirements. Innovators are noted by observers for their venturesomeness and are eager to try new ideas. They are active information seekers about new ideas and they have a high level of exposure to mass media (Rogers, 1983). This group of innovators can be typified as young, idealistic, liberal, and long-haired with dreams of saving the world, communal living, and Earth mothers. Collectively they viewed themselves as these and many other things. Their stories reflect these characteristics of risk-taking, venturesomeness, and willingness to try new ideas before they reached Boone and after.

William McCarthy described the staff in this way, when I asked him about his first impressions of Boone.

WC: I liked it. I mean, I thought everybody was pretty right on and I mean, everybody was a little, a little weird; there definitely was an outlaw feel to a lot of people that were there. I mean, you know, there were several people from my buddy old Rob Ruster, whose paths crossed mine back and forth. He had just come back from the Peace Corps from Bogota, Columbia and there were people like that, a lot of people who were from the sixties. They believed in being genuine and honest with folks. They were willing to help others and to go out of their way to make you feel cared for and part of the group. They believed in kids and in trying to make things better for people who hadn't had the same breaks as they'd had.

Jack Knight, originator of the Boone innovation, in response to my request for them to describe the innovators of Boone stated,

JK: "Weird."

Richard Peng saw the staff in a different light. He pointed out the dichotomies that existed among many of the individuals who came to Boone. Reflective of many of the descriptors that Rogers (1983) has found in his studies.

RP: We were woods people on one hand but very cultured on the other hand. A lot of times, we were into culture, music, and the arts. We wanted what the big city had to offer and we appreciated these kinds of activities. Yet, they wanted to be in the woods too. Maybe this sounds very esoteric but I saw that dichotomy from the very beginning. Even the trainers had that, because the trainers were people who were attracted to the outdoors sort of thing but they also liked the arts and music.

Rhett Wilkes described the staff in this way when I asked:

SH: How did you perceive the staff?

RW: I thought they were generally pretty good. I thought they were a reasonable group. I thought they really cared about kids and what they were doing. I think

they had good interpersonal skills, they were generally positive people. I think they tended to make far more correct decisions than wrong ones. And I think the kids learned a lot from them.

I continued by asking,

SH: What kind of general philosophy do you think the staff or you had, what were the things they felt were important in life? What did they believe in and value?

RW: I think everyone brought with them a belief of what the right way to treat people, to treat each other was. I think there was an integrity that was preached through actions. I think there was a lot of self-esteem when they looked at what they were accomplishing out there and when they looked at things they were doing. I think there was a free spirit that was common among the original staff. People were pretty calm. I don't think people were afraid to make mistakes and they weren't bothered by kids when they made mistakes. There was a tenacity that was common among the staff.

Just as natural consequences played a role with the students, natural consequences had a role with the staff. Bad staff didn't stay long.

Later in the interview, the staff came up again, when Rhett was describing the changes that have occurred since Boone. He described the staff again.

RW: There was a lot of idealism, save the world kind of values. And I think these people still feel that way. They were involved with the kids. Pretty much everyone had a sense of humor and continue to have that today. They can still laugh at themselves and what they are doing as much as they did back at Boone. But I think we're probably a little bit smarter.

Sue Smith, one of the two female informants involved in the study, characterized the staff during our interview in these ways.

SH: How would you typify the people who came to work at Boone? What were their beliefs and philosophies about?

Sue: Just generally, they probably were some of the brightest

and wittiest people that I've ever been around. Humor is really an important area for me and that was a big part. Their philosophies were all fly-in-the-face type. Nontraditional, very nontraditional people. Incredibly -- some of them had such traditional appearing backgrounds. They came from the sanitary corporate world and what the hell are you doing out here? Very open, very open to experience. I don't think anybody brought any rock hard preconceptions to either work or to one another. It was just open. Just completely open. They believed in acceptance of others and others ideas and opinions. It was a very, very intelligent group. We could have screwed the program to the wall but we made it last with little or nothing. Very intelligent group. I think all of us maybe were at that point where we had to stop and assess what was important. I think some of us had been into the money making thing and decided that we needed to stop and look at it again. Others of us, myself, I could see this nice sanitary world over here and then I could see the adrenaline junkies world over here. And I thought, well, Boone, its

different, let me check it out. I might get bored. And there were other people from very sheltered environments. Like Carl Myers that wanted to get out away from the corporate world and I wanted to develop another type of contact with the world. But -- I think it was a different setting. I think the reason that the camping program failed in the end is that ethic or that morality among people was gone. In other words, we worked as a team. I mean we could be very miserable to one another, and dash one another. And do this. Religiously. To this day we still do it. We have great fun. But when push came to shove, it was a team. And there was not one person who was more important than another person. It was a cohesive group. And I guess the best way that I can sum it up is that a lot of the people who ended up at Boone did what was intended to have been done during the 1960's. They revised a whole way of life and they did that service to the community. They actually gave service and they didn't want anything back from it. You know, the paychecks. Look what

people did with their money. I mean remember the junk and crap that people used to drive around in?

The willingness to seek challenges common to innovators was pointed out when I asked Ian Martin to typify the people at Boone and in response he described them in this way:

IM: I think there was something else, not really philosophical, but there was a drawing factor that kept people there and the people that made it were people that had some kind of intestinal fortitude about them.

SH: What else kept people there?

IM: I think it was some kind of individual, innate desire to accomplish, to deal with a challenge. I mean, there was an undefined world in front of us and there was something that we were challenged to accomplish. I think there was some predominate definition of the program as being survival oriented. And that translated itself into the staff and they were into the survival of it. And those three days off were often spent in individual survival. So often people's social life and professional

life were all in one because it was the same circle of people who were involved. There was a lot of not only helping of the clients but a lot of other help in one way or the other in reliance or dependency on one another. But it was a survival thing. And people would bitch and moan and groan about how bad it was and be back because it was something that was a need, it became a need and a challenge that people wanted to accomplish. There was a belief common to all of us that we could make a little difference in the lives of these kids and that we had a obligation to do it.

I met with Jed Walker, the primary change agent/consultant/trainer hired by Jack Knight to formulate the program that would become the Boone Wilderness Therapeutic Camping Program, in the Hill Country of east State. I hadn't seen or talked to Jed in almost eighteen years but the wizened, piercing intensity was still evident in his eyes. I wanted to explore with him the types of people that Boone attracted and the beliefs, values, and attitudes that he perceived the innovators brought with them to Boone.

SH: You interviewed the people hired at Boone in the first year? What kind of people were you looking for in terms of beliefs, attitudes, and values?

JW: Yes, for the first year, I interviewed them all. What we were looking for was people who liked kids and that thought kids had the potential to do anything they set their minds to do, and that didn't want to be jail keepers or have kids locked up and didn't mind putting in the hours and sacrifices that were necessary to do that kind of work. Which meant basically that they were willing to give up a normal life style and live with the kids in the woods with the idea they weren't going to do it forever. It was an excellent place for staff in college or just out of college to get a "basic training" in group work and working with kids. We didn't want people who were going to be best buddies with the kids but they were going to be role models and help the kids discover things about themselves. We wanted kids not to look up to staff but we wanted them to feel pride in finding out about themselves and the things they learned. The idea was when they left the

program they weren't looking back and saying, "The program was really good for me", but rather they were looking back and saying, "Look what I did, what I accomplished". We were looking for staff who wanted it also.

SH: Remember any of the questions you asked potential staff in the interviews?

JW: Basically. We would feel them out about working twenty-four hours a day. I can't remember the specific questions but many of them had to do with their attitudes about kids. And if they were someone who thought that kids ought to be punished or locked up, we didn't hire them. There wasn't that kind of control. The only control staff had was the group. Your influence. You did have the ultimate power of determining whether the decision of the group was responsible and whether it was the best decision we could make at the time. The litmus test on every decision was is it responsible and then you moved on. The whole idea was that you learned from each decision made and at the same time you had them experience things where they were learning. Some

of the first things were basic responsibilities like cleanliness, dry clothes and others. The kids had a say in how their lives went. Basically, we hired people who had or could accept that life style and so you got some independent, free-thinkers. People who lived alternative lifestyles. Also the college we were drawing some staff from was in a wilderness setting and it attracted those kind of students. The whole idea was to get away from urban sprawl. Also, we had the masters program in the psychology department working with us and they were granting credit for working at Boone.

SH: In describing the staff at Boone, one of the informants described them as two types. The first pseudo-hippies; the other "come to Jesus". How would you comment on that?

JW: If you mean by hippies those that lived a simpler life and weren't into monetary/material things, I would say yes. On the "come to Jesus" types, I don't remember that being dominant. The values they had were right in line with those the rest of us had, they were just individual and we weren't into organized religion. But as far as their values, beliefs on

what was good and bad we were basically the same. They both boil down to "do unto others as you would have them do unto you".

SH: If I asked you to list the top five beliefs or values of the staff what would they be?

JW: I think basically they valued honesty, they valued kids and what they had to offer, they didn't come there to push their values or beliefs on kids, they valued education, and they valued the experience and how you learn from experience. I don't think they wanted people laying down rules but they believed in self-reliance. They believed in teaching others to be self-reliant and to take responsibility.

From outlaws - to weird - to cosmopolitans who delved into the arts and music - to people who had integrity, tenacity, a belief in how people should be treated, and willing to make mistakes, span the range of descriptions for this group of individuals who came to the woods of deep east State. Their stories and how they came to Boone are as unique as the program itself.

William McCarthy was a Vietnam veteran who returned from the war with a dream of a team of mules and a wagon. When I met with him for our first interview, he stated, " I guess I've given up my dream of a wagon and a mule team." He had an education degree and was working as a caseworker with the department of human services nearby Boone. He spoke of his coming to DHS and then Boone in this way and in it he revealed a venturesomeness common to the Boone innovators.

WC: I was there primarily because I couldn't find a job. And I had a degree and I had tried tons of other things. I got hooked in every little sales type job that there was. Boone sounded good to me. I think in a lot of ways I was extremely naive about the real world. I don't think anybody ever told me what it was that you really need to look for in life. It was all just a deal. Of course, I was a Nam vet and that changed a lot of perceptions. I was right down Dustin Hoffman's alley for the Graduate. I understood and identified with that movie to the max. And then I became a professional actor when I got back from Nam for a couple of years.

Went to New York, auditioned in New York. I could have done some children's theater eventually but I could tell that New York was not where I wanted to hang loose. I got back and stayed with some cousins for awhile that were caseworkers.

Richard Peng's trip to Boone took a more traditional route but his need, desire for something new and different was a common theme.

RP: Well, I taught public school, City Schools, I started in junior high, seventh grade. And I taught, I originally started teaching like a "January" thing because I had already graduated from college. I went back for a semester and got my teaching stuff. I went an extra semester of college after I graduated with my English degree. So, I started teaching seventh grade for a couple of years and then, I was drafted.

SH: You were teaching before you were drafted?

RP: Yes, I was drafted into the military and then after serving in the military for three years, I came back and they gave me a job back but they didn't give me my

old job back. They, the administration, in the junior high they asked me if I would consider the high school. I said, "fine". And that's when I went to teach at City High School.

Later during his interview, he stated with conviction.

RP: "I had always wanted to be an English teacher."

Rhett Wilkes' story involved early experiences in working with kids through high school and college. Finishing South University with a degree in anthropology, then three years in the military with an overseas assignment in Germany, Rhett was working as a hotel manager when he heard of Boone.

RW: I found out about Boone when Richard called me in New Orleans. There had just been someone who died in a room when he called. We were cleaning that up. He had been there for awhile. And Richard called and asked how I would like to go hiking, camping, and canoeing and get paid for it. That sounded like a good idea so I came up and interviewed. Everyone seemed real nice.

To many that came to Boone, it was a new beginning. Tired of what they had where they were at, they saw an opportunity for change, a chance to be different. Richard Peng spoke of it most poignantly.

RP: I knew absolutely nothing about what I was getting into. But I was ready. Boone came available to me at a time in my life when I was wanting a change, and I was open to something new. I wanted --I didn't want anything like I'd had before. I just wanted a new experience, and boy, it was. It was not to be anything like I'd experienced before. I mean, it was real strange. This program was not like anything I ever thought I wanted to be working in. But yet, I was hoping for a whole new thing. I thought, well, you know, if this is what it is, this is what it is. I'll try anything because I want a change. I don't want that setting where I had been before.

SH: What were you looking for when you went there?

RP: Just a new beginning and people who had more liberal ideas, who really wanted to teach and who really

wanted to work with kids. People who believed in kids and helping kids. They didn't just want to be bureaucrats and all of the traditional things. They wanted to know their students and they wanted to hope that they made some difference in the lives of their students.

This need for change, something different was also echoed by William McCarthy when in response to how did he come to Boone, he stated,

WM: It was almost the same reason I went to Nam. I didn't have to go to Nam, but certain circumstances made it what I needed to do. So it was certain personal circumstances that made it (Boone) where I probably needed to be. It sounded romantic to go on 30 day camping trips and to do all these things and hang out in the woods and whatever. I still think to some degree that there was a little bit of residue left over from Nam, because Nam had a lot of primitiveness to it and somehow you could cope in that environment

fairly easy. Boone was the same, you didn't have to deal with a bunch of mundane stuff because things were pretty cut and dry.

Ian Martin's trip to Boone took a wrong turn at New Orleans and he ended up in Venezuela. After spending two years working in the federal prison system directing recreational programs, he returned home with a new wife. He came back to the United States not wanting to go to work in a traditional environment but wanting to work in the "helping business". Boone provided him the opportunity.

IM: I hung out for awhile after graduation and after a year, I was accepted into the Peace Corps into a pilot project in Venezuela. It involved the development of rehabilitation programs in the federal prison system in Venezuela. And specifically my assignment was to work in recreation and sports programs. So I went because I didn't really have much else going on at the time. It offered me a real hands-on opportunity to get into the helping business. And I guess when I said a minute ago, you've got to go back before graduation as far as

what my beliefs, values and my desires were. My primary motives for everything I was doing was athletically motivated but my endeavors in psychology and sociology were probably the most enticing things that I was involved in. It was just that I was young and idealistic and really didn't have any idea where I was going. Of course, getting out of college I found didn't get me any place just because I had a degree. But again, the opportunity to go in and work with the federal prison system in Venezuela and working in these programs gave me some hands-on experience. The frustrations and the difficulties of dealing in the helping business. And I spent two years in Venezuela and I worked in the federal prison system. There were a few adjustments. From 1974 to 1976 I was in Venezuela. I was not only working with the federal prison system, but also working with the Department of Education. And I was developing programs for young children, underprivileged young children, in sports and recreation.

So that kind of helped me transition what I was doing in the helping business from adults in the correctional program to working with underprivileged children. Still in the helping situation and providing services, I had opportunities to do some things. They didn't have that kind of expertise available. And it was great, you know. It was a very monumental part of my life as far as making decisions on what I wanted to do. And I really enjoyed it. I got into it. I didn't accomplish a lot in my assigned positions but I think on more of a personal side that in some of the endeavors I was able to be involved in that I accomplished a lot more. Basically what all that did was provide the catalyst for when I wanted to come back to the United States and what I was going to do.

Ian Martin spoke of his coming to Boone and new beginnings as:

IM: I drove back down there and found out what this program was all about. Well, what enticed me originally, you know, I had the desire to get into the

helping thing. I felt like the Peace Corps experience had provided me with some rather nontraditional experience or basis to move from. And I just didn't feel good about walking into a mental hospital or a real traditional-type, rigid-type of program. But the camping program, I thought, really provided a real creative, a real idealistic environment to do some things with kids. And from how it was described to me, it was far from being well-defined. But a lot of it was I needed a job and Boone was outlandish enough that it attracted me. I didn't have hard core experience in camping or corrections or anything else. Just enough, I'd had a taste of a couple of those things. It sounded exciting and it sounded very different. And that's what attracted me to it. So I took the job.

Sue Smith was 24 years old and a single parent. She had graduated with a masters degree in guidance and counseling and had worked with another agency, and was also looking for something different. I asked her how she had become aware of Boone.

SH: How did you find out about Boone?

SS: George H. I had gotten out of graduate school and was working at a Pizza Inn and George came in on his off time and drank coffee for like five hours a day. He and my boss at the time, Brad, were drinking buddies. Brad told him I was looking for a real job and George told me about Boone.

SH: And do you remember anything about the interview, questions that were asked?

Sue: Yes. Dave basically spent the interview trying to convince me to go to work at the girls' camp. And there was no discussion of my experience with kids. There was no discussion of whether or not I even understood what the hell the program was about. They had an opening at the girls' camp. I could get a job there. And I kept telling him "no". I disliked working with girls. I didn't have any desire to do it and he told me basically that when they filled their EEOC quotas he would give me a call.

Kim Daniels was a young divorcee who had just completed a degree in guidance and counseling. In an attempt to explore further the theme of networking that been evident in the stories of Rhett Wilkes, Ian Martin, and Sue Smith, I asked Kim:

SH: Where did you come from before Boone?

Kim: Before I came to Boone, I had finished a year of a master's program and then I had gone back full time. And when I got my degree, I didn't have any particular jobs in mind and I saw a flier on the bulletin board at school that said "Wilderness camping, experience with kids", call this number at Boone. So I called and went over and interviewed with Jed Walker and he hired me.

Dylan Jones had just completed his masters degree at Jefferson Davis University. Unlike his peers, Dylan was from east State and had spent most of his life growing up in the woods. A U.S. Navy bosun's mate, he returned home to participate in the anti-war movement. He joined the Boone staff in 1976 and would remain until the closure of the last camp and beyond.

SH: Who were you and where had you been before Boone?

DJ: After graduation, I couldn't find a job teaching so I went to work in construction. After a couple of years I went to work in a program called Latch Key working with kids who had been identified as problematic. I ran into Debra and she told me about a job at Boone.

SH: Who did you interview with?

DJ: I met with Carl Rivers and he was about to become principal. He described a new program that was a sailing program at Punta Gordo. I had been in the navy and that really interested me. He sent me to see Jack Knight and he hired me. They decided I should go to the new camp.

SH: Do you remember any of the questions they asked you?

DJ: While in college I had read some A.S. Neil and others and adopted some of their philosophies. That is the manipulation of natural consequences. We talked about that and later I found out that natural consequences was one of the major tenets of the Boone program. They asked about how I felt about discipline and corporal punishment. I told them I

didn't believe in them. They asked about being in the woods. I told them I'd grown up in the woods.

SH: So you had plenty of wilderness experiences to draw from? One of the few who had spent time in the woods.

DJ: Yeah. I had plenty of experience.

SH: Was there anything (beliefs, attitudes etc.) they were trying to screen out?

DJ: They were trying to screen out people with violent tendencies. People who would lose their temper quickly. People who had predisposed ideas about kids in trouble. I think they were trying to avoid the come meet Jesus types.

Manny Moore was a Marine who had served in Viet Nam. He had completed his masters degree at Minnehka University and was looking for a job when he found an advertisement in the university Placement Office.

SH: Who were you and what were you doing before Boone?

MM: Before I came to work at Boone, I was a graduate student. I finished on Saturday and went to work at Boone on Monday. Previous to Boone I was in the Marine Corps for four years.

SH: Had you had any experience working with kids before Boone?

MM: No but what excited me about working at Boone was that I had been in an Outward Bound program and so I liked the thought of therapeutic camping and gaining insight into oneself in a natural environment.

SH: Would it be safe to say that you believe that being in a natural environment had some positive impact on development and maturation?

MM: Its very real. Instantaneous in the consequences that are received from the behaviors that a person has or participates in. That feedback that a person receives so direct is an advantage in dealing with people who don't accept responsibility well. If there in a situation where they can see immediately what can happen as a result of their behavior, it helps them quite a bit.

SH: What type of people did Boone attract?

MM: People who were in between situations in their lives and were to give a lot of time. A lot of people who had things

in their lives they didn't want to deal with and they used it to avoid them.

SH: What beliefs did you perceive among the staff?

MM: Many believed that change was possible and they could impact kids in a positive manner. I was impressed by their honesty. They would be real straight with you and calling it like they saw them. They would make do in hard situations.

So for the informants, Boone was a new beginning, a chance for something new. A change. They came from varying paths. Veterans home from Viet Nam, graduate students, business persons, Peace Corps volunteers in foreign prisons, corporate types, and public school teachers to name a few. Clearly, they possessed the characteristics of innovators. They had the courage to try new ideas, concepts, and new environs. They were venturesomeness and willing to try new ideas. They sought challenge and they were tenacious in pursuit of their goals. They were willing to commit to the concepts of natural consequences, positive peer pressure, and experiential education, to nurture these concepts in their infancy. There were many who were "true believers" who possessed almost fanatical beliefs

in causes such as service to others. These individuals sought places where they could do what they believed should be done - that place was Boone.

I would be remiss if I did not address the individual who had the vision of the Boone Wilderness Therapeutic Camping Program, Jack Knight, the originator and Superintendent of Boone. Jack is currently a superintendent with the agency and a twenty year veteran. He possesses a master's degree in social work and has served in numerous administrative capacities within the agency. Rather than describing Jack, I chose to allow the informants to describe him.

Richard Peng described him in this way:

RP: Jack's an agent of Change.

SH: And?

RP: And Rob Mason saw him as an agent of Change. He had been in the juvenile courts in North State and then when the lid blow off over at Maysville and we had the riots. It was the only time where they had real riots in the agency. And that was when the court case began and all of that confusion. And Jack went in to restore order and literally went in where buildings were on fire and restored order.

SH: Jack did?

RP: Yes. But he did not go in and restore order by bouncing heads. That was not his approach. He went in and started playing basketball with some guys and said, let's talk about this. And that was the beginning. You know, that's who this guy was and he, Mason, felt that if anyone could make Boone work, Jack could.

Rhett Wilkes described the Jack Knight of today:

RW: Jack is by far the most creative, the most innovative institutional superintendent in the agency. He's not constrained by the system. Whenever there is a task force going on, they bring Jack in. He'll oppose anyone -- he'll just have an opposing view.

SH: Some people would consider that to be blocking behavior.

RW: Well, yeah, but that's not how it works, really. And that's not what I hear people say.

SH: Jack's seen as the devil's advocate, so to be speak.

RW: Yeah. I think all of that is something that these

people brought to Boone. A willingness to challenge the traditional ways of thinking about and doing things. But it was also something that Jack Knight and Boone nurtured.

I met with Jack Knight in his office and I asked him how he had come to State and how the Boone program had evolved.

SH: How did you come to child care?

JK: Well, at an early age of twenty I read an article about kids and it came as a "flash in the night", that it was exactly what I wanted to do. There were no doubts, after I read that article, it seemed I had found what I was looking for. And I searched out jobs but nobody would hire me. I didn't have any experience and they told me I needed to go get my degree. I packed up my wife and kid and went to Mid-State University and got my undergraduate degree in sociology. One of professors at the University was talking about social work and he told me they could help get me a stipend for graduate school. I explored that and got my masters

degree with the intent of working with kids. I had done some internships at the juvenile court. One of those was under Rob Baker and he was influential throughout my career. After graduation, I interviewed with several states and I actually signed up to go to a training school in California. I had gone back to the juvenile court where I had done an internship to visit some friends and found out about a job as a chief probation officer. So I liked the court system and applied and to my surprise I got the position. I worked in North State trying to develop things to help kids that were in trouble. I did that for three years and became Director of the Juvenile Bureau. There were conflicts with a local judge and I had worked with another person influential in my thinking, Steve Bill. He was a criminal justice consultant and so I went to work with him as a consultant. I consulted, did training, and wrote grants. I got one funded through?

SH: LEAA?

JK: Yes, LEAA which provided consultant services to Indian County and that evolved into organizing a full juvenile probation program. We wrote another grant and got to hire some officers and set up a juvenile probation department. That lasted for a year and a half. After it ended, I sent out a bunch of resumes because I was interested in getting back into direct contact with the kids. And I was still interested in a more residential setting. I fired them off and I got hired by the agency. They wanted me to go to Owlville State School which was all girls and I told them that it was too tame, that I was looking for more excitement. Something more demanding. Owlsville appeared to be maintaining things and I am more innovative. I want to build and develop things. I perceived it as not really testing me. The they told me about Maysville State School. We're under a federal court order, they're rioting and kids are raising hell. And I said that sounds just like what I wanted and so I met with Rob Mason, the acting director. Rob

said he wanted me at Maysville and he was trying to find Bob Baker to be superintendent. I came to Maysville and worked with assaultive kids on the Norman unit. Rob told me at the time that he was going to close that facility down within a few years. I must say one thing that's real important about this agency is the leadership. Rob Mason has always set the climate for creativity. And responsiveness to kids, allowed it, and encouraged it to happen. I was brought into Maysville with Dan and Rob told us to run the place. We were trying to find ways to relate to kids. You know, if you develop a relationship with kids, you got it whipped. So, when the crap came down, they knew me and I could walk into some difficult situations. There were some real dangerous situations there, it was a wonder nobody got killed. But I just talked to them. I knew them. It didn't make big changes then but it allowed me to intervene and keep the lid on.

SH: What was Rob looking for when he hired you?

JK: I think Rob was looking for people that were kid people; people who could provide leadership. I just conveyed what I thought about kids and he felt the same way. Then Bob assigned me to do assessment. I then became the Director of the Assessment Center. I was there three or four months and Rob called and said he wanted to set up a program at Blackwood and "I want you there next week."

SH: How long were you at Blackwood?

JK: About eight months. I helped with the organization of the system. We spent about three weeks completing a plan. Right before we finished Rob Mason walked in and said " Bob and I are going up to Boone and we want you to go with us." So we went up there and at that time it was for dependent and neglected kids. They were closing it out. We looked around and when we left he asked me what I thought and I told him, "I think it stinks. I wouldn't want to be over there." He said, "Congratulations, you're the new superintendent."

SH: So this was?

JK: The June of 1975 I went to Boone. There wasn't anything there but three or four kids and I was told to close out the old program and then set up a new institution. Bob was the Director of Institutions and he was also a very creative and innovative person. Bob and I and his wife were driving to Boone to look it over. And I said Bob, I hate to go over there a do a regular routine institutional program. He said I do to and here are some things I've been thinking. And we started talking. We were talking and we didn't even know what therapeutic camping was. Bob had tried to develop something like it in North state. He said I'll mention it to Rob and see what he says. Rob called and said come in and present what you want to do and we'll talk about it. I had got involved with Manny Hoffa and we were talking about woods and camp and Bob had talked to Manny who he knew had been involved in therapeutic camping. So I talked with Manny and he said you can probably get some land there. I went in and talked with

Rob and all I was doing at Boone at that time was phasing out staff. We were going to phase it out and then bring it back as an institution. I went in and talked to Rob and told him what I had in mind was something along a camping program. He said " Ok, we got a million dollar budget, you got to stay within the budget, and if you go out and spend a bunch of money, and it fails, its your ass." Manny told me about Jed Walker and Jed and I talked and he said this is what you want to do. Jed and I drafted the original proposal for the program. We hired him as a consultant and we went to the chief of the national forest department and located a spot and leased the river property.

SH: At Council Bluff?

JK: At Council Bluff for a dollar a year.

SH: What were you looking for in terms of staff for this Boone program?

JK: First thing I did was hire core people and keep them. I found people who knew what they we doing. We hired staff and set up a training program.

SH: I have the idea that the people that you hired in the first year were the people that gave Boone the substance it was to become. If you had to typify the staff that came the first year, how would you do it?

JK: Weird. Not fitting the mold. People who would buy into trying something different, buy into the excitement of a new concept, who also had a strong feeling about kids. We had a team that interviewed them and we tried to pick out those kind of folks.

The vision of Jack Knight for something different for kids needed form and substance. He turned to Jed Walker and hired him as a consultant for the still emerging Boone program. I asked Jed how he had come to Boone and more importantly therapeutic camping.

SH: Where had you been and what had you been doing prior to Boone?

JW: I had completed a bachelor of science degree in forestry from Big Tree University and then I had gone to work for Dumas Systems in 1969 where I got my basic training in outdoor education and therapeutic camping. It dealt with

emotional disturbed boys in a twenty-four hour responsibility based program. The kids went to an outdoor school and built their own structures, cut their own wood, and cooked their own meals.

SH: The program sounds similar to Boone?

JW: Yes, but it was a responsibility based program that focused on kids taking responsibility for their own actions. Being a private program, we had some liberties where there was some minor suffering going on, well, we all suffered together. If we couldn't get a meal together, we didn't eat. Basically, it was a group therapy program based on guided group interaction.

SH: Like PPC?

JW: We tried to avoid labels at Dumas. The philosophy was kids when they begin having trouble is basically around how they handled responsibility some way or another. It can be something as basic as not knowing how to get up and brush their teeth or get dressed. Those basic responsibilities that most people go through at an early age and get through and

then they spend their whole lives learning how to handle varying levels of responsibility. When it comes down to it, the only strokes or whatever is centered on how you handle responsibility. The better you handle responsibility, the more people respect you, the more they appreciate you, the more they trust you. And so that was the philosophy at Dumas.

SH: So you started at Dumas in 1969?

JW: And I worked there for eighteen months. And then, there was a short-term program for boys called Boy's Trek but they didn't have anything for girls. My wife and I became the first counseling team for girls called Girl's Trek which was a separate, non-profit organization. I spent a year and half where we took month long trips with emotionally disturbed girls who were referred from the Big Town school system.

SH: What we would have called CHINS (Children in Need of Supervision)?

JW: Yeah, and that's where I had my first involvement with the State because they wanted to do a special program with the Farwood School for Girls where Rob Mason (Director) came to

visit us at Girl's Trek. I was the Director and my wife was the intake counselor. I hired new people and trained them and supervised them in the field. We contracted with the State to take their girls on these trips because their didn't have the staff. As a part of that we trained some of their staff who later ended up at Boone.

SH: Go on.

JW: I left and went back to school and continued part-time, volunteer work with Girl's Trek. My first counselor at Dumas was Mark Hartman and he called me up and asked if I would be interested in working for the State. And I said yes and so Jack Knight called me and said "I hear you know something about outdoor therapeutic camping". " We're trying to start a new program here at Boone". I went down and walked around the property with Jack and he was saying that maybe we would bring the kids to campus (institution) and then send them to the woods. I told him I thought we were doing it backwards. That we should send them to the woods and then they would earn their way back to campus which represented a higher level

of responsibility. We were going to work with first time offenders.

SH: What were some of the initial steps you had to take to create the wilderness program?

JW: We spent the first year acquiring sites and the US Forest Service offered us leases on land. We did site development, program development, writing up the program, laying out all the logistics and setting up a school. They wanted an accredited school and they didn't they could do that with just the counselors. The teachers weren't going to live with the kids but were going to come out camp. The reason for that was so the school could be accredited with the State. We knew we had to have people with experience in that kind of work but I had learned from Dumas had lay people could learn the philosophy and do they job as long as they had experienced people backing them up.

So for the program and the staff that were to become Boone, it was a new beginning. It was something totally different than any of them had been involved in before with the exception of Jed Walker.

Characteristically, they were young and idealistic. Products of the late 1960s and early 1970s. They were venturesome, desired change, were avant-garde and they were willing to take risks. They were tenacious and persevering. They were cosmopolitan, coming from many different places and many different backgrounds. They were bright, creative, and fun-seeking. They were well educated and they were open to new experiences and events. They had a strong beliefs in being honest and genuine. They believed in challenging tradition and that there were better ways to accomplish things. They valued teamwork and believed in taking risks for kids. They had a belief in the right way to treat people and to treat each other. They were free-spirits who sought to save the world. They believed in being non-traditional and being open to experience. They believed in acceptance of others and acceptance of others ideas, values, and opinions. They believed in giving service to their community with no expectation of pay-off. The believed in seeking challenges and supporting causes. They believed kids needed to learn problem solving skills and responsibility for their actions.

Eric Hoffer (1951) might have described them in this way:

> "People who see their lives as irremediably spoiled cannot find a worthwhile purpose in self-advancement. The prospect of an individual career cannot stir them to a mighty effort, nor can it evoke in them faith and a single-minded dedication. They look on self-interest as something tainted and evil, something unclean and unlucky... Their innermost craving is for a new life-- a rebirth-- or, failing this, a chance to acquire new elements of pride, confidence, hope, a sense of purpose, and worth by identification with a holy cause." (p. 12)

These were the innovators of Boone.

Teach Your Children

You who are on the road
Must have a code that you can live by
And so become yourself
Because the past is just a goodbye
Teach your Children well...

Crosby, Stills, Nash & Young, 1968

I've chosen **Teach Your Children** to represent the theme of Boone innovators beliefs, values, and attitudes about children, what worked and didn't work, and what children took from the program. For many who came to work at Boone there was little experience or frame of reference for working with kids in trouble. Their beliefs, attitudes, and values about kids in trouble were open and optimistic. They believed that given the right opportunities kids could change. They believed that kids needed appropriate role models and someone to be significant in their lives. They believed in taking risks for kids. They believed that something different had to be done for kids in trouble and adjudicated to Boone. They believed that kids were people and not different than anybody else.

I asked Richard Peng early in our interview if he had any experience with the population that made up the students at Boone.

RP:I had never worked with juvenile delinquents. I never even really thought about working with alternative populations. I had always wanted to be an English teacher.

Rhett Wilkes experience was similar.

RW: I hadn't had any experience with programs like the Boone program or with delinquent kids. I coached for years with age groups from the ages from under six up to eighteen years old. I did that for more than probably five or six years. I coached swimming, things like that.

William McCarthy had this to say about his experience prior to Boone.

WM: I'm trying to figure that out. I'd done some, when I was a lot younger, had done some camping and what have you. I had some summer jobs in Lake Louise, Alaska, at a military fish resort type thing. And other than that I'd done some children theater and I was working for DHS.

The experience level of the other informants with the exception of Jack Knight and Jed Walker mirrored those of Richard, Rhett, and William. Jack Knight expressed his beliefs and attitudes about kids very pragmatically.

SH: When you got to Boone, did you have any particular attitudes or beliefs about kids? A philosophy about the way kids should be treated?

JK: Oh, I always have to struggle with which came first, the chicken or the egg? In other words which comes first, control or treatment. I was at a point where I thought, you can't have treatment unless you have control. How can you have control in the woods? So Boone was real scary for me but I had a lot of training and advising from Tom. But I don't mind taking personal and professional risks for the benefit of kids. Beyond safe things, things that's are going to make everybody happy.

Later on in the interview I asked Jack, what was his vision of Boone?

JK: It was what Bob and I had talked about but it developed and as I brought other people in, it changed. I knew I wanted to do something different for kids, not just be different. I did not believe that institutions were very effective and that they didn't adjust to the times or the needs of kids. I thought in our own little way that we could set this program up with a real close environment where people could relate. It was designed to create a real strong bonding between staff and kids. It was incredible. The biggest problem in institutions then was the constant turnover in staff. So we wanted to set it up so that staff could be significant to kids and that is what therapeutic camping offered.

SH: Because of the intensity?

JK: Because of the intensity of staff and student involvement, together. We began to bring groups into together so they could graduate together as a group. It worked fine at first but as time went by we began to lose that. The vision was to create something that was

responsive to kids whether or not it met the needs of the institution.

Further exploring the vision and purpose of Boone, Jed Walker provided this perspective on the origins and philosophy of therapeutic camping and responsibility.

SH: Can you talk for a moment about the origins of therapeutic camping?

JW: Campbell Loughmiller was the guru of therapeutic camping in this part of country. He avoided jargon. His thing was experience; you learn from experience. You have a guided, controlled experience where kids learn the things that you and I learned in a "normal" family about responsibility and then learning the consequences of that responsibility through the experience that you had with it. Also, kids build up to handing bigger and bigger responsibilities. Some of his (Campbell Loughmiller) groups spent six months floating the Mississippi River and they learned how to handle responsibilities and had experiences of learning responsibility and making their own decisions. If you (the staff) had to

correct the course you did but only if it posed a threat to the group. Part of the philosophy was to explain, show it, let them do it, and evaluate it together. The fundamental tenet of the philosophy is that you learn from experience and that you tap into previous experiences and make it better. Its' a pyramid on which you build. When you get down to do what else do we really have to feel good about other than the experiences you've had and the level of responsibility that people trust you with. Basically, people access you on how well you handle responsibility. Campbell Loughmiller said this is easiest philosophy to describe this working with kids and giving them opportunities for experience. The simplest philosophy but you must experience it. Experience is the thing.

I also wanted to determine what issues and concerns the leadership had in initiating an innovation like Boone in a state supported agency. I asked Jed:

SH: What issues and concerns did the leadership have about Boone?

JW: Jack's concern was how do we control the kids. Primarily, I think because of his experience at Harwood. I felt you controlled the kids with the staff and the groups and the group process. Other concerns centered on kids getting lost in the woods and the fact kids had access to knives and axes. Control, security, safety, and welfare of the kids were the main issues. How do we keep them warm in winter?

Continuing to explore the beliefs, attitudes, and values of the innovators of Boone with William McCarthy, I asked:

SH: What beliefs did you have about how kids should be treated before you got to Boone?

WM: I don't think I had any preconceived ideas about how kids should be treated. Because I still came from DHS and it didn't matter, you treated everybody pretty close to the same anyway. I mean, idealistically, you treated them as human beings with respect and dignity. They always say in the social worker field you get burned at least once because you get too close to people. And I had already gone through that.

Later on in my interview with Richard Peng, I asked him what attitudes or beliefs he had when he came to work at Boone.

RP: Well, I'd always wanted to be a teacher and I've always held with this belief, kids can learn. I had all these philosophies that I did believed in and that I do believe in.

SH: What are some of them?

RP: Well, you know, I liked working with kids and it didn't make me any difference who they were. One thing I did notice when I was teaching in junior high, that was back when we did the old grouping thing, where we had the low group, middle group, and the high group. There were two groups I liked to work with. I liked the low group and the high group and I didn't like average kids. I didn't dislike them personally, but I found as a group they're just kind of boring. You didn't really have the gifted kids in there to challenge the others. You didn't have the really problem kids cause they stuck them in the low group,

even though, maybe, they didn't belong in there. It was just really kind of a boring thing.

SH: So you preferred kids that either operated at the lower end or the whiz kids?

RP: The low and the top. It was all that middle ground that I didn't like. I guess that was one reason that I was destined for alternative programs. Because they deal with the lower achieving kids. They're not in that middle ground, at least, not too many of those come into my system.

Richard continued to talk about the kids relating an incident when he had become disgusted with the group and genuinely vented his feelings.

RP: We knew it was the worst group down there. And God after we started down that trail I couldn't believe what we had agreed to do. And when we got down to that camp they were just assholes. And they were giving me a really bad time. Finally, I blew up. I'd had enough and I did, I blew up. I said, I cannot believe the way you people act. Is this the way you

behave all the time? Is this what you really are? You just go around acting like assholes. You're not decent, you don't know how to be decent. And I just blew up on them. I probably threw all of the counseling skills out the door. But I got honest with them. And I said, you know this isn't the type of person I am at all. You really irritate me. You're disgusting. And I said, what do you get out of this? Why do you do this sort of stuff? You're obviously intelligent, why do you do this stuff? And I was just basically mad and I really vented on them, not just kind of venting. I really was venting on them. And their reaction was funny, interesting because they knew it was real. And I hadn't cussed them or anything. I just told them exactly how I felt on some stuff and how stupid I thought it was and how silly and stupid looking they were. I couldn't believe that they'd engage in all of this. And the kid I was looking at, he said, " Mr. Peng, we're bored sometimes."

SH: What does that tell you about adolescent behavior?

RP: The braggadocio, what they really want, where they're really coming from, what they really value, and that their just human beings and they have the same old needs that all the rest of us have. We think we're so sophisticated. And when you get down to some of those basic needs, they're the same and just, very real.

SH: So is that kind of a revelation that you had while you were at Boone?

RP: Yeah, I think, I knew that we're all human beings before and that's a wonderful thing. But out there you got in on a really earthy level and it really came through to you because -- I don't know how to express it but you knew the kids. They're weren't just kids on a campout. You lived together; you cooked with them; you bathed with them; you did everything. You slept with them; you swatted mosquitos with them. You bitched with them; you were uncomfortable with them; you missed home sometimes just like they did. And

they got to know you and they knew whether you should even be out there or not. They were getting to know what you were about. They would kid you on different things and you would kid them and you got to know them. And when they left, you missed them.

I asked Sue Smith the same question to ascertain the differences, if any, between male and female staff.

SH: I'm looking for kinds of attitudes or feelings you had about kids and the way they ought to be treated?

SS: I walked in believing that kids needed to be treated in a different way other than being locked up.

SH: And that was based on your experience?

SS: Yes. That was my experience with State Hospital, with MHMRs, with some probation departments that we were farmed out to do some testing with kids. I was appalled at the way kids were just shunted to the side. The Probation Department used the facility at State Hospital to detain their kids for whatever. I mean if the guy wouldn't go to school, well let's lock them up

at State Hospital for 30 days and, you know, he'll come back okay. I hated that. I mean the whole thing appalled me. And I wanted to do something different. I wanted to work in a program that had a different approach to kids. I wasn't really sure exactly what the approach was going to be, but I knew it didn't involve walls, it didn't involve bars, it didn't involve the stereotypical treatment procedures.

Rhett Wilkes arrived at Boone one afternoon and by dark was being directed to a group campsite with twelve juvenile delinquents. I wanted to explore with him first impressions and attitudes or beliefs he had about delinquent kids.

SH: Okay. So did you have any kinds of feelings? I mean here you are the first night. Did you have any kinds of feelings or reservations about juvenile delinquent kids and how they should be treated?

RW: Yeah. I met one of my students on the trail walking down to the campsite. He met me on the trail

and pulled back his sleeves and showed me where he had thorns laced into his arm.

SH: And how did you respond to that?

RW: I told him it looked like it hurts.

SH: What did John (the student) say?

RW: He said, "Oh." I think he was expecting more of a reaction out of me.

SH: He was trying to get a reaction out of you then? Any other kinds of general feelings about kids at that time?

RW: Oh, I'd always liked working with kids. I liked to interact with them. I had really -- I was apprehensive. I wasn't real sure what a delinquent was. I'd worked with swimming and that was the closest I'd worked with kids. They were fairly intelligent and motivated. They wanted to be there. This group I realized probably didn't want to be there. Probably not very much at all.

Ian Martin, home from the Peace Corps, had experience in setting up programs for disadvantaged kids in Venezuela. When I asked if he had any preconceived beliefs or attitudes about juvenile delinquents, he responded in this manner.

> **IM: No. I had no preconceptions whatsoever. To me they were kids. At Boone, it wasn't like I was working in a reform school. To me they were kids, they were people. And that was a very basic belief that I had. It was a belief that I always had even in college studies. My distant view of correctional facilities was like, hey, these are people, these are human beings. These people aren't any different from anybody else. Whatever the circumstances that got them here, there's no reason we don't need to treat them like human beings. That was my youthful idealism that I went to Venezuela with and in the brief experience I had of working in the correctional program. Yeah, I was working with murders and everything else but they were people and they responded as such if you treated them like that. I had**

a number of experiences that kind of reinforced that. But in particular at Boone, I said, hey, I'm out here in the middle of Never Land with a bunch of felonious offenders and I don't have anybody to depend on. I don't know anything about camping. I don't know anything about where I am. So I'm going to have to fake it, you know. I'm going to have to do some serious pretending to buffalo these kids into thinking I really know what's going on. And then, you know, I started finding out how to interact with them, to basically interact and provide for kids.

Ian continued by talking about his feelings about working with delinquent kids.

IM: I wasn't intimidated by the kids. I think I felt real comfortable with the fact that I was there working with them. We got along real well. You know, I was nervous. I didn't know what I was supposed to do or anything else. But I very quickly made the decision that, hey, I'm here, I've got to do what I can do. And

I'm going to treat these people like I want to be treated. And I'm going to be open with them. I didn't have any -- there was one question on the interview that I remember and that was like what is the problem solving process. I mean it was like a scientific process, you know. I do remember that and that was one thing I said. This is my approach. We'll sit down and talk it out. I don't remember anybody telling me about it but I'm sure they did. That was the whole positive peer pressure culture concept, the whole PPC kind of community. The whole group process, where we sat down and dealt with things. Somehow that was the philosophy of the program. So, I guess I had to learn that because everything we did we did as a group at that time. That made it real easy for me though. And I didn't have any problems with the kids. It was just that I was there by myself all the time. I had to do the best I could do.

Kim Daniels viewed them in a another way.

SH: Had you had any experience with kids or other educational/treatment programs before you got to Boone?

KD: None whatsoever. I'd worked with college kids in the counseling center. I'd worked with kids in the Jewish League Center but there were like six, seven, and eight years old. And I'd worked with older adults but not teenagers.

SH: So when you got to Boone did you have any kinds of beliefs, attitudes, feelings about kids and how they should be treated or not treated?

KD: Well, I felt they didn't need to be abused. I think my beliefs were kind of on the south end of the continuum. That you didn't need to be laissez faire with them but that you didn't need to be punitive either. I think I was kind of a blank sheet almost, having no parenting experience or supervising kids experience, I pretty much didn't know what to expect.

Manny Moore provided a different perspective related to beliefs about kids and others at Boone.

SH: What were the staff's beliefs regarding kids?

MM: They saw value in kids. Regardless of their past, they saw them as a valuable human being. We saw kids with chaos and trauma so there was a lot of nurturing.

SH: What did you believe?

MM: I felt education should be stimulating and we developed lessons around the environment. It was a hands-on process where they actually did something. Theory had little value to them. You used the tasks they had to do to teach. Getting kids out and letting them interact with nature.

SH: What about beliefs about kids?

MM: I feel that many of those kids are doing well. We had a tight relationship with the kids. I felt that many of them needed role models and the staff did that for them. There was a bonding. Very often they were not bonded.

SH: Where did your beliefs come from?

MM: I was one of seven children and we lived close

together. Both grandmothers lived with us. We had a strong sense of family. Being in a large family, everyone is respected and has a place, a feeling of worth. A lot of values were developed in the Marine Corps. Values like comraderie, sticking together, loyalty. During hardship working together to achieve goals. The feeling you get after going through difficult times.

SH; Any other sources of beliefs?

MM: Teachers through the years. Various individuals I've run into. People I've worked for. I was raised a catholic but I don't feel that much there assisted me. I gave up on Catholicism.

Jed Walker reinforced this theme of dominance of the family on the origins of beliefs, attitudes, and values.

SH: Where did your beliefs, attitudes, and values originate?

JW: They were formalized when I was working with Dumas Systems and Girl's Trek when they became a set of beliefs about kids and how to work with kids. I was teaching others cause I believe you have to spread them. I grew up with

them. My grandparents in the main that was the way they were. They were independent and they worked hard but they worked hard at things they enjoyed. I spent hours as a kid experiencing things with my grandfather and father. And they always provided new experiences and new responsibilities that were appropriate to your age. Sometimes it was just tagging along on hunting trips, vacations, with my grandfather on his land development trips. How to deal with people and human nature. Growing up on a farm, there is a lot of responsibility and I learned from that. I always had responsibilities and things to do. I got my teaching experience initially by bringing other city kids to farm or taking them camping. My family was honest and they valued others who were honest. They were independent and they were self-reliant. We were always experiencing things and my parents would let me go camping or horseback trip for as couple of weeks, it was OK.

SH: How about education? Teachers?

JW: Education played a part. Teachers, none really stand out. The people who had the most affect on me were my

grand dad and dad. I remember spending a lot of time with my family listening to stories and adventures.

Beliefs about kids held by many of the staff were best characterized by Dylan Jones. They were also characteristic of the description of the staff by one informant as outlaws.

SH: What did you believe about kids who had gotten into trouble?

DJ: I didn't see them as being different than when we were kids. They just got caught more often. They weren't any different. From my research, they had trouble at home. They didn't respond to discipline and organization of public schools and needed an alternative format in which to learn.

SH: Other beliefs about kids?

DJ: I was apprehensive. Some them were violent.

SH: What kinds of people did Boone attract?

DJ: Two types. People who had experience in church camps. Some of these naive. Other people who had gotten degrees but didn't fit in with the public school thing. They seemed to identify with the kids. They were liberal.

SH: What kinds of beliefs, attitudes, and values did they have?

DJ: The church group had traditional ones and they had come to love the outdoors. They felt that the outdoors was a good place for kids to be in.

SH: Where did your beliefs come from about kids, life?

DJ: My dad was not violent at all even tho' he had served four years in the South Pacific during WW II and I think he passed that on to me. He had strong sense of right and wrong. Right has to do with treating people like you want to be treated. My basic core came from my father and mother. Later on after the Viet Nam war, I didn't feel it was right to send boys off to kill other boys in a place we didn't care about. Other things that John Lennon and Bob Dylan said about the world being a better place if we would quit being violent to each other. Also, I had a lot of political philosophy courses and Dr. Lee and I think many of his beliefs rubbed off on me.

SH: Any other sources for your belief systems. What place did religion have in their formation?

DJ: I grew up Catholic and back in the sixties I read a lot of eastern philosophy. I found that the two in practice are not that divergent. I think the majority have their main interest as self-support.

The beliefs, values, and attitudes that the Boone staff discussed were also modeled by the leadership of the agency. Richard Peng related this information on the executive director of the agency Rob Mason.

RP: And you've got Mason, because he is a former juvenile delinquent. He wasn't just an orphan, he was arrested for delinquent acts. And later, you know, to make a long story short, Mason becomes executive director of this agency. After working -- starting in the agency as a maintenance person or something and getting his degrees and working his way up. He has a real genuine concern about what's happening to kids. That they're treated decently, that they have a chance to grow up and to have some human experiences that they should

have a chance to have a decent life. I'm just saying this sincerely because I really think this is where the man comes from. He doesn't always accomplish it and he has a short-term memory problem but -- long-term -- he, truly, is very, very concerned about how kids are treated. And if Mason ever thinks that you mistreat a kid in this agency, you're in trouble. He has no room or tolerance for people who will mistreat children. I mean, that's just who he is. I can honestly say that. And that man has made the difference in this agency. And he saw these wilderness programs as an opportunity to something different for kids. He liked Jack Knight and he allowed him to start the Boone program.

Another avenue I used in my attempt to identify values, beliefs, and attitudes was to ask the informants about their experiences at Boone and what they believed kids took from the Boone program. Whether they felt it was an effective way to treat and educate adolescents.

I began with William McCarthy who had served as a groupworker at Boone.

SH: Looking back on Boone, what was one of your best experiences?

WM: The best one is when you have people that left that you really thought could make it, when you know that people had benefited.

SH: Were there many successes?

WM: I don't know.

SH: Have you ever thought about if recidivism rates were equal for Boone and more traditional programs, which environment was better for kids?

WM: I think that a kid will not forget that experience. Whether they gained a lot by it, they won't forget it and they always look back and say remember when this happened and whatever. I'm sure they liked it a lot better, particularly those that got to do the 30-day trips. I mean even when I left Boone, I went to something that was kind of woodsy in experience. And I perceived myself as kind of a woodsy guy for awhile after that. I think a lot of people considered the benefits and knew

that there was no correlation in the system. Somehow if we could have transferred them back home with there being another program that would make the transition to where we could follow through with that, we could have done the urban survival skills kind of thing. They shouldn't have just been cut loose. You know that is what happened, we just cut them loose.

When I spoke with Richard Peng about what he thought kids took from Boone, the following exchange took place.

SH: One of the things that somebody had said as a criticism of the program was that it didn't transfer. They questioned the transferability of the things that you did at Boone back to the streets. How would you respond to that criticism of Boone?

RP: I think that's a criticism even today of the things that we do today. What transferability is there? And there will always be that question, is what you're doing transferable? But I think that some of those first groups that went through Boone, we gave them some abilities to

cope, to solve problems, to work with people instead of trying to batter their brains out, or whatever. That you could sit down and solve problems. Because this was what we practiced when we had the huddle-up thing. That was all abandoned later. But the real emphasis -- one of the real emphasis was on interpersonal skills and problem solving.

SH: Talk some more about huddle-up.

RP: It was just this process we had where if you had a problem in the camp you all huddled up and people joined in a circle. They formed a circle. And you stood around or some times they'd allow you to sit, depending on how long the huddle-up went on. A huddle-up could go anywhere from three minutes to -- I've seen them go for hours and hours. I have seen them go for two days. They'd even bring meals to huddle-ups. They really worked on problems.

SH: Do you think that was good for kids?

RP: Yes. It's good for everybody, because you really

learned a lot about human dynamics and what people valued and what they were willing to do to get what they wanted. You also saw people who were willing to confess to things that they hadn't even done to get the damn huddle-up to come to an end. I've seen that happen too. But, that would also come out. Later, it would come out in the group that they weren't the ones responsible.

SH: It seems to me like one of the things that we professed was the philosophy of positive peer pressure culture and natural consequences. What did you think of that approach?

RP: Yeah, the survival things. If you do certain things there are consequences. With state laws and child care things you have to be careful about the consequences. You couldn't always let them suffer the natural consequences. And a child shouldn't. That's what adults are for. They intervene in the lives of children in our society, and should in order to prevent the cruel

consequences from being wrought. A child could get hurt and that would violate everything this program supposedly stood for. If there was anything this program stood for it was that we care about kids, and it's was a whole different way of looking at treatment and education. And we value their lives and we value what's going to happen to them.

SH: Why would you think that Boone was a better program than most institutional programs? And do you see it as an effective program? I guess the first question was, did you see it as an effective program? And the other one was, why was it better than other institutional programs, in terms of what it gave kids?

RP: At that time, particularly, and for the most part even today, institutions are ruts and they are ruts without any real intention of therapy. They're just kind of like a ditch or grave that the end's knocked out. It is what I've always thought of as a rut. And that's what a lot of institutions still are. They are our throw-away

children. But at Boone it wasn't a rut. There was so many different things and therapy was a goal and you weren't to leave the camp until they really were ready. In the beginning, the group even had to decide whether they thought that you were ready to re-enter society and that sort of thing. And I think that was one of the first breakdowns that we had was when they started taking releases out of the hands of the group. Because the group was so strong at the beginning that they actually made release decisions. If they felt that Johnny needed to stay a little longer, Johnny would stay a little longer. And they knew the kid. After they had been there for months, they knew whether he was ready to leave or not. Some of our very first groups all left together. They left at the same time. And destroyed their camp before they left. They dismantled the camp.

Sue Smith saw things on a different level; one that corresponded to the philosophy that Jed Walker had expressed earlier. A view that

emphasized the importance of kids seeing their change as the result of their actions not those of others.

SH: How effective was Boone for kids?

SS: I don't think we really did a lot. This is terrible. I think that the structure of the program did what needed to happen with the kids. Taking them out in the woods, taking the radios away, taking the neighborhood away, divorcing them from everything. Letting them hit bottom, be physically uncomfortable. I think that's what did it for the kids. I look back at times and think, oh, well, you know what, I probably did this and that with that kid. No. Hell, no. The kid made the decision to change. Because he got so damn uncomfortable that he had to change to get the hell out of the program. Period. As much as I'd like to say we made a difference, it was the kid that made the difference.

Ian Martin who had worked with adult offenders and disadvantaged kids in the third world provided a somewhat complimentary view of program and what kids took from Boone.

IM: I think it was a very intense program. I thought it was very meaningful. The transferability. I think we did teach them transferability. It's the only program I've really ever been associated with that actually talked about transferring skills from one place to another. And I know that you can say critically, what does living in a canvas structure in a national forest have to do with when you got back to living in the fourth ward in Big Town? But we talked to kids about that. And we talked to kids about that after they've gone back to Big Town, what did they do with what they learned. And they would say, yeah, I had a huddle-up with my family. It was the same lingo. Check yourself, huddle-ups, they learned the lingo. You know, they interpreted that, they transferred that in whatever way they could.

SH: What do you think kids took away from Boone when they left?

IM: I think some inner strength was built. I think it somehow met their need for adventure. I think there

were some physical skills that kids learned and I think those skills turned into a sense of survival and that made them tougher and able to deal with challenges. I think kids were more gutsy. There was some self-confidence and self-esteem factors that had to be involved. But there is a negative factor. I think kids who were weak were pushed into some weak positions that they could never get out of because it was a environment in which only the strong survived. I think that in the early days of the program before the sophistication of culture really set in, it may have been more effective than later on when we tried to get smart.

Jed Walker served as a trainer in the Boone program for three years and provided a more global view of the purpose and the value of the program to kids.

SH: What skills did we teach kids at Boone?

JW: The most important was how to approach problems and deal with them. Basically, that each problem is approached the same way. You realize there is a problem, then you talk

about solutions, pick one and go with it, and then evaluate it. You either continue or you start again. Everything in life is approached over and over and if you do that problems don't overcome you.

SH: Do you think kids took it back with them to Big City, Mercer City, and Oiltown?

JW: I think a lot of them did and if you had follow-up that transfer was increased. That was a draw back at Boone. The secret to high success rate is someone to help them back on course when they falter. Focus them back on the model. Without the follow-up, its asking a lot for a kid to really understand that and carry out without support. But many of the kids got a lot. Because they had experienced it, and we exposed them to problems where they could have successes and failures and you got them experienced in dealing with them. That's what we are, the sum total of our experiences. That's what I'm doing now with handicapped kids. Getting them experiences, something different from what they experience day

after day. Our goal is to get them positive experiences from which they can learn.

When I queried Rhett Wilkes about what kind of kids we produced at Boone, he responded at length and he told a story that some logical positivists may view as a criticism of Boone but to phenomenologists, it goes to the heart of education and treatment of juvenile delinquents.

RW: My feeling is that we produced kids that could handle special situations a little bit better. I think we produced kids that actually had experience with dealing with conflict. We actually did something that helped kids deal with problems.

SH: Did the things that you gave them transfer back to the other environments?

RW: It did for awhile. But it wears off. Boone - one of the biggest weaknesses in the whole system was transition and follow-up. I think we did real good stuff, it was real effective in that camp. There was a lot teamwork required. Kids had to work together to accomplish things. The foundation was natural

consequences. That if someone didn't hold up their end then it just chain reacted all through the system. For example if the fire builders didn't build a fire then nobody ate. So there was a lot of that sort of thing. I really think that was the basis of our program. Building cooperation, understanding how actions affect others. Learning how to get along, challenging them to do work. But also having fun. A lot of the kids had never even been in the woods.

SH: Did they have fun out in the woods?

RW: They did have fun sometimes, sure did. We did things they had never done before and probably will never do again. We took canoe trips. We went on hikes. We looked at our environment and talked about it. I think they learned things.

Continuing on Rhett tells the story of Stewart Samuels, a former Boone juvenile delinquent.

RW: At some point I lost track of Stu. He was out of the system. But at some point in time he got put in

the state hospital. And the Chronicle did a feature on emotionally disturbed people who were being released from state hospitals. Well, it just so happens that Stu's picture was on the front page of the Chronicle, and he was living in a dumpster. And they were talking about him. But if you look at that picture of him living in that dumpster, it was just like camp. He had a tarp set up, a structure built out of the dumpster, he had his fire built off to one side. Everything was just sort of arranged just like camp.

SH: He had learned a way to live, to survive and tried to take it back to the streets of Metropolis?

RW: Yeah. Jack Knight and I looked at that. It was a little bit spooky to look at that picture and look at this mentally ill adult now that we had at camp, living in an alley.

SH: He walked away with something?

RW: He learned how to live out of a dumpster, I guess.

SH: Well, I mean, he learned how to live in the environment that he was in.

RW: There's some pride in his face in the picture. He was pretty proud of his camp site.

I spoke at length with Dylan Jones about what the staff were trying to teach kids in the Boone program and if the staff was successful. He offered a comparison between the Boone program and the institutional programs of the agency.

SH: Identify the kinds of skills we were trying to teach kids.

DJ: The skills were how to understand a problem. To know that there are alternatives to physical violence. You don't have to run around with your buddies and steal cars because that will bring you back. Whether we were successful? I haven't got a clue. We tried to get them to rely on themselves and to take satisfaction from what they did. To understand the relationship of behavior and consequences. I tried to get kids to understand is that you should be considerate of others. To get them to think about things before you say something. For example when the blue and red lights come on behind your

car, its proper to address the police officer as officer not greasy pig SOB. The consequences of that are we're going down town or "have a nice evening son". A respect for authority. If you have that same attitude with your teachers, you're going to do better than if you're misbehaving. The program helped a lot more than the institutional ones. In the camping program few of the kids got institutionalized. I worked in both the camps and the institution on campus and I believe the kids from camp had a much better chance of making it back on the streets.

Manny Moore saw it this way.

MM: I feel that many of those kids are doing well. We had a tight relationship with the kids. I felt that many of them needed role models and the staff did that for them. There was a bonding. Very often they were not bonded.

I asked Jack Night about his experience with Boone and whether he believed that it was effective with kids. By this time, Jack had served at all levels of the juvenile correction system. From probation and parole in

North State - to Director of Assessment - to Superintendent at Boone - to Director of Institutions and beyond.

JK: As I said before the vision was to create something that was responsive to kids whether or not it met the needs of the institution. It was one hell of a struggle because it was out of the norm. I know that if I hadn't support at the top that I wouldn't have been able to pull it off. It was a real struggle in the context of a state program.

SH: Was Boone effective for kids?

JK: I think Boone was effective for kids. There were the relationships with staff and kids found out there were adults that cared for them. I think they came to recognize what natural consequences are and I think that natural consequences are right out there on their own street. You make choices. It was also an environment that allowed kids to learn. It taught kids how to make choices and how other people depended on them and others and how that related to them out in society. I

think keeping it simple was important. It gave kids a totally different perspective on life. The environment out there allowed for kids to get in touch with themselves. To get away from the stress and demands of street life. I've had kids call and talk about Boone.

SH: What did they say about Boone?

JK: Some kid called from California to see how I doing. I was talking to him about the camping program and he said " I don't know why you people did that, I wouldn't want to go out there again." I asked him if he learned some things? And he said, well I learned some things but he thought there were better ways. Then I've had kids when we went to court and the judge says, "Well, tell me about it?" She told her story. And then the judge said, "Do you feel that they helped you at Boone?" She said, "Oh yes, I really felt good. I had a really good relationship with my groupworker and I really learned a lot." The case was over. I had another case when I was at Boone and one the parents

came in and said, " I want my kid out of there, it too cold." And I said, "OK" and I picked up the phone and had this kid brought in to my office. I told the parents "we'll transfer him out." The kid came in and I told him that his parents were concerned. And he said, "it really gets cold out there." I said, "OK, then I'm going to transfer you to Blackwood." And the kid said, "I don't want to go to Blackwood, I want to go home." I said, "you're not going home, you haven't completed the program and I'm going to transfer you to Blackwood." He said, "No, I rather stay here." And his mother said, "it's really cold out there." He said, "I don't care, I just wanted to go home and if I can't do that, I want to stay right here at Boone."

In summary, the beliefs, attitudes, and values of the Boone staff and the leadership of the agency, Jack Knight and Rob Mason, about kids represent many dimensions. I think clearly, they saw kids as kids and they were not too concerned with how they got there or what crimes they had committed. They believed that kids were human beings and that they had

many of the same needs as the staff did for achievement, attention, recognition, and caring. The believed that it was important to know your kids and to interact with them. They believed that it was important to give kids experiences and to teach alternative methods to solving problems. They believed that to be effective in treating and educating these kids that you had to be open, genuine, real, and that you had to treat them in the same ways that all humans want to be treated with fairness, equity, and love. They believed that kids shouldn't be abused but that you shouldn't take a laissez faire attitude with them either. They believed that kids didn't need to be behind bars or locked-up in institutions suffering under stereotypical treatment procedures but rather that new and different approaches needed to used to touch the lives of kids. They believed in the group process and the use of huddle-ups and pow wows as effective strategies in dealing with problems. They felt kids should be nurtured and given an opportunity to change. They believed that kids could change and that they could make a difference in the lives of troubled kids. They saw value in kids irregardless of their past lives. They believed that kids needed positive role models.

Other values, beliefs, and attitudes were reflected in the things they felt kids took with them from Boone. Many of the staff believed that kids when they left Boone were better able to cope and to solve problems. They had experience in team work and cooperation, and interdependence, they had come to understand how their actions affected other people. They left with increased self-confidence and self-esteem and they were better equipped to deal with life's challenges and conflicts. They knew how to deal with conflicts and how to handle difficult situations. They knew something about human dynamics and interpersonal relations. They left knowing how to get along, to have fun, and a sense of personal responsibility and the nature of consequences.

Start A Revolution

You say you want a revolution
Well you know
We All want to change the world
Tell you that its Evolution
We All want to change the world.

Revolution 1, Beatles, 1968

This theme addresses the beliefs, attitudes, and values staff took with them as they left Boone and explores where these people went after Boone and the programs in which they have integrated the Boone philosophies, beliefs, attitudes, and values.

I began this discussion with Ian Martin.

SH: Where have you been, what have you done since Boone? Have you been involved in similar programs and did you take anything from Boone and apply it to these other programs that you've been involved in?

IM: I've probably applied the Boone experience to every program that I've worked in and I've refused to let them, a lot of the basic concepts, go. I went to Southwest Town to be superintendent of the half-way house there. I immediately implemented most of the

concepts of group work and group consequences, reality therapy, into that facility. I still believed that kids were people and that they were any different than anybody else. This facility was shot, run down, overrun with drugs and everything else, and the Boone initiatives were very effective. And I fired 50% of the staff and rehired people that got in and really cared about kids. Unfortunately, I was only there for a year when I turned around and went to West State and the same philosophy was implemented there because Alex Mansom who was the superintendent and he was also out of the camping program. And Mike Smith was out of the camping program. And I was out of the camping program and Jack Knight was the director of institutions. So the philosophy of huddle-ups, of problem solving, of groups, a lot of that values and attitudes that had never really been bought off at the rest of the agency were implemented. We utilized a very similar part of the Boone philosophy. Leaving West State and coming down

here and opening up the half-way house I had the opportunity to take a program -- a nonexistent program, and open up a brand new program. And I had like two and half months of training with these people because there was a delay in getting the facility ready. I have rewritten training packets from the camping program for years. I utilized a lot of the very basic training materials that we utilized with our half-way house in Allison. A lot of the group stuff. And I've continually reinforced that. I continue to do that today.

Richard Peng's would be at Boone for almost seven years serving as a camp teacher and later as principal. His response took on a more personal flavor.

SH: What did Richard take away from Boone?

RP: What did I take with me that will always be a part of me?

SH: Yeah.

RP: Well, I came to that program needing something. I was needing a new home. I wanted something

different. I'd came away from there feeling good about myself, feeling that I had proven what I thought about myself before. I had thought I was a good teacher, that I was a good child care worker. I proved it there. I proved that I could laugh at myself and have a good time. I could meet people again and really have a good time. That I liked kids. That they're worth saving. Boone came along at a time when I needed Boone. I needed something. I certainly met a lot of personal needs, it met professional needs. There's just a lot of things. I can't belittle Boone. Because in spite of all the problems, in spite of where it was when I left there, I left Boone -- and this may sound corny too -- but I left Boone a much better and a much richer person, a much more -- much fuller. There was a substance to me, that there hadn't been before. There are beliefs and attitudes about kids and people that I carry with me even today.

SH: How did the Boone experience influence Richard today in the ways that Richard views and works with troubled kids?

RP: I believe Boone instilled in me a belief that I know as much about what I'm talking about as other people do.

SH: Confidence?

RP: Confidence. Also just knowing that -- I've worked in all kinds of programs now.

SH: Tell me about some of those.

RP: I've worked in public programs. I've worked in junior high. I've worked in high school. I've worked in a school system that is a fairly prestigious school system, it is well thought of.

RP: But the strength to get through all that, I think, came -- it came from any things, but I think it came from the experiences at Boone. That confidence that you're talking about. I can do it. And what you're doing with these kids is wrong. The way you're

conducting these classrooms is wrong. But there again like any other program, whether you're talking about a new one from scratch or redoing an institution that's been there for a long time, I had to identify a core of people I could work with. And I found an incredible core of people here. If it had not been for that core of people that were here, this program would have blown up.

I chose to explore the revolution theme with Rhett Wilkes in a different way and I got a different response.

SH: Has the Boone experience influenced other programs that you've developed.

RW: Yeah, Particularly in equating issues of accountability and performance and these weighed real heavily on my program design. Those were things like natural consequences, thinking about it before you did something. That they (kids) have to do certain things in order to receive the benefits of the program. The values addressed as one of the criteria addresses

aftercare. It does have a continuum of in the process where skills can occur in an institutional setting and then later, living independently in their own apartment.

I asked Rhett to talk about other Boonies who were still with the agency and if they had brought about change in the agency. He related numerous instances where the innovators of Boone had taken both the program components and the values of Boone to other programs and initiatives.

SH: Are the people that came out of Boone, the original Boone people, are they still recognized by the other members of the agency as coming from there and perhaps being a bit unique. I use the word unique. Or do you think that's all faded away?

RW: It's all faded away. The Boone people recognize that among themselves. When I think of Dan, assistant superintendent out at Farwood, or I think of Sue Smith, whose now down at Challenge House doing just an outstanding job. Mary Evers, used to be Mary Burnson, directing the 4-E program. Jack the maverick, is a

general superintendent. When I think of those people and look at those people, those people are not afraid to make choices, not afraid to stand up for themselves. They will go off and try new things for kids. Jack is by far the most creative, innovative institutional superintendent, not constrained by the system. I think all of that is something that these people brought to Boone. But it was also something that Jack Knight and Boone nurtured and that they have taken to other programs.

Sue Smith left Boone and the kid business for a few years but returned to therapeutic camping and even Boone in later years. She served as a superintendent of a half-way house with the agency before going into private programs.

SH: Do you think that the Boone experience prepared you for what you're doing now?

SS: I think if you lived through Boone, you can work anywhere and do anything period. And I think it produced very fine employees. I really do.

SH: You're talking about the people who stayed with the agency?

SS: Or left the agency. In general, I think the caliber of people it took to run that program. The line staff as a whole were very creative, very capable, very assertive, very aggressive. And they were not -- when things became uncomfortable, they kept going. Or when it appeared that there were no alternatives, they found alternatives. And I think -- when I look for staff and when I evaluate my staff, I look for those types of people.

SH: Tenaciousness?

SS: Real tenacious, real creative.

SH: Yeah, if this doesn't work I'm going to try something else?

SS: Yeah, you know. Think on their feet.

SH: Circumvent the system?

SS: That's right. And I really believe with this staff that I'm working with in Palmhead most of them their

whole credo is "if we can do without even involving that person, then we're going to do it." I've been there for nine months and they haven't really called me with anything. On the weekends I'll call and check with them. But I've had people tell me, "leave me alone. We're doing fine. If we need you, we'll call you."

SH: It sounds like you've got some people that know how to take initiative and be responsible.

SS: And those are the type of people that Boone produced.

I continued by asking Sue if the Boone experience had influenced the programs that she had initiated and whether she had integrated Boone strategies and philosophies in existing programs.

SS: Challenge House that was kind of directly a spin-off from Boone in terms in innovations or the way you look at innovations?

SH: You want to talk about those?

SS: Oh, yeah.

SH: It seems to me like there's a whole lot of exciting things going on in the agency.

SS: Oh, yeah. We have a real good team for kids that are the end of their line. At age 17, we kick kids out. I mean we just literally get to a point with a kid where we tell them, well, hasta lavista, bud, here's your shit, there's the street, go for it Jack. And we discharge them, like, you know, forget it. There is a point where we don't play, okay? The end of their institutional experiences, people crawling on their knees and crying of please, baby, please. Our attitude is look, this is what you've got to do. It's all there on paper. It's real cut and dried. You either do it or you don't.

SH: Sounds like personal responsibility?

SS: Yeah. Absolutely. We try real hard to focus them on being an adult, making them look ahead, establishing some goals.

William McCarthy had a different perspective on the Boone experience. He talked about things he would have done differently and the modifications of Boone philosophy he has made as he has applied it to other programs.

SH: Boone was based on the idea of natural consequences?

WM: Right. Which is what I have developed. Tons of stuff on natural consequences.

SH: Talk about what you thought of natural consequences in the Boone environment and then tell me how you have applied it.

WM: Well, its relative, because it only applies to--in some ways that was an artificial environment.

SH: Completely in wilderness, yet it was artificial?

WM: Artificial from the stand point that we--that the structures and the rules were already set and the environment was set in such a way that it was not true natural consequences. As a matter of fact, the biggest knock about the program has always been that we didn't

prepare anybody for when they got home. People when they got back home got back to exactly what they had before. There was no one back in their hometown to set the stage for those folks to come back. Just like from Nam. And so people came back and they might have had these experiences and they might have grown but all of a sudden if they had thirteen kids in the family when they got back, there were still thirteen kids.

SH: You question whether the things that happened in the wilderness transferred back to home?

WM: Well sometimes it did, but sometimes it didn't. People weren't prepared for that. They didn't teach people that well. But, like I said, that was the biggest knock of the program was that after a year in the woods there has to be a little bit of shell shock when you get back and there was no follow-up or aftercare. All we tried to do was get people to conform to what it is that we wanted them to do. And in an environment that we

could control, where we could build up some steam, that we could do so many things, and that worked there.

Later on as William described a program he established to deal with inner city kids in large metropolitan area out west and the things he felt were important that we didn't address at Boone.

SH: Focus on what interests them?

WM: Yeah or figure out ways to bring it back later. And a lot of things that just required you to have to think. I already mentioned the budget thing. But we also had things that dealt with relationships. We tried doing some things with sex and things of that nature. And we brought in the police department. We had a session called, "Anything you ever wanted to ask a COP". And so they would write down their questions and a cop would answer them. It was amazing, I learned some things. Questions, I didn't know.

SH: Were there strategies that you used in this program that were similar to Boone?

WM: Yeah and particularly huddle ups. I used huddle-ups whenever I've dealt with other at risk kids. I used that when I dealt with 30 day emergency shelter kids and runaways. Those were the two things I instituted, pow-wows and huddle-ups. Natural consequences-- I know that I used it in a program I created in Phoenix. Personal Responsibility YMCA Developmental Education (PRYDE) It dealt with urban survival skills, natural consequences, and personal responsibility.

SH: Any comparisons to Boone?

WM: People got relatively free. But the nice thing for me was I probably had more satisfaction that I did at Boone. Primarily because I was able to watch results. And there were some things that I couldn't do at Boone. My biggie was to follow up. There were people who actually wanted to have reunions in this program. I had parents tell me what a change it made in their kids, even if it was temporary. But again, I had some letters from parents saying, yeah, my kid is really different. Some kids said, I never went to school two weeks in a row in my life but I went to school there.

The staff were not the only agents of change that were attempting a revolution in the care and treatment of kids. Jack Knight, mentor of the Boone revolutionaries, was also at work. After Boone, Jack became the director of institutions for the agency and the empowerment of people who cared about kids that Mason had given Jack in the early years was in turn passed to several of the staff that had been at Boone. Jack, as Director of Institutions, selected the people and the programs for several years after Boone. Jack put it this way:

> **JK: Its real good now to sit back and see some of the things you started flourish. But you have to recognize, Sam, that things change because life and times change, programs come and programs go. You can't let that get you down.**

Ian Martin related Jack's revolutionary influence in the adoption of many of the Boone program elements, beliefs and attitudes.

> **IM: I was out of the camping program and Jack Knight was the director of institutions. So the philosophy of huddle-ups, of problem solving, groups, personal responsibility, and natural consequences--a lot of the**

Boone philosophy that had never really been bought off before in the rest of the agency was implemented by Jack.

I explored with Jack the changes that he and others of the Boone staff had been responsible for in the intervening years. He related stories of independent living programs, vocational programs, special programs like Challenge and ropes training. He spoke about first about change and then, the key ingredients for change.

JK: It was a difficult time when I first got to Maryville. Change is always difficult in the beginning. The first thing I did was put the ROPES course in, Mason suggested that. He said that will send a message to everybody that things are going to change. It was a major task to bring about the change. The key is finding the key people and applying pressure.

JK: I tried to get short term courses, what I call leisure/educational type things. So it took me four years to get in some programs like scuba diving. I believe in exposure. I don't believe that scuba diving solves kids

problems directly but exposure to other things that they can learn. There are other things out there other than dope and hanging out on the street. And if you step forward and participate, it's all legal. We have to have programs that let kids know that there's something else out there and expose them. Its' nothing major but it was a major task to get there. We got the ROPES course and then the Strive to Be program. I had written this program in Metropolis years ago. Its the belief that kinds need the basic things, reading and math. That they need proper physical conditioning tied in with proper nutrition. These elements with education create a synergy that will improve their math and reading scores. And reading and math are essential to survive in today's society. We set that up but I haven't quite dealt with all the fiscal issues. The program has been really good. The kids are first commitments and they meet other criteria. We attached the ROPES course to alcohol and substance abuse program. I'm setting up a program now

to meet the problems of gangs and aggressive kids. Here, we used some of the PPC things that we had used at Boone. The gang issue is one we're going to have to address in the future.

SH: Other programs?

JK: We set up an independent living program that has tremendous potential.

SH: This is the one that Rhett is working with now?

JK: Yes. We have a dorm for independent living kids that prepares them to live independently. And we have a contract with the community college to provide a teacher to teach those skills modules.

SH: Were these similar to the pre-release modules that we used at Boone?

JK: Yes, the same. Rhett wrote the modules and he developed program around facilities like the one Sue is running. The Legislature likes it and we've shown some positive results with the data. We have a jobs program out in the community; we pay the salary, you pay the

benefits. The community thinks its wonderful. The next big issue is going to be gangs and I'm already working on some programs in that area. I've got consultants coming in to work out programs for kids in gangs. We do community service projects and the kids get a lot out of it. We got vocational programs where we build smokers and picnic tables. This is run by an advisory council. We use some of the money they earn to do special projects for kids, things they want. In the future, I want to expand the program so kids can learn the process of buying materials, building, and marketing. We're not there yet but we're just beginning. We started a horticulture program, photography courses, and other programs to expose kids to something different than the streets.

Jed Walker left Boone after three years and the helping profession. His belief in the tenets of experience and responsibility remained strong. He continued through part-time consulting to carry the philosophy of therapeutic camping and Campbell Loughmiller to a myriad of other

programs. He provided guidance and training for other agency adventure programs and outside the agency he developed programs for emotionally disturbed kids, recovering alcoholics and drug addicts, and handicapped kids. I explored with him the diffusion of beliefs, attitudes, and values that comprised the Boone philosophy.

SH: Talk about your role at Boone and the diffusion of the Boone philosophy.

JW: I was focused on ensuring the groups and staff experienced successful problem-solving sessions. I felt there were many successes with both the kids and staff. You had motivated staff who were young and eager to learn. You saw this occurring with 20, 30, 50 people. They got the philosophy and were spreading it and that was a great feeling.

SH: When you saw the philosophy being diffused?

JW: Yeah. All this information was being disseminated and going to all different programs. These people who had chosen to work in the helping field taking this out and spreading it. You would run into them and they had taken it with them to schools and other programs.

Whether the staff of Boone created a revolution in the care and treatment of kids depends on your criteria for what constitutes a revolution. They did spread the beliefs, values, and attitudes of Boone. Beliefs, attitudes, and values related to natural consequences, responsibility, problem solving, group processes, acceptance of others and others ideas, values, and opinions, and service. In part through independent action, in part through the empowerment of Jack Knight and Rob Mason. I think I would typify their journeys in this last eighteen years as more as agents of change than as revolutionaries. I think Eric Hoffer (1967) typified it best with:

> "We used to think that revolution is the cause of change. Actually it is the other way around: revolution is the by-product of change. " (p.119)

I Remember You

Knowledge should be a refreshing and vitalizing force. It becomes so only through stimulating intercourse with congenial friends with whom one holds discussions and practices application of the truths of life.
I Ching

I Remember You is a collection of individual remembrances of the Boone experience. It addresses how the experience changed or modified their beliefs, values, and attitudes.

Ian Martin spent several years in the woods working with the Boone kids, first as a groupworker and then later as groupworker supervisor and Camp Director. I began by asking him to talk about a typical day at Boone.

IM: I recall a lot of flexibility as far as what you made happen during the day. Although there was -- in contrast there were some rather rigid expectations for a daily routine. You know, there were certain things that had to happen. And these were things that I always thought were meaningful. But you had to get up, you had to cook breakfast. I mean you had to have fire wood, you had to cook breakfast, you had to wash

dishes, you had to rake the trails. I loved raking trails. It was fantastic. We were raking dirt in thousands of acres of national forest. You know, it looks great. The squirrels love it. The whole housekeeping thing -- I don't think I recognized the importance of it until a lot later. But you go through a lot of that daily routine. There was a lot of structure that I thought was very meaningful because you would have your schedule set up to go get fire wood because we need fire wood. We've got to cook with fire wood. We've got to have our pow-wows with fire wood. Your routine is set up. You've got a guy that goes over here and he builds your pow-wow fire. It was structured. You've got your huddle-up sections, which were sacred, you don't go there unless there's a problem in the group. So there was some real neat things going on. What happens if somebody says, I'm not going to get up, I'm not going to do my chores. You go over to your huddle-up logs and you sit down and you talk about it. You may talk

about it for five minutes, you may talk about it five hours. But that's what takes place, because that's the predominant thing, to deal with issues that are on the table at the time. The problems are dealt with and then you move forward. There were certain activities that were planned for survival on a day-to-day basis, planned for every day. The accomplishment of those activities were dependent upon the acceptance of responsibility of the group, the people that needed to do that. And I think a key role was played by whoever the staff member was that was leading that group because you couldn't blow it off if there's a problem, you couldn't go, oh, the hell with it and blow it off or Billy and Freddie would beat the shit out of each other. You can't say, we've got to go cut fire wood so we'll talk about it later. The philosophy that I understood was that you deal with the problems and if you're cutting fire wood at midnight, you're cutting fire wood at midnight. You deal with the problem. There was

structure there but the structure was built around the acceptance of responsibility and the whole PPC philosophy. That's what I worked with and that's what I felt good about. But day-to-day, it was very basic needs and accomplishments that were taken care of. And I felt like the more basic, the more understandable the lessons of life that were being taught. I still believe that today.

SH: What was the best time of the day? Do you have a best time, a time you liked?

IM: I loved the pow-wows.

SH: Why?

IM: Because I was a pyromaniac.

SH: You always had "lighter pine" in your back pocket?

IM: No kidding.

SH: Why was pow-wow important to you?

IM: I wanted to put those kids to bed, man. No, because to me it was real -- I mean after you deal with

problems, after you deal with anything else. You may have a lot of B.S. from kids talking about what their day was. But I really -- and to this day, I think it was the most important part of the day and of the process. I try to impose the pow-wow philosophy in different ways in every program I've been involved in.

SH: When you left Boone, was there anything changed about the things you believed in or valued or cared about? Had your beliefs, values, and attitudes changed?

IM: Disillusioned.

SH: You were disillusioned with the program?

IM: Yeah. I still felt like there was a great group of people. Some of the people had already left, but there was a good core of people. And we were being stymied in implementing something that we believed in by bureaucratic restraints. The people that had the insight about what was going on -- the constraints, the frame work that was being developed around us was not of our own making. And for years we had been able to work

within a frame work of our own making, but we were losing, we were gradually losing control over our own destiny. I think that's what was happening. The closing of the program was the result of that, ultimately. When they finally closed Maxey Camp down it was because of the Fair Labor Standards Act and overtime issues. It was always criticized as a high dollar program. I think a lot of the justification was we weren't defined by the rest of the policies of the agency. So it was easy to fall through the cracks of the bureaucracy. But in an institutionally based agency and the more accountability we were pressed for, the more we had to fit into the frame work of what their measurements and criteria whether it was relevant or not. And we never felt like it was relevant. And I still don't think it was relevant. But that had a major impact on the development and the evolution of the program.

SH: Did the Boone experience prepare you for what you're doing now?

IM: It made you tough. This is a tough business.

SH: The kid business is a tough business?

IM: Corrections is a tough business. I don't know if it's kids, but corrections is a tough business. Yeah, kids are tough. Correctional programs with kids are a tough business. The Boone experience was intense. You were committed, you did it 24 hours a day, you lived it, you breathed it, you believed in the people you worked with, and you believed in what you were doing, because it made you good, if you were worth your weight in salt. It was a personal thing. When I look back through my whole thing, to me, it was very meaningful. It was a very strong catalyst for everything I do and everything I've done with kids and programs since Boone.

SH: How would you compare the person Ian Martin was at Boone with the person that Ian is today?

IM: I had more hair then.

SH: Those are the kinds of superficial things, what I'm trying to -- you were better looking then, but --

IM: You asked me that question. You weren't supposed to respond yourself. Well, I was young and idealistic. I've become callused and bureaucratic.

SH: You're not idealistic anymore?

IM: No, I'm still very idealistic. I'm in my program in South Town because I'm a sucker for a challenge and I refuse to accept the rigidity of the frame work that bureaucracy forces upon it. Its' not directly related to Boone, but that's where my initial experience was. And I felt good about it. But there is a big difference I think in an increased understanding of what's going on and I'm much more global visioned. At Boone, we all focused on what's going on at Boone. And now, I've worked all over the state, I'm a certified auditor with the American Correctional Association. I see programs throughout the United States. I have a much more global vision on what's going on in juvenile corrections. I think it has impacted my beliefs and values.

I asked Sue Smith if she thought the philosophy of Boone was consistent with what went on during her tenure and she continued by talking about why Boone eventually faded away.

SH: And after your experience at Boone, did you think that personal responsibility, problem solving, natural consequences, and positive peer culture were the dynamics?

SS: I think, partially, yes. In the early years -- and again, when I started, it was still novel. When I stayed for a couple of more years you could see the institutionalization started to creep in. And suddenly we were doing things by the book and we had to feed the children and snack the children and ..... And it became really vanilla. Sort of pointless?

SH: How did Sue feel when you left?

SS: Oh, it was great to get the hell out of there. It didn't even resemble what I knew as a camping program. It was an institution in the woods.

SH: I want you to explore that with me because this has come up a couple of times.

SS: Very slowly, whatever you could get accomplished, you did. When I left everything was regimented.

SH: You had a problem with that?

SS: Oh, yeah. A big problem.

SH: Part of that was your coming from the State Hospital and the programs before Boone?

SS: Right. My problem with it was that I felt that the bureaucracy and the needs of the organization had become paramount to what was going on with kids.

SH: So if you were to say -- and let's call Boone an innovation-- if you were to say that the Boone innovation was no more and you were seeking primary responsibility. Why was Boone in the later years less than the ideal it had been?

SS: Because there were a lot of people around that were too stupid to understand what Boone was.

SH: Talking about people?

SS: In the bureaucracy. Boone had ceased to have the magic of the bailout from the court order days. It was put on the back burner. It was harder and harder to find staff.

SH: And when you say the court order days, you're talking about?

SS: The court -- the court cases. Which Boone had been developed in response to that. Well, we were in agreement with the order and we cared. And the very thing that -- what really made me angry was the very damn thing that had created Boone had ruined the hell out of it. They wanted this innovative, fascinating, titillating cocktail conversation quality at the upper level program. But they wanted it to be non-frightening, sanitary, predictable. They wanted to be able to just, you know, turn the key on the gate, leave the kids and the staff there and just go on about their business. That's not what Boone was about. The whole purpose of Boone was the same thing that some people do with

alcoholics. You hit the bottom, you crater, and that's not a calm process.

Continuing on the same theme, Sue offered:

SS: Each year there were new improvements. We wanted to go -- and don't misunderstand the way I phrase it --we wanted to go white middle class with the program. The agency did, Mr. Mason did. Well, we began to follow the same regulations that DHS followed. Well, DHS deals with totally different kids. It's the same kids in many senses, but the commission of a felony is not there. And the intent to commit a felony is not there. And that whole process that goes with it. Suddenly, we were feeding the kids two meals a day at the central area. I prepared breakfast. I prepared lunch. On the new camps we were feeding them, initially just one meal a day up at central. But then it got to be three meals day. And then, a ____ing television set to break the monotony of camp, oh yes.

SH: Was there ever a time when you felt, this program works?

SS: As far as a peak experience, yeah. We had gone through one of the group changes, you know, the attrition. Some kids would leave, we'd get new kids in. We had this one kid, a white kid from West State. Morey Alexander who was a major pain in the butt. We were having a huddle-up with this kid and it was the most -- it was the most bizarre experience. Everything clicked. I mean these guys were dead on his case. We all seemed to be very crystal clear about what was going on with Morey. And nobody was afraid at that point to confront him, to talk to him about it and to share the experience. We didn't fall for the tears and we didn't fall for all the manipulation. And finally this kid jumps up and runs over to the wash area, the dish washing area. Kicked buckets over. And he just stopped. I mean it was just -- we're sitting here almost like a picture plaque. These disinterested spectators.

Okay, what are you doing now? He stopped and looked at us and said, you're all right. Absolutely right. I've got nine months here because I don't want to go back out there. And the peak experience of it was that the rest of the kids were like, one-by-one, yeah, yeah. That's the way it is. And it was the only huddle-up that I really felt extraordinary about. And I walked away going, so that's what a therapeutic change is. I just got to see something. It didn't happen but that one time. That was probably, as a therapist, one of the most illuminating experiences for me.

Concern and disdain for the bureaucracy was echoed by another informant when I asked him to tell me about his worst experience at Boone.

The worst was when the axe would fall from above and everything you had been working was thrown helter skelter. Where an administrative decision would say "you can't do that". We want a program that's the same as Boxwood, we going to have a treatment program that's the same from

institution to institution. And you'd say, " its a good idea but that's not the philosophy we want to teach". From higher up in the organization there would come the message "we are going to keep you in line". It seems it was a tactic used by the bureaucracy to let you know they were in charge. It was antithetical to what we were teaching kids, trying to exercise control by external force. Those were some of the worst experiences where someone was given authority over you who had no success with kids and who didn't subscribe to what we were doing and changed it without justification. In the final analysis, it is the cross that innovators and agents of change carry.

I continued by asking Sue if the Boone experience had changed or modified any of the beliefs, attitudes, and values that she had as far as working with troubled kids.

SH: How had your belief system changed? What are the things that seemed important in terms of kids?

SS: When I left Boone I took with me the personal responsibility, the natural consequences, the having to see

the cause and effect that kids had to see. If they do this, then this will happen. I took away the thought process that one of the other chiefs (groupworkers) had brought up in a meeting one time and that was the kids needed to see their victims. And they needed to know what damage that they caused. It just wasn't a trivial thing that they had done. I took away the recognition that there are a lot of extraneous variables that have to be cut away from kids. Reduction of those extraneous variables. Forcing the kid to focus on something other than the radio, friends, clothing. That there were so many things that people could use to avoid working through a particular emotional situation other than drugs and alcohol. I took away kind of a disappointment that we never got our hands on families and that we didn't have that much contact with the families. The personal responsibility was the big thing, a very big thing. I don't believe in pandering to kids. You know, I don't believe in -- I see a lot of people in this agency and

other agencies that will not tell them the bad news. And the kids usually know the bad news. They just haven't heard it from anybody else. I took away a directness that I don't think I would have had as a therapist if I had not been at Boone. I think I would have been one of those people who use 40 billion words to say, well, you really screwed up. Instead I came away with the ability of saying these are the behaviors that you engaged in and here are the consequences. And its real hard for me to quantify but it gave me a problem solving strategy with kids that were at once behavioral, cognitive and emotional.

SH: No B.S.?

SS: No, none.

SH: Genuine?

SS: Yeah. You have to either do it or you don't. And I guess that's the big rule. Same rule I use at Challenge House, don't tell me. You told everybody and then you went out and murdered that guy and stole his

car. Big deal. Show me. Do it. And like I said, I think those of us that went through the camping program aren't afraid to be grownups. And politically that's pretty bad sometimes.

SH: How would you compare the Sue Smith of today with the Sue at Boone in terms of what you hope for, what you're striving to do?

SS: Oh, I'm a lot more cynical. What I am trying to do with these guys at Challenge House is simply give them the experience of being an adult. Give them the opportunity to become self-reliant. I am not trying to cure them. I am trying to buff up some of their self image. But I don't have that "global village" concept anymore that things will work out well for them. I really don't. I try to arm them as much as possible to how difficult it really is going to be. I mean, we're like the big cold pail of water in their faces. And that's what I try to do. Just the reality of it. If you think it sucks now, pay taxes, make car notes, survive in a

relationship, work every day, drive in traffic everyday. You know, the nuts and bolts, reality.

SH: Straight time?

SS: Its what we call life without parole. They're just in it forever.

I explored the idea of whether the program had ever met the ideals and philosophy of Boone with Richard Peng. Richard is a 18 year veteran with the agency, he currently serves as an administrator at one of the agency's "schools".

RP: There was one time when I saw this brought together, where our philosophies, our values, our beliefs, the people, everything came together. John Carlson was camp director and he had called Ken King to plan this trip and we went to Enchanted Rock and did rock climbing. I had never climbed rocks in my life. And this was after Ken and I had a lot of problems and yet I put that all aside. This trip was so successful. I put my life in his hands. I had to depend on Ken that day. He could have killed me. I was in some positions

where he very easily could have given -- I could have had an accident, I could have been seriously injured or killed. It never ever occurred to me that he might do that. I trusted him so much on that trip because that's the way this whole trip went down. Everyone's, the best of you was pulled out. Only the best. And I have never felt any higher than that on any drug or anything in my entire life. It was just -- it was a peak experience -- it was religious experience. But they didn't keep that going because they didn't have someone who knew how to keep it going. That was one of their -- one of the problems in the alternative programs is -- I think all alternative programs. You create this unique energy and everything but trying to give it longevity. I guess peak experiences are like orgasms, they aren't meant to last forever. And I don't know that could have lasted -- it could have lasted longer and better than it did, but there was a leadership that did not even seem to be able to conceive of the fact this

could really be ongoing, and looking at the needs -- the long-term needs -- of the employees as well as the children.

Richard was at Boone for seven years so I asked him to tell me how the wilderness therapeutic and education program ended.

RP: I was there until all the camps were closed. What I saw in the camps in the last few years was sad to me. It was not even the same program. You literally were taking -- you were just taking an institution and tearing the walls down and putting it out in the woods with all the same rules and all the do-da. But even then, there would be glimmers at times, they did things. But it was different. In order to make an alternative program such as that one successful, first of all it was located in the wrong area. You have got to be in an area where -- maybe this is part of my philosophy or whatever but in order for that program to succeed it couldn't just start with the very talented people that it had. They had some incredibly talented, very unique people. But, they

had to continue to attract these people. And that geographical location, because of the lack of awareness -- people had a very low level awareness in that community (Boone). It was a very backward area. The community was truly red-neck. Leadership in the community was inadequate. It was backward. It is not a town where progressive college educated people would want to live. If that same program could have been done outside of a community, a city maybe like Metropolis. Or where there were universities closer. A more desirable living area. Wages could have been different, hours could have been different, living conditions could have been a little better. It was the right program in the wrong place. Probably at the right time, but the wrong place. It had a real detrimental affect and we just -- when I left Boone I was glad to leave because the people we were attracting were no longer people that I had much interest in. I didn't care about working with them.

SH: How did they change?

RP: We were getting more of your traditional institutional type people. People that wanted to work in an institution. Well, we attracted people at the beginning who did not want to work in an institution, that was diametrically opposed to what they wanted. But so many of my friends were gone, the really interesting vivacious people were gone, and the original woods program was gone. I felt like a foreigner when I went to the woods.

SH: Towards the end?

RP: Yeah. It was time for me to go. So, when it was time for the program to go, it was time for Richard to go, and I needed out of there.

Attempting to explore changes in beliefs, attitudes, and values, I asked Rhett Wilkes this question.

SH: Did the Boone experience change any of your philosophies or beliefs or attitudes?

RW: I left Boone with a greater understanding of age

groups that we were working with. I had a heightened sense of accountability.

SH: Are there any events, or series of events, that makes you feel like Boone was everything that it strived to be? At least the ideal that deals with natural consequences?

RW: I think in the beginning. The central office at this point didn't really understand what it was all about. And there was a lot of freedom exercised back then. After about a year they began to interfere. They got in the way of natural consequences. Suddenly hot meals needed to be provided rather than produced by the kids. Then suddenly, the quality -- they became concerned about the quality of life. They had to have running water out there. And it became institutionalized after awhile and I think it just lost all of its spontaneity and its creativity and its freedom to experiment. It killed it. The bureaucracy killed it. And I think you can see -- if you look at who got hired for that period of time

I think you'll see a decline in the personnel. The kind of people that were being hired. There are not very many Boone people left that are working for the agency. But almost to the person, the only ones that are left are the ones from the original camps.

Kim Daniels served as groupworker and a groupworker supervisor at Boone. She left after nine months and then returned to work in an off-shoot of the wilderness programs, wilderness adventure. She left the agency but continued to work in the helping profession for several years as both counselor and director of programs. She has recently returned to the agency and is currently the director of substance abuse and alcohol programs at one of the agency's "schools". I explored her perspectives of the Boone experience and its effectiveness.

SH: I'd like for you to tell me about the best experience you had at Boone.

KD: My best experience was probably one of our canoe trips. Our group successfully planned an overnight trip, a weekend adventure trip. It wasn't an extended adventure trip. I remember that it went very smoothly

and the counselors and the kids had fun. We had a victory celebration.

SH: Seeing things all work together, the group?

KD: Yeah, it really all came together.

SH: Was Boone an effective program for kids?

KD: Yes. You were able to see a change in kids happening before you. You were able to see kids problem solving in a group. You would overhear it in conversations among the kids, there were changes, benefits. It was doing things with them. It was far more effective, active, and interactive therapy than just sitting and talking.

SH: What did you take from Boone in terms of changes in your philosophy, beliefs, and attitudes about kids?

KD: I don't know I came away with beliefs other than my normal beliefs. I believed they should go to school and not be abused. I believed that people could change. I believed that they were basically starting out life as good people and they didn't want to be bad. If

presented the proper ingredients for change that they would. I had never known kids in trouble. It was an eye-opener for me that kids could be in those types of situations. I think I began to understand how they got that way. I came to believe that they weren't just "bad" kids. That all those bad things in their lives had led to their survival. I came to believe that they were good survivors more than anything. One of the other things that came to believe is that if you make a mistake with a kid, you need to go ahead and own up to it. As far as counseling, I came in believing that you did a traditional one-one-one, individual therapy. That's what I was trained to do. When I left Boone, I had a lot of doubts about whether or not it was the way to bring changes about in people. I came out believing it was the group experience that really changed people. I became a strong believer in wilderness programs rather than institutions. I believed that all kids should be in camping programs, that no kids should be in institutions.

I asked Jack Knight if he would typify the Boone experience for me and to talk about his relationship with kids today.

JK: It was one hell of a struggle because Boone was out of the norm. I know that if I hadn't had support at the top I wouldn't have been able to pull it off. It was a real struggle in the context of a state program.

SH: How would you compare the person Jack is today with the person at Boone in terms of beliefs, and attitudes about kids.

JK: I'm not as involved with kids as much as I was at Boone. My feelings toward kids, as always, I believe every kid has the ability to overcome adversity. Given the right chance, the right opportunity, kids can change. I also realize that not everyone is going to make it but we've got to give them the opportunity to be successful. I still love kids. I still care a lot about kids. I still believe in kids. Sometimes I really wonder how much longer I can stay in this business but I don't know what I'd do without them. I have to have new things to

explore, to try things that will help kids. It's real good now to sit back and see some of the things you started flourish. But you have to recognize that things change because life and times change. Programs come and go but you can't let that get you down. My attitude and beliefs toward kids, they've not changed. I think my biggest change in attitude has been with the bureaucracy. It harder to work with kids. You can't find the time for kids. Its not how well your working with kids but how well you do the paperwork. I don't understand it.

Summary

This chapter has reported the results of the data analysis that emerged from the responses of the informants. Four themes were identified dealing with the beliefs, attitudes, and values that these innovators brought to Boone, what beliefs they had about kids in trouble, the transference of these beliefs to other programs and environs, and how their beliefs have weathered the experience of time.

Boone was a new beginning, a chance for something new. A change. These innovators came from varying paths. Veterans home from

Viet Nam, graduate students, business persons, Peace Corps volunteers in foreign prisons, corporate types, and public school teachers to name a few. Clearly, they possessed many of the characteristics of innovators. They had the courage to try new ideas, concepts, and new environs. They were venturesomeness and willing to try new ideas. They sought challenge and they were tenacious in pursuit of their goals. They were willing to commit to the concepts of natural consequences, positive peer pressure, and experiential education, to nurture these concepts in their infancy. There were many who were "true believers" who possessed almost fanatical beliefs in causes such as service to others.

These individuals sought places where they could do what they believed should be done - that place was Boone. They saw kids as kids and they were not too concerned with how they got there or what crimes they had committed. They believed that kids were human beings and that they had many of the same needs as the staff did for achievement, attention, recognition, and caring. The believed that it was important to know your kids and to interact with them. They believed that to be effective in treating and educating these kids that you had to be open, genuine, real, and that you had to treat them in the same ways that all

humans want to be treated with fairness, equity, and love. They believed that kids shouldn't be abused but that you shouldn't take a laissez faire attitude with them either. They believed that kids didn't need to be behind bars or locked-up in institutions suffering under stereotypical treatment procedures but rather that new and different approaches needed to used to touch the lives of kids. They believed in the group process and the use of huddle-ups and pow wows as effective strategies in dealing with problems. They felt kids should be nurtured and given an opportunity to change. They believed that kids could change and that they could make a difference in the lives of troubled kids. They saw value in kids irregardless of their past lives. They believed that kids needed positive role models.

Other values, beliefs, and attitudes were reflected in the things they felt kids took with them from Boone. Many of the staff believed that kids when they left Boone were better able to cope and to solve problems. They had experience in team work and cooperation, and interdependence, they had come to understand how their actions affected other people. They left with increased self-confidence and self-esteem and they were better equipped to deal with life's challenges and conflicts. They knew how to

deal with conflicts and how to handle difficult situations. They knew something about human dynamics and interpersonal relations. They left knowing how to get along, to have fun, and a sense of personal responsibility and the nature of consequences.

Boone innovators created a revolution in the care and treatment of kids in east State. They spread the beliefs, values, and attitudes of Boone into many programs and environments. Beliefs, attitudes, and values related to natural consequences, group processes, problem solving, responsibility, acceptance of others and others ideas, values, and opinions, and service. In part through independent action, in part through the empowerment of Jack Knight and Rob Mason.

In the main, the beliefs, values, and attitudes of the Boonies have remained intact as regards change and as regards kids but they have been tempered with reality and with cynicism about the bureaucracy. The staff who have remained with the agency see a pronounced difference in the student population and that has modified some of their beliefs, attitudes, and values. They still view kids as human beings that when provided the right experiences, opportunities, problem solving tools can change.

Chapter 5

Conclusions and Implications for Further Research

The purpose of this study was to identify the beliefs, attitudes, and values of a select group of innovators and change agents who participated in the Boone Wilderness Therapeutic Camping Program during the years 1975-77. In addition, the study explored the origins of their beliefs, attitudes, and values of these innovators, as well as, their transference to other innovations, and their persistence over time. I began this qualitative study of the Daniel Boone Therapeutic Camping Program seeking to add to the body of knowledge about beliefs, attitudes, and values that people bring to educational innovations. As the interviews took place themes emerged related to the identification of beliefs, attitudes, and values, origins of beliefs, attitudes, and values, their persistence, and permanence of beliefs within individuals.

Based on the results of the analysis reported, the following conclusions, discussion, and recommendations for further study are presented.

A composite of the informants who participated in the study revealed a group that was predominately white, predominately male, was middle aged, experienced (12 years in treatment and juvenile corrections), and very

well educated (80% had degrees beyond the bachelors). They were representative of the individuals who gave substance and meaning to the Boone innovation.

Characteristically, Boonies were young and idealistic. Products of the late 1960s and early 1970s. They were venturesome, desired change, were avant-garde and they were willing to take risks. They were tenacious and persevering. They were cosmopolitan, coming from many different places and many different backgrounds. They were bright, creative, and fun-seeking. They were well educated and they were open to new experiences and events. There were clearly innovators in that they were the first to adopt and put into practice the concept of wilderness therapeutic camping in a public setting. They gave the concepts of natural consequences, positive peer culture, and experiential learning substance in day-to-day practice.

Conclusions About the Beliefs, Attitudes, and Values of the Boone Innovators

It should be pointed out that this study was an attempt to extend the earlier work of Smith, Kleine, Prunty, and Dwyer detailed in Educational Innovators: Then and Now (1986). Their work was based on an intensive

interview study of individuals who were involved in the attempt to introduce innovation and reform in the public school setting. The study examined in detail the lives of those individuals who participated in the Kensington innovation. The study identifies the beliefs and their origins that innovators brought to the innovation and through the vehicle of life histories examined the persistence of beliefs over time and where the innovators lives have evolved. Importantly, the Kensington study and the Boone effort have sought to examine the individual in the innovation and change process; to extend our knowledge beyond the bounds of technological, political, social, economic and cultural domains.

It is interesting to note there were many similarities between the two groups of innovators, Boonies and the people of Kensington, even though more that a decade separated their efforts. They shared similar qualities of enthusiasm, excitement, and idealism. In the main, they were "true believers". Each group of individuals was drawn to the innovation by their ideals and conceptualizations of a better way and more enlightened future. Collectively they sought a freedom to create something better for kids. Also characterizing both groups of innovators and change agents was the element of inexperience. Many of the individuals who came to both

innovations had little or no experience in the activities upon which they would embark. Within the sample that represented the Boone innovation only one had a wealth of experience in therapeutic camping and responsibility-based programs. Both groups of innovators shared characteristics of intelligence and creativity. The individuals who made up the Boone and Kensington innovators were all graduates of colleges and universities with many possessing advanced degrees. Their creativity exhibited itself in the myriad of ways that they approached the day-to-day problems of living and surviving in a wilderness environment and in adapting to an open-school milieu. The humor evident in the Kensington innovators was mirrored by those of Boone.

The evolution of their beliefs followed similar paths. Their origins of family and early experience and their persistence over time were common. The continued involvement of both groups of innovators in educational change and reform is noted. Few of the Boonies remained with the agency but many went on in similar programs and became agents of change. None of the innovators remained at Kensington but the majority continued to initiate change and reform within the public school system. While the similarities between these two groups of innovators is striking

there are points of departure. The most notable is the absence of the strong religious commitment on the part of Boonies as compared to the innovators of Kensington. Personal issues were dissimilar and the influence of the Vietnam conflict and the decade of the sixties evident with the Boonies was not present in the innovators of Kensington.

The people who came to Boone came from many paths, however, they shared many basic beliefs. They believed that there was a right way to treat people and to treat each other. Non-possessive warmth or a belief in the innate value of all human beings no matter what their origin, color, social status, or sex was a common value. They believed that people should be nurtured, attended to and that you should listen to their issues and concerns. These individuals believed in trying to emphatize with others. They valued honesty. These innovators believed in being genuine. They were free-spirits who hid very little from their peers or charges. They valued being up-front and straight forward. They believed in telling the truth and accepting the consequences. Boonies believed in perseverance in the face of adversity. They believed in serving as appropriate models for their charges.

They were described by others and themselves as "save the world types" with values of peace, love, sharing, and respect for nature. They believed in the words of John F. Kennedy, "Ask not what your country can do for you but rather ask what you can do for your country" and they demonstrated their belief by giving service freely with no expectation of payback. They embodied the words of Robert F. Kennedy, "Some men see things as they are and ask why? I dream things they have never dreamed of and ask why not?" They believed in creating a better world, a better place for all of God's creatures, and importantly, for kids in trouble.

Individuals came to Boone with many of these beliefs, values, and attitudes. The origins of these beliefs, attitudes, and values were in many regards typical of the origins identified by Black (1952), Rokeach (1968), and Smith, Kleine, Prunty, and Dwyer (1986). Rokeach (1968) contends that belief systems are developed initially from individual experience, from what one has felt or perceived directly from the object or from the experience of others. Parents and significant others (i.e., grandparents, aunts, uncles, etc.) proved to be a primary source in the formation of the Boone innovators basic beliefs about people and how people should be treated.

The maturation of Boone innovators belief systems is consistent with the concept of the experiential funnel described by Smith et al (1986). Education was a major influence by a number of individuals as being central to the refinement and expansion of their beliefs, attitudes, and values. A number credited individual professors and teachers for the formation of certain beliefs, attitudes, and values about kids and life. Religion or spiritual experience proved to be the source of other beliefs, attitudes, and values. Religion was cited specifically by one of the informants, however, spiritual experience and exposure to eastern and other philosophies was mentioned by several as a important source of their belief systems. Military service or military rearing was to a few of the Boonies the source of some of their beliefs and values such as duty, loyalty, and country. Others cited contemporary music and artists naming John Lennon and Bob Dylan and other social activists as a source of their beliefs. For many, the culture of the 1960's had tremendous import to the formation and reconceptualization of beliefs, attitudes, and values.

Boonies beliefs in reference to kids can be typified as they saw kids as kids and they were not too concerned with how they got there or what crimes they had committed. As one informant reported, "I saw them as

no different from us when we were kids. They just got caught more". They believed that kids were human beings and that they had many of the same needs as the staff did for achievement, attention, recognition, and caring. The felt that it was important to know your kids and to interact with them. They believed that to be effective in treating and educating these kids that you had to be open, genuine, real, and that you had to treat them in the same ways that all humans want to be treated with fairness, equity, and love. They believed that kids shouldn't be abused but that you shouldn't take a laissez faire attitude with them either. They believed that kids didn't need to be behind bars or locked-up in institutions suffering under stereotypical treatment procedures but rather that new and different approaches needed to used to touch the lives of kids. They believed in the group process and the use of huddle-ups and pow-wows as effective strategies in dealing with problems. The believed in modeling appropriate behaviors and setting parameters.

Other values, beliefs, and attitudes were reflected in the things Boonies felt kids took with them from Boone and the beliefs and values they believed kids took with them. Many of the staff believed that kids when they left Boone were better able to cope and to solve problems.

They had experience in team work and cooperation, and interdependence, they had come to understand how their actions affected other people. They left with increased self-confidence and self-esteem and they were better equipped to deal with life's challenges and conflicts. They knew how to deal with conflicts and how to handle difficult situations. They knew something about human dynamics and interpersonal relations. They left knowing how to get along with others, to have fun, a sense of personal responsibility and the nature of consequences.

Rokeach (1968) contends that in studying beliefs one must consider both the conditions which foster change and those which foster stability and integration. One aspect of stability of an individual's belief system is that the social action of the individual becomes more consistent with the value priorities (Rokeach, 1985). Did these identified beliefs, values, and attitudes survive the Boone experience? If you view the actions of the informants following the Boone experience, I believe they did and further, they were reinforced and refined. Numerous informants reported how the beliefs, values, and attitudes they had possessed at Boone were integrated with new beliefs and attitudes dealing with issues of victims, families, aftercare, follow-up, and other dimensions of the treatment/educational

process in new programs, approaches, and innovations concerned with the treatment of kids. They transferred both the beliefs and the innovative approaches to numerous other programs both within and outside of the agency. Ian Martin and Sue Smith both talked of the integration of Boone beliefs into the half-way houses they had established. William McCarthy transferred them to his PRYDE program in Arizona and later into Christian educational and recreational programs throughout the Southwest. Rhett Butler talks of their centrality in independent living programs. Jack Knight as director of institutions and recognized change agent serving to propagate the beliefs and ideals throughout the system.

Recommendations

1) As a result of this initial research, it is clear that explication of beliefs, attitudes, and values associated with innovators adds a deeper understanding to the change and innovations processes and should explored further.

2) It is recommended that additional studies of other innovations/innovators be conducted to determine if there exists a commonality among innovators in terms of beliefs, attitudes, and values.

3) Further research related to the origins of beliefs, attitudes, and values of innovators would further define and clarify the findings of the present study.

4) Additional studies comparing the beliefs, attitudes, and values of the innovator to those of the organization in which the innovation occurs would be useful.

Concluding Statement

Concluding the Boone study, there are many issues related to beliefs, values, and attitudes and innovation that must be further explored. It does not establish a set of beliefs, attitudes, and values representative of all innovators but those of a select group. Beliefs, attitudes, and values have been present in innovations and those may have influenced the integration or rejection of innovations. Do they have a central place in the success of educational and treatment innovations? In reference to the entire issue of beliefs, values, and attitudes of educational innovators, I think we must look at other programs and in other settings. The importance of this study is that it adds to the discussion addressing beliefs, attitudes, and values in the innovation process. Our goal must be to address the human element in innovations if we are to confront and solve the educational and social problems of the twenty-first century.

Bibliography

Baier, K. and Rescher, N. (Eds.). (1969). Values and the future: The impact of technological change on American values. New York: The Free Press.

Bailey, B., Faherty, J., Selman, G., Spencer, D. (1977). Wilderness therapeutic camping evaluation. Austin, TX: Texas Youth Commission.

Barry, R. and Wolf, B. (1965). Motives, values, and realties: A framework for counseling. New York: Teachers College Press.

Bennis, W., Benne, K., and Chin, R. (1985). The planning of change. New York: Holt, Reinhart, and Winston.

Black, M. (1952). Critical thinking. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Blumenthal, M. (1973). The belief systems of protesting college students. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 2 (2), 103-123.

Borg, W. and Gall, M. (1989). Educational research. New York: Longman.

Eagan, G. (1985). Change agent skills in helping and human service settings. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Ellis, B. (1979). Rational belief systems. Totowa, New Jersey: Rowman and Littlefield.

Engel, J. and Blackwell, R. (1982). Consumer behavior. New York: Dryden Press.

Fazio, R. and Zanna, M. (1981). Direct experience and attitude-behavior consistency. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 14, 162-203). New York: Academic Press.

Festinger, L. (1957). A theory of cognitive dissonance. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Fiske, S. and Taylor, S. (1991). Social cognition. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Frank, J. (1977). The nature and functions of belief systems: Humanism and transcendental religion. American Psychologist. 32 (7), 555-559.

Glesne, C. and Peshkin, A. (1992). Becoming qualitative researchers. White Plains, NY: Longman Publishing Group.

Harvey, T. (1990). Checklist for change: A pragmatic approach to creating and controlling change. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Havelock, R. and Havelock, M. (1973). Training for change agents. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

Havelock, R. with Zlotolow (1995). The change agent's guide. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.

Hoffer, E. (1951). The true believer. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, Inc.

Hoffer, E. (1967). First things, last things. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, Inc.

Janoff-Bulman, R. (1992). Shattered assumptions: Toward a new psychology of trauma. New York: The Free Press.

Kallgren, C. and Wood, W. (1986). Access to attitude-relevant information in memory as a determinant of attitude-behavior consistency. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 22, 328-338

Kagan, J. (1978). The growth of the child. New York: W.W. Norton.

Kanter, R. (1983). The change masters. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Kelly, G., (1955). The psychology of personal constructs. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc.

Kiesler, C., Collins, B., Miller, N. (1969). Attitude change: A critical analysis of theoretical approaches. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Kirton, M. (1976). Adaptors and innovators: A description and measure. Journal of Applied Psychology, 61(5), 622-629.

Kreitler, S. and Kreitler, H. (1990). The cognitive foundation of personality traits. New York: Plenum Press.

Levine, K. and Lightburn, A. (1989). Belief systems and social work practice. The Journal of Contemporary Social Work. March, 139-145.

Loughmiller, C. (1965). Wilderness road. Austin, TX: Hogg Foundation for Mental Health.

Madsen, K. (1974). Modern theories of motivation. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Maehr, M. (1984). Meaning and motivation: Toward a theory of personal investment. In R. Ames and C. Ames (Eds.), Research on motivation in education: Vol. 2. Student motivation. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Maio, G. and Olson, J. (1995). Relations between values, attitudes, and behavioral intentions: The moderating role of attitude function. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology. 31, 266-285.

Milburn, M. (1987). Ideological self-schemata and schematically induced attitude consistency. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 23, 383-398.

Reeve, J. (1992). Understanding motivation and emotion. Fort Worth: Harcourt, Brace, Janovich College Publishers.

Rokeach, M. (1960). Open and closed mind. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Rokeach, M. (1968). Beliefs, values, and attitudes. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Rokeach, M. (1985). Inducing change and stability in belief systems and personality structures. Journal of Social Issues. 41 (1), 153-171.

Rogers, E. (1983). Diffusion of innovations. New York: The Free Press.

Rosenberg, M., Hovland, C., McGuire, W., Abelson, R., Brehm, J., (1960). Attitude organization and change. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.

Schon, D.A. (1967). Technology and change. New York: Delacorte Press.

Smith, J. (1992). [Class notes: Planned Educational Change, EIPT 6133]. University of Oklahoma. Unpublished.

Smith, M., Bruner, J., White, R., (1956). Opinions and personality. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Smith, L., Kleine, P., Prunty, J., and Dwyer, D. (1986). Educational innovators: Then and now. New York: The Falmer Press.

Spence, J. (Ed.) (1983). Achievement and achievement motives: Psychological and sociological approaches. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman and Company.

Stewart, D. (1982). The diffusion of innovations: A review of research and theory with implications for computer technology. Paper presented to the 1982 Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, August.

Wangen, N. (1982). The relationship of receptivity to change to personal characteristics and organizational perceptions of teachers in small schools. Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association, March.

Zaltman, G. and Duncan, R. (1977). Strategies for planned change. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Zaltman, G., Duncan, R, and Holbeck, J. (1973). Innovations and organizations. New York: Wiley Interscience.

Appendix A

Interview Guide

1) Who were you and what were you doing before Boone? What experiences had you had with kids? Had you worked in programs similar to Boone?

2) How did you find out about Boone?

3) Were you aware that Boone was an experiential education program conducted in the woods?

4) Do you recall the interview process? What types of people were the Boone directors looking for? What type of people did Boone attract? What beliefs, values, and attitudes did you perceive among the other staff members?

5) What beliefs, attitudes, feelings, and philosophies did you have about kids before Boone? Where did they come from?

6) What was you impression of Boone after your first day? After the first six months? After the first year?

7) Tell me about a typical day at Boone.

8) Did the skills you were trying to teach transfer back to the streets?

9) What was the best and worst experience you had while at Boone?

10) Was Boone an effective program for kids? What did they leave with?

11) What affect did Boone have on your beliefs, values, and attitudes? What did you take from Boone? Has it affected any of the ways you approach kids and programs today?

12) Would you do the Boone experience again?

13) Have your beliefs, values, and attitudes towards kids changed since Boone? How? Why?

14) Would you do the Boone experience again?

15) Compare yourself with the person you were at Boone with the person you are today in terms of beliefs, values, and attitudes.

Appendix B

University of Oklahoma - Norman, Oklahoma

College of Education, Department of Educational Psychology

CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN A RESEARCH PROJECT

You are being asked to participate in a study to identify the beliefs, attitudes, and values of individuals who participated in the Daniel Boone Therapeutic Camping Program during the years 1975-77. This study is being conducted by Samuel Hendrix, a doctoral student in the Department of Educational Psychology.

Your involvement will require you to participate in one or perhaps two interview sessions in which questions will be asked regarding your participation in the Boone program to include your beliefs, attitudes, and values. You may be selected to participate in a second follow-up session. You will be asked to allow tape recordings to be made of these interviews. Following transcription by the investigator, the recordings will be destroyed.

There are no known risks to your participation in this study. All responses made during the interviews will be kept confidential.

You will not be identified as an informant nor will the name of the agency, program, or location be divulged in any publication or presentation.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may end your participation at any time.

Should you have any further questions about this study, please contact me, S. Hendrix, phone (405) 329-4816. Should you have questions about your rights as a research subject, you may contact the Office of Research Administration, University of Oklahoma, phone (405) 325-4757.

I agree to participate in this study and I understand all of the statements above.

_____ _____

Name (Signature) *Date*

Appendix C

RESEARCH PROPOSAL

A) Project Title: Boone Wilderness Therapeutic Camping Program: A Retrospective Study of Beliefs, Attitudes, and Values of Selected Innovators and Change Agents

B) Names and qualifications of project researchers:

Samuel B. Hendrix III

Mr. Hendrix is a doctoral candidate in the educational psychology (instructional psychology and technology program) department at the University of Oklahoma. His specialization is in the area of implementation and management of innovative programming in the areas of education and training. He is a former employee of the agency (1976-77) where he served as an educational diagnostician and teacher in the Boone Wilderness Therapeutic Camping Program. Mr. Hendrix has completed extensive work in both quantitative and qualitative research methodologies and design. He is currently employed

by the Federal Aviation Administration as an Instructional Systems Specialist in the design, development, and delivery of air traffic training courses. Mr. Hendrix is a published, award-winning author in the area of future methodologies for technical training.

C. Purpose:

The purpose of this study is the completion of dissertation requirements for the doctor of philosophy degree in the area of instructional psychology and technology. Further, the purpose of the study is to identify beliefs, values, and attitudes of individuals who participated as innovators in one therapeutic camping and experiential educational program and what they are doing now. The research questions addressed by this study are: Where the innovators, leaders, and participants came from? What philosophies and events prompted their involvement? What beliefs, attitudes, and values did they bring to the program? How do they remember it? What are their perspectives of the alternative program and its effectiveness? What did they learn or experience from their involvement in the

program? Were their belief systems changed as a result of the Boone experience? Where have they gone? What have they done? What are they are doing now? What influence did the experience have on other aspects of their lives and belief systems? Would they participate in the program again? Have these themes continued into involvement in other programs, careers, interests, beliefs?

D. *Research design and methodology:*

The principal goal of this research is the identification of beliefs, attitudes, and values of innovators who had participated in the Boone Wilderness Therapeutic Camping Program during the years 1975-77. Qualitative research methods will be used to accomplish this end. Naturalistic inquiry is a process through which to study human life. It includes techniques such as interviews, document reviews, and participant observation. The aim of naturalistic inquiry is to create for the reader, a detailed picture of the shared beliefs, practices, attitudes, and behaviors of some group of people. In the case at hand, it will be used to examine retrospectively the beliefs, values, and

attitudes of a group of individuals who participated in a singularly unique educational and treatment program. The value of a study of this nature is four-fold: 1) it contributes to the limited data available on beliefs, values, and attitudes of educational innovators; 2) it captures for the historical record the experience of these innovators which may assist others in developing future innovations in education and the treatment of adolescents; 3) it extends the utilization and sophistication of important qualitative research methods; and 4) it provides a reflective analysis of important dynamics that does not occur typically in the midst of implementing change and innovation.

Glesne and Peshkin (1992) point out that qualitative research methods such as naturalistic inquiry seek to understand and interpret the perspectives of the participants in the event. Its epistemological roots reside in the philosophy of rationalism which views the origin of knowledge as logic. This results in a phenomenolgist orientation which views the world as socially constructed. The assumptions of qualitative inquiry are: 1)

primacy of content; 2) variables are complex and interwoven and are difficult, if not impossible, to measure; and 3) an Emic (insiders) view is preferred. Its purposes are contextualization, interpretations, and an understanding of the participants perspective.

The qualitative approach varies from quantitative research methods in that: 1) it ends with hypotheses rather than begins with them; 2) focuses on the emergence of variables rather than their manipulation, control, and measurement; 3) it is naturalistic rather than experimental; 4) it views the researcher as a primary instrument; 5) it seeks patterns; 6) investigates complexity and pluralism; and 7) the findings of qualitative research are descriptive not abstract (Glesne and Peshkin, 1992). The absence of pre-specified focus allows for the emergence and discovery of unique phenomena such as that which occurred at Boone.

E. *Number of and time required by each agency youth if used in research:*

Not applicable.

F. Provisions for confidentiality of youth names and identification numbers:

Not applicable.

G. Amount of agency staff time needed:

Agency staff which serve as participants will be interviewed in a manner (i.e.,off-duty) designed to minimize the use of official time. Agency staff necessary to locate available documentation is expected to be minimal.

H. Benefit to agency or juvenile profession:

The value of a study of this nature is four-fold: 1) it contributes to the limited data available on beliefs, values, and attitudes of innovators in juvenile education and treatment; 2) it captures for the historical record the experience of these innovators which may assist others in developing future innovations in education and the treatment of adolescents; 3) it extends the utilization and sophistication of important qualitative research methods; and 4) it provides a reflective analysis of important dynamics that does not occur typically in the midst of implementing change and innovation.

I. Research Supervisor:

Jay C. Smith, Ph.D.

Doctoral Committee Chairman

University of Oklahoma

Norman, Oklahoma 73069

(405) 325-1503

J. Amount and source of funding, if any:

Not applicable.

Appendix D

My Story

He's a walking contradiction
Partly truth and partly fiction
Taking every wrong direction
On his lonely way back home

The Pilgrim, Kris Kristofferson, 1972

After reading and reflection on both quantitative and qualitative methodologies and my own academic and professional experience, I believe that for much of my life I have been engaged in both "positivist" and "naturalistic" paradigms.

As an undergraduate in history and graduate student in the social sciences, primarily in the areas of history and political science, I focused on interpretations, social and cultural paradigms, and political and economic interactions which surrounded events of historical relevance, a naturalistic paradigm. The purpose of these activities was to explore and define the contexts, motives, intentions, and circumstances which led to or attended these events. Continuing graduate studies in the area of counseling psychology, I focused on quantitative, descriptive statistics such as mean, median, mode, Z-scores, t-tests, correlations and other measurements oriented to empirically verifiable phenomena, a positivist paradigm.

Currently, as a systems designer, trainer, and program management specialist, I use both positivist and naturalistic paradigms, quantitative and qualitative methods, in the evaluation of programs, courseware, media, instructional strategies, and training systems. My bias is that all things are not expressed quantitatively and that much of what occurs requires interpretation of holistic interactions of and between phenomena that cannot be explained through correlations and deviations. At best, these events can be identified, interpreted, and perhaps, understood.

Further in my attempt to focus on who and what I am, I have identified three principal areas that I feel drive my perception of people and events. These areas are: 1) belief in the values of the late 1960s and the early 1970s; 2) a desire for perfection, and 3) a disdain for authority and bureaucracy. These beliefs, values, and attitudes did not emerge in one blinding flash of insight but rather, they have evolved through college and my professional career in education, counseling, and training.

The first, belief in the values of the 1960s and early 1970s, is contained in my remembrance of this era as one of social and more importantly, personal transformation. I left high school in 1965 firmly believing in the United States government and the people who led our

country. I supported the war in Vietnam, George Wallace, use of tactical nuclear weapons, and I denigrated "hippies" and other who led alternative lifestyles. By 1969, I had resigned from the army reserve, I opposed the Vietnam war, participated in the free-speech movement, had an obsessional dislike for Richard Nixon and all things governmental, and I perceived alternative lifestyles not only as acceptable but as a desireable goal. The individual who entered the decade of the 1970s was more tolerant, accepting, and less dogmatic. Inherent within me was the belief, a dedication to making things better for everyone. As I conducted my first Boone interview for this study, I felt these beliefs, values, and attitudes reemerging as William McCarthy spoke of the beliefs, values, and attitudes that he brought to Boone and his perceptions of the beliefs and values that other staff members brought, as well. Listening, I remembered my ideals of "country life", independence, and giving to others. I am certain that this is reflected in the final report of Boone.

The second area, my desire for perfection, I believe is representative of many childhood messages provided by my parents, that I was not good enough, my accomplishments not up to their standards, and a general feeling of marginal competence. I can remember statements such as, " It's

pretty good but you could/should have..." These messages have resulted in an almost compulsive need to seek perfection not only in myself but in others as well. While today, I view that as unfair to myself and others, the tapes still play. While I am aware and attempt to compensate, I find I establish high standards for others and often set my expectations beyond their capabilities. In reference to the Boone study, I have avoided some themes that I felt may take away from the ideal and I think they add no value to the study of Boone beliefs, values, and attitudes and thus I have maintained my "perfectionistic" standard.

The disdain I feel for authority/bureaucracy stems from my childhood and my experience with the military and later educational and social organizations in adulthood. I came to believe and I still believe that people in charge must be willing to provide the why for the things they do, say, and set in motion. I am predisposed to believe that many good programs and ideas are suffocated by authority, control, and bureaucracy. As I explored the end of Boone camping program with William McCarthy, he stated, "Boone began to break up when too many people in Metropolis became interested in the program and sought to control it." I found myself saying to myself, "Another good program screwed up by the bureaucracy."

The Boone study has not provided me with reasons to change that belief. These three philosophical "gray areas" are part of the way that I have perceived the people of Boone and their beliefs, values, and attitudes.

Importantly to the reader, I was a member of Boone staff for a period of fifteen months as an educational and psychological diagnostician. Additionally, I had administrative responsibility for Title I programs and served as a teacher in one of the juvenile camps. I believed in responsibility-based programs, natural consequences, experiential educational, and group problem-solving. I believed that kids were kids and that they needed to be provided opportunities to change. I fully shared the beliefs, attitudes, and values of the Boone innovators and change agents. These beliefs, attitudes, values have been central to my continued involvement in the treatment and education of juvenile delinquents, adult offenders, and emotionally disturbed children. I like to think that I am a "true believer". In response, I have sought to apply the appropriate levels of compensation and objectivity during my retrospective study of the people of the Daniel Boone Wilderness Therapeutic Camping Program.