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CHAPTER I

THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Traditionally, the people of the United States have considered competition an essential ingredient of democracy. Statesmen, successful business men, and leaders of all kinds have extolled its value in shaping individual character, and especially in developing the wealth and productivity of this country.

Today, however, educators particularly are accused of taking exception to this way of thinking. Newspapers, popular magazines, and numerous books accuse them of trying to undermine the "American competitive way of life." Contrary to the wishes of the majority of the people, the educators are pictured as taking advantage of the contact they have with the young people of the nation. Instead of perpetuating the time-honored competitive way of life, they are accused of trying to replace it with socialism, "dead level equality," "mediocrity," etc.

The critics generally do not make clear what motives prompt the educators to follow this program. It is seldom inferred that they simply feel socialism is a better form of government. Instead, the inference is that the educational system has lined itself against our present way of life and is attempting to make vast alterations.

John Dewey is generally held responsible for this thinking. Such other "progressives" as George Counts, Harold Rugg, William Kilpatrick, and others, are also considered sizeable contributors. It is charged
that this group, representing a hard core of leadership, has indoctrinated almost all other educators in the profession. Their disciples are thought to be in every teachers college and university, and consequently new teachers who go out into the field are in turn given a thorough indoctrination regarding the evils of competition.

The people who make this criticism are not a majority. However they are a very verbal, and in some cases, respected minority. A few quotations will make the problem clearer.

Edward Whitman, quoting Kenneth MacFarland, whom he interviewed, said:

Personally, I am not one to label everyone a communist simply because he does not think as I do. However, when one calls for the abolishment of all competition in the classrooms, and doing away with rewards for superior effort, he is merely advocating for the childhood level the same things that the Communists are demanding in our society for the adult level. If this policy is carried to the extreme in the childhood years, it seems obvious that it prepares children to fit better into a communistic regimentation than it does into a society championing democracy and free enterprise. ¹

A full page advertisement in The Daily Sun, Arlington, Virginia, listed the aims of the modern progressive school and the aims of the traditional school. The traditional school was pictured as striving to preserve individualism and free enterprise, and the modern school was shown trying to instill socialism into the minds of the students. Report cards, grading, and promotions, were among the targets, and the results which they painted for the modern school ultimately would be:

¹Edward Whitman, "Report Cards: EGFU, SNUX, or ABC?" Collier's, 154:61, September 17, 1954.
The elimination of individualism and the competitive spirit as a means of eliminating the free enterprise feature of American society. An approach toward "dead level" equality.

Unprepared for the students to cope with failure in adult life, the individual who experiences it is predisposed to accept Socialism, under which his security will be planned for him. When no value is placed upon mental competence, ignorance becomes socially acceptable. In time, the future citizen will have only respect for forces under the rule of dictatorship.

Equalisation of all scholastic achievement to mediocrity. Eventual evolution, through the leveling process, of an "American proletariat."  

George Crane who often criticizes the public school system in his newspaper column wrote:

"Dr. Crane, Jack is a very bright boy," his mother began. "But he gets the same grades as other pupils in the class who do not know half as much as he does.

"... Our school has adopted the system of grading everybody in the class with an E for efficient work.

"Thus, the dull student gets an E if he is working as well as the teacher thinks he can, with his limited ability.

"Meanwhile, the brilliant pupils likewise are given an E. Thus, a boy like Jack who makes 98 in geography or spelling is given no higher grade than the dullard who would rate only 68 or 10 if arithmetical scores were used."

"... This method which Jack's mother attacks is a form of communism that has invaded our schools.

We've had it in our Chicago schools for years. And it is a reversal of our entire "free enterprise" system in America where the rewards have gone to those who won them."  

---

2 The Daily Sun, Arlington, Virginia (February 27), 1954.

Following the same line of thinking, John T. Flynn, writing in Reader's Digest said:

... A group of educators—not numerous but influential—has set out to introduce into the social science courses of our high schools a seductive form of propaganda for collectivism—chiefly of that type which we call socialism.

This propaganda takes the form of teaching ... three things. First, that our American system of private enterprise is a failure. Second, that our republic of limited powers is a mistake. Third, that our way of life must give way to a collectivist society in which the central State will own and operate, or plan and finance and control, the economic system.

I ... maintain teachers have no right to mold the minds of students in their religious or political philosophies. There are teachers that do this ... (He then cites George S. Counts' book, Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?, and Harold Rugg's The Great Technology, as two examples of educators attempting to indoctrinate students' minds through teachings in the school.)

Very often one sees letters to editors of newspapers which voice the same fear as the above. Here are some examples:

It seems, however, that reduction of the individual personalities of citizens young and old, to a common level is the goal of a number of educators who are in a position to carry out their ideas.

My particular contention is that the system of grading students in the elementary grades is an outstanding example of this abasement of the spirit of industry and competition.

In a letter to the editor of the Columbus Evening Dispatch, Carl Turner appeared to fear that the National Education Association

---


was going to take over in politics, and that fearful things would follow:

... Many of the books, since banned, will in all probability be returned to the classrooms.

Indoctrinated teachers who constantly prate about their insipid democratic way of life will be pushed to the front.

The type of instruction so acceptable to the John Dewey-trained progressives will become the order of the day. The dynamic American competitive spirit of our forefathers will soon be a thing of the past.6

These few examples do not pretend to cover the field. Every medium of mass communication has samples, and the American people are hearing it on every side.

It appears that the situation calls for a study of the role of competition in the schools. While all phases of the problem cannot be covered in this study, the following questions will be answered:

1. Is our culture primarily competitive or cooperative?
2. Is man, by nature, competitive or cooperative?
3. How effective is competition as a means of motivation?
4. Does the attitude of educators toward competition differ from the attitude of other groups?
5. What is the role of competition in the schools?

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. It is the purpose of this study, 1) to determine through the literature: a) whether our culture is

primarily cooperative or competitive, b) whether man is primarily co-
operative or competitive by nature, c) the effectiveness of competition
in motivation, and d) the attitudes of educators regarding competition
as revealed in the educational literature; 2) through a questionnaire
study to compare the attitudes of educators, business executives, and
wage earners concerning three aspects of competition: a) whether they
believe man is inherently competitive or cooperative, b) how effective
competition is as a means of motivation, and c) whether our culture is
primarily competitive or cooperative. In addition, through the ques-
tionnaire study, to show the relation between attitude toward competition
and parenthood, occupation, sex, age, and religion; and 3) to determine
a role for competition in the public schools.

Importance of the study. First, it is important that some effort
be made to clarify the position of educators regarding the charges that
have been made concerning their attitude toward competition. This
study will gather evidence which will help in making this clarification.

Second, teachers operate in the classroom under the assumption
that behavioral changes can be produced in the students under their
direction. It follows then that teachers should be able to make
individuals either more or less competitive through the experiences
offered in the classroom. Since there is such wide difference of
opinion as to whether or not students should be taught to be competi-
tive, a clarification of the philosophical aspects of the problem is
very much needed. This subsequently calls for a proposed role for
competition in the schools.
II. METHOD OF THE STUDY

The problem as stated has three aspects. First, there is a need for a philosophical clarification of the concept of competition. This was done through an investigation of the related research and literature. Second, there is the problem of whether or not the attitudes of educators differ from the attitudes of certain other groups concerning competition. In order to determine this, a questionnaire was constructed to measure attitudes concerning competition. A detailed description of the development, administration, and interpretation of the results of this questionnaire is presented in a separate chapter.

Finally, the results of the above two steps are brought together in chapter nine in an attempt to clarify the role of competition in the public schools.

The final chapter presents a summary and conclusions.

III. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The role in the schools of the related term, cooperation, is only discussed as it helps to clarify the role of competition. It is not the purpose of the study to determine the role of cooperation.

The questionnaire was submitted only to educators, wage earners, and business executives in the state of Ohio.

Specific methods for teaching competition or not teaching competition, are not considered. Only the philosophical role of competition in the schools is presented.

Attitudes of wage earners sampled for the questionnaire were not
considered as representative of laymen in general.

IV. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

Competition. Competition is the behavior of a person, as he acts alone, or as a member of a group, attempting to place himself in a position which is superior to that of certain other persons. (See Chapter II, for a complete statement of the definition of competition.)

Wage earners. Laborers, and "white collar workers" selected from a variety of jobs in the city of Columbus, Ohio. (See Chapter VII for a more precise breakdown of the wage earners who responded.)


Educators. Teachers, supervisors, and administrators, in the state of Ohio, selected on the basis of districts who were willing to cooperate in the study. (See Chapter VII for a more precise breakdown of educators who responded.)

Attitude. "A consistency among responses to a specified set of stimuli, or social objects."* (See Chapter VI for a discussion of the meaning of attitudes.)

---

An acceptable definition of competition is vital for this study since interpretations differ through the various academic disciplines and through common usage in everyday life. The complexity of the problem will necessitate a rather detailed discussion of the term.

In part, competition will be clarified as it differs or resembles certain other terms such as cooperation, rivalry, conflict, and hostility. In addition, certain behavior neither clearly competitive nor not competitive will be discussed.

**Competition and cooperation.** Webster's dictionary defines competition as the "act of seeking, or endeavoring to gain, what another is endeavoring to gain at the same time; common strife for the same object; strife for superiority; emulous contest; rivalry, as for approbation, or for a prize; as competition with a person for an object sought."

This apparently fits in with the commonly held understanding of the term and it is acceptable until we begin to analyze specific behaviors. For example, when the grocer is very solicitous over a customer and agrees to help her to the car with her groceries or volunteers to procure certain items which she asks for, we cannot find a description of this behavior anywhere in the definition. Yet, it is common knowledge that what this grocer is actually doing is strenuously
competing with other grocers when he offers his "cooperative" service to gain the custom of the housewife.

It seems apparent that to understand competition, we must also utilize an understanding of other terms as well.

It is apparently for this reason that competition is generally considered as it differs from, or as it opposes cooperation. Actually, the two terms have a common derivation and an overlapping of meaning.

Competition comes from the Latin competere, meaning "to strive together," and cooperation comes from cooperari meaning "to work together."

It is the "together" that is the common factor. This necessitates a social element in each instance, about which more will be said later.

Turning from the dictionary to the interpretations of writers in the field, we find some who show differences in the terms and some who show likenesses as they define them.

Cooperation consists of those relationships in which the activity and success of one directly furthers the activity and success of others.

Competition consists of those relationships in which it is primarily the ends rather than the means which are in opposition. Here the success of one individual or group, in part thwarts the success of other individuals or groups.

It is not clear in these definitions, in which behavior the means are primarily in opposition, but the distinction of emphasis on,
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furthering success of others, and thwarting success of others, is helpful.

Doob points out the blurred picture "when viewed through the binoculars of competition and cooperation" in a variety of situations. Even very simple behavior such as an adolescent plucking a flower while alone in a field becomes complex when we try to sort out the competitive elements and the cooperative elements. He cooperatively wishes to take the flower to his friend, yet he is the only person who will ever pluck it and in competition with all others, he has won.

Individuals acting alone present other complications for understanding competition. When a golfer goes over the course alone, when the athlete attempts to break the records established by others and runs or jumps without an immediate contestant; when the housewife struggles to bake a "good" pie, it is difficult to determine whether they are competing or not.

Doob acknowledges the existence of a lack of correspondence in labeling behavior one thing or another. The terms are not mutually exclusive and in any situation which appears to be of a competitive or cooperative nature to an outsider, there may be any number of motives at work inside the competitors or the cooperators.

He concludes:

It would be a mistake, however, to call competition and cooperation polar concepts; for the opposite of "competitive" is not always "cooperative" but may be "uncompetitive"; and "uncooperative" may be the contrast to "cooperative." There seems to be a common element in the two terms: competition or cooperation is behavior directed toward the same social end by at least two individuals. In competition, moreover, the end sought can be achieved in equal amounts by
some and not by all of the individuals thus behaving; whereas in cooperation it can be achieved by all or almost all of the individuals concerned.\textsuperscript{2}

**Competition and rivalry.** Webster lists rivalry as a synonym for competition. In everyday usage it is often used in this manner. It is a natural thing to ask who one's rival might be in any competitive endeavor. Though there are some who might wish to take exception, it is felt that there is not sufficient difference in the meaning of rivalry and competition to make an issue of separating them. It should be pointed out that there may be some difference in the emphasis. Rivalry seems to imply that one's opponent is known, while in competition this may not always be the case.

**Competition and conflict.** Rubank\textsuperscript{3} shows an interesting difference in these terms. In his opinion conflict has for its immediate objective the elimination of one's opponent from the contest, while competition has for its objective, not the overcoming of an opponent, but the attainment of something which the opponent desires. The elimination of the competitor from the contest is incidental and wholly secondary to securing the thing desired.

Dawson and Gettys\textsuperscript{4} appear to agree in the distinction and make certain additions. They feel that conflict is personal and always


conscious. Competition tends to be uncontrolled, impersonal, and unconscious. Whenever competition becomes a conscious process it passes over into the area of conflict.

These distinctions are to some extent compatible with the theory of competition which is developed in this study. Competition does not have as its primary objective the elimination of one's opponent. The attainment of something which the opponent desires is the important thing and it may or may not become personal. Eubank, however, apparently thinks of the "thing desired" as a variety of specific objects of wealth and position. In this study, this "thing desired" is considered a single factor. It is the desire to take a higher place among one's fellows and includes the other more incidental acts.

The dictionary definition of conflict is helpful once again. It is described as a "strife for mastery; a hostile encounter; or a clash." All of this is acceptable except for the hostility. One can think of many competitive situations such as athletic contests, or county fairs, in which hostility is held to a minimum.

Competition, then, is not conflict when we think in terms of the primary objectives as described by Eubanks, Dawson and Gettys. This interpretation of conflict does enter in, however, as one seeks a place in society, and in this sense, competition includes conflict.

While hostility is not always present, it is not possible to conceive of competition which is devoid of strife, encounter, clash, and struggle. Without these factors competition loses its force and is left weak and useless.
Competition and hostility. Hostility is not necessarily present as was stated in the last section. Hostility infers enmity and ill will. For competition to be carried on, these feelings do not necessarily have to exist.

Competition and aggression. In historical treatments of competition the term aggression is often found describing early symptoms of a competitive nature in man. Vaughn and Diserens mention this factor. Barbara Burks in speaking of first signs of competitiveness in infants, cites aggression as the beginning. Leaving out the hostile connotations of the term aggression, and stressing the self assertion, initiative, and attack involved, it is felt that aggression is also a necessary part of competition.

It has been pointed out that competition and cooperation are closely related terms in derivation, and to some extent in actual practice. Because of the social nature of either a cooperative or a competitive situation, it is evidently not possible to speak of them in a pure sense. That is, we cannot think of an act as being purely competitive or purely cooperative; both elements are found in the social interaction of human behavior. Our definition must admit this limitation and either speak in terms of emphasis or look deeper for behavior which is both things. Therefore, when we speak of competition,
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we do not rule out the necessity of the competitors utilizing cooperation to achieve their ends as well.

Competition does not necessarily involve enmity or hostility, but elements of aggression and conflict are always present. Rivalry is a virtually synonymous term.

Economic competition. Economists tend to think of competition as it operates in the cycles of supply and demand. Competition is one of the elements necessary for the proper operation of a capitalistic economy. This shifts the emphasis from the behavior of humans to the behavior of wealth as its value rises and falls. Of course, this activity would not take place except for the competitive or cooperative behavior of the persons in the economy, but the definitions in economics are more concerned with the behavior of tangible and intangible things than they are with the behavior of individuals.

An understanding of what economists mean by competition is essential for this study, however, because it is the capitalistic system characterized by free enterprise and competition which many of the critics are saying the schools are destroying.

When Adam Smith wrote about competition in economics, he gave us the conception that it meant a hands off policy. In order for the law of supply and demand to operate we were not to manipulate the economy or to artificially introduce wealth at any one point. Left alone, "the invisible hand" of competition, supply and demand, would keep the economy more or less in a state of equilibrium marked by minor cycles of variation. This type of operation came to be known as a
laissez-faire economy which was characterized by an absence of government or other interference.

Clifford James describes the competition which operates in this kind of an economy in the following manner:

The presence of competition in a market assumes the existence of a large number of firms selling the same commodity. Each of these firms tries to get the business of the customers by increasing efficiency, cutting costs, and selling the goods or providing the service at a lower price. In a truly competitive market each producer furnishes such a small proportion of the total supply of a commodity that no individual seller has any control over the price of it. This price is determined by the impartial forces of total demand and total supply in the market. If the commodity is homogeneous, if each seller supplies an unappreciable amount of it, and if there is no obstacle to the entry and exit of sellers, an individual producer cannot charge a higher price than the one prevailing in the market, because no one would pay it when he could get the commodity at a lower price from a competing producer.

Pure economic competition means, then, that there must be a large number of producers; the amount of the commodity furnished by each producer must be unappreciable, that is, must make no difference to the total supply; the commodity must be homogeneous; and there cannot be an obstacle to the entry and exit of sellers.

It is obvious that a state of pure competition does not, and probably never has existed, as described above. This will be discussed more in detail in a later chapter. Of importance at this point is the relation of this definition of competition to the definition of competition in this study. It will be noted that the

economic definition is a rather impersonal one. It is characterised by a great number of participants and that which causes a person to fail or succeed is not especially the behavior of any particular producers, but instead, it is the wheels of economic law grinding out the results of the behavior of a great number of producers. Competition, in this sense, eliminates much of the hostility which is characteristic of more personal competition. A contender would not know who to become angry with, since it is not any individual who might defeat him, but it is the accumulation of all of the individuals, and all the other factors which operate in the economy that are pitted against him. A certain amount of this type of competition is meant to be included in the definition, for it is believed that a contender need not know his rival personally in order for competition to exist.

Conscious and unconscious competition. Turning from competition and economics to a clarification of other aspects of competitive behavior, we come to the question of consciousness or unconsciousness. Many people, when they think of competitiveness, think of an individual picking out a goal, discovering who it is that stands between him and the realisation of the goal, mapping out a plan for achieving it, and then entering the competitive field and trying to succeed. This picture suggests that the competitor is very much aware of what he is competing for and who he is competing with at all times. To consider competition in this manner would simplify the definition a good deal. However, it is felt that competitive behavior is more complex than that. The field of psychiatry has conclusively established the fact that much
of our behavior stems from unconscious motivations. These motivations are just as real and just as demanding as are the motivations which reach the conscious level. In the area of competition we might offer the following example. Suppose a citizen decides that he wishes to run for political office. Prior to this time he has not been active in church work. It is very possible that he would not sit down and say to himself that if he were to start going to church now and were to take an active part, it might help him to get votes. While getting votes might actually be the reason, it is very possible that the only motivation for going back to church that would reach the conscious levels of his mind would be that he suddenly realized he had been lax in his church duties and now he felt he should go over, pay some money in, take an active part, and help out. He does not necessarily have a real feeling of religious revival or of altruism for the church congregation. He may only be offering himself rationalizations and delusions when actually he is utilizing his opportunity to gain votes for himself. If this were the case, consciously he is acting respectfully and morally, but unconsciously he has a different goal: he wishes to succeed in the competition with his opponents. Earlier it was alluded that there possibly was a single motivation which impelled human beings to action, and which included both cooperation and competition. As we probe into unconscious motivations in competition, we come closer to the question of what this single force might be.

**Competing with oneself.** Educators, especially, are often heard saying that harsh competition between students should be eliminated
from the schools and that the students should be pressed to compete with themselves instead. Instead of a person trying to do better than some other person in the room, he should try to do better than he himself did on previous attempts. He then competes against his own score or record, and unfair competition, much hostility, aggression, and failures are thus eliminated.

There are two points that need to be made in regard to this question. First of all, we should consider the nature of the score or record against which he competes when he supposedly competes with himself. It is not possible to think of any such score or record in any sort of endeavor which would have any kind of meaning whatever as something within itself. A score of ninety-five per cent on a mathematics test would mean nothing unless it was clearly understood that it was the upper part of the percentage scale which stood for the best performance. If zero were assigned to the best performance, then ninety-five would be a score in which a student could not take pride. It is common usage, and it is common knowledge, however, that it is the upper end of the scale which is assigned to the good performances. In addition, it is soon discovered, even in elementary levels, that the majority of the class does not generally achieve ninety-five per cent or more on tests and other performances. Most of the class will usually fall below that, and the scores will pile up in a manner which resembles the normal curve. So when a student gets a score of fifteen per cent, even though it might be much better than the five per cent he got on the previous test, he still knows the meaning of
that score. That is, he very quickly gets the idea that probably the
majority of the class all were able to do mathematics problems better
than he did. It is the same for other forms of endeavor. One has a
conception of what a good pie tastes like. One knows how high most
people can jump, and how fast they can run the hundred yard dash. If
the results of the performance of students are kept secret from one
another, and each individual knows what his score is and does not know
the score of anyone else, this does not eliminate the probability that
each student will be able to interpret his performance not only in
terms of what he himself did on previous tries, but in addition he
will have a pretty good idea of where his score relegates him in terms
of what the most of the people are able to do. Perhaps there is a way
around this problem. If one could devise a separate scoring system
for interpretation of performance for each individual, he might come
closer to the realization of self competition—barring other complica-
tions. As it is, when students, or anyone else, perform, whether the
results are made public or not, the performer will be able to make
some judgment as to how his performance would compete if stacked up
against others. This is how one is able to say that a pie is "good"
or "bad" even though the pie is not compared directly with other pies.
This is how a person can time a solitary runner, and can label him
"fast," "slow," or "average." It is how one can classify students
"responsible," "bright," or "punctual." This can be done because these
labels or scores have taken on a certain meaning in terms of our ex-
periences with past performances.
When looked at in this manner, "competition with oneself" is meaningless. What actually is happening is that even though a performer does not know the actual results of the immediate performances of others, his score still tells him something about how he stacks up with others. The immediate motivation may be for the person to do better than he had done previously, but the basic and the actual motivation is for the individual to be able to assume a respectable place among his fellows. He may do better than he did before, but ultimately these successes over self must take him to success in terms of standards for all people. In the final analysis, then, he is not competing with himself, but is competing with the past performance of a number of his fellows. Whether or not this sort of thing can be considered competition will be determined shortly.

The second point to be considered in connection with self-competition regards the social aspects of the behavior. In order for a person to compete with himself he would have to remove himself from all of the stimulation and influence of his fellows. This is hardly possible even for a hermit. It is certainly not possible for children in a crowded classroom. The interest of parents in performance, the conversation with friends about what went on in the classroom on that day, the advertisements, the books, in fact all of the elements of our culture prohibit the removal of oneself from this influence.

It must be concluded, therefore, that self-competition is a naive impossibility. When the student supposedly competes only against his own record it is not possible to take away the implications of his
knowledge of how most people perform in regard to this task. While he cannot identify an individual contender, he is actually competing against the performance of all of his fellows. Though we supposedly wall off each person and do not reveal scores to one another, we cannot wall off the stimulation of social interaction. The stimulation of competition with one's fellows is operating in both instances.

This takes us to the question of whether or not a person is actually competing when he acts alone. Does the Olympic star compete when he attempts to pole vault higher than the present record holder? Or to take it to a greater extreme, is the baseball player who tries to hit more home runs than Babe Ruth, who is now dead, actually competing? It is felt that this behavior must be called competitive just as much as though the holder of those records were there to contend again. The same forces are at work motivating the contestant, though they may or may not be somewhat less intense. True motivation for competition does not lie in defeating a specific contender. As Rubank says, this is conflict, and while it may be present in competition as an ultimate objective, it is not necessarily so. The important thing is that the performance relegates the contender to a particular position among his fellows. Let us follow the example of the baseball player who tries to hit more home runs than Babe Ruth. Throughout the season, he might have the record in his mind. As he discovers that he might have a chance to break the record his excitement mounts. The newspapers follow his progress and his fellows make heartening remarks. On the day he hits the home run that actually breaks the record, it is
possible that the stands would wildly cheer. His buddies might slap him on the back and carry him to the dugout on their shoulders. All this time he has been striving against a past performance contributed by a man who is no longer alive, and who he possibly did not even know. However, all of the essential elements of true competition are still in operation. The same glands have produced the extra energy necessary; the feelings of excitement and joy are the same; his buddies have just as much regard for him, and will elevate him just as much in their estimation. The situation would have been comparable if Babe Ruth had been on the same playing field.

**Competition against an obstacle.** Max Marshall in an article in *School and Society* suggests that we eliminate competition between persons and substitute competition between a person and an obstacle. He says that competition exists in the three areas of athletics, business, and education. In athletics we should compete against the sport itself. The speed and curve of the ball, the contending wind, the element of time. In business the obstacle is to make the business better for the sake of that alone, and in education it is the problem, or the list—the subject matter itself.

Such an interpretation leaves out the basic motivation. We do not compete simply for the sake of winning. Neither do we compete wholly for the purpose of eliminating our competitor. Instead, it is
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the position we gain in society as a result of the competition, that spurs us on. This is done as one person is measured against another person in all of our social interaction. It would be fruitless to attempt to eliminate competition between persons.

**Summary.**

1. Competition and cooperation are related terms. They do not exist in a pure form and cannot be thought of other than in a social context.

2. Competition and rivalry are virtually synonymous terms.

3. Conflict seeks the elimination of one's opponent. This element is incidental and secondary in competition, but may exist.

4. Hostility infers enmity and ill will. This element may, but need not exist in competition.

5. The self assertion, initiative, and attack, connoted in aggression, are present in competition.

6. The impersonal meaning conveyed in economic definitions of competition may exist in competition as meant in this study.

7. Competitive behavior may be conscious or unconscious.

8. It is not possible to compete with oneself.

9. Both or all competitors need not be present for competition to operate.

10. One does not compete with an obstacle though there obviously are obstacles in the larger competitive picture.

11. One does not compete for the sake of winning, nor to eliminate contenders, but for a place among the members of society.
With this in mind the following definition for competition is again submitted:

Competition is the behavior of a person, as he acts alone, or as a member of a group, attempting to place himself in a position which is superior to that of certain other persons.

In Chapter III, related research will be reviewed, which will help in the clarification of the concept of competition.
CHAPTER III

RELATED RESEARCH IN THE AREA OF COMPETITION

An investigation of the literature has shown that there was a period in the mid-thirties and earlier when research concerning competition and cooperation was very prevalent. The reason for the intense interest in the subjects can only be surmised. However, there are indications in the studies that the purpose for the experimentation was to demonstrate the superiority of cooperative behavior over competitive behavior, and then to determine techniques for teaching cooperative behavior in the schools. Whatever the reasons, it was during this period and somewhat earlier that the most careful and comprehensive studies are found. Acknowledging the superior work which was carried on at that time, it seems important that some of the classic studies of that period be reviewed in some detail. Following this, some of the most important studies of recent years will be presented.

I. EARLY STUDIES

Probably the most widely known of these early studies is the one done by J. B. Maier\(^1\) in 1929. One thousand five hundred and thirty-eight children from three different schools were used in the experiment-

---

\(^1\)J. B. Maier, Cooperation and Competition. Teachers College Contributions to Education, No. 584 (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1929), 176 pp.
Assuming that a "practice" task was an "unmotivated" task, he measured differences in performance from the unmotivated tasks to those motivated for self and those motivated for group. If the student did better when motivated for self, his behavior was labeled competitive. When he did better for the group his behavior was classified cooperative.

Simple tasks were assigned such as running, computing simple additions, making dots, etc.

Instructions for tasks which would involve self interest were: "Work on test X at your very best in order that you may get a prize and recognition. Write your name on your work."

For group interest tasks the instructions were: "Work on test X at your very best in order that your group or team may gain a prize or recognition. Do not put your name on your work."

Some of the conclusions reached were:

1. The efficiency of work for self was definitely higher than that of work for the group.

2. A comparison of the curves of work under the two forms of motivation indicates that the curve of self work goes up, and the curve of group work goes definitely down, with the progress of work. The difference between the two increases consistently throughout the testing period. It follows that work for self evokes greater persistence and is less affected by fatigue.
3. When opportunities are presented to continue working either for self or for the group, the former is chosen about three times as often as the latter.

4. On practically every aspect of measurement the motive of cooperation with one's group was less effective than the motive of competition for personal gain.

The study is comprehensive and many factors such as home life, health, number of friends, cleanliness, persistence, acceleration, retardation, etc., were correlated. Since it is not practical to report all these findings, only those of interest or of pertinence will be shown.

Cooperation seems to increase with intelligence up to a certain level. Beyond that level of intelligence, cooperativeness is on a decrease. The bright group cooperated less than the average group and the dull group cooperated least. However, cooperation of a group seems to depend less on the average magnitude of intelligence of the group than on the variation within it. The greater the homogeneity of intelligence within the group the greater the cooperativeness of its members.

Four hundred children from the upper and lower quartiles of the efficiency scores were chosen for detailed study. These represented the students who worked most efficiently for themselves and those who worked most efficiently for the group. The cooperative group scored higher on all tests involving socialized behavior. They were quite superior in tests of honesty and in ratings on honesty. They were
more often engaged in club activities and attended movies less frequently.

The competitive group displayed greater ambitiousness. They worked at a higher speed on all speed tests and they were more deceptive on the honesty tests. They showed greater persistence on some tests and were rated equal in persistence to the other group. They came from somewhat wealthier homes and were of better health condition.

Those having seven or more friends and those having none were below the average in cooperation. "Only" children and those having more than four brothers and sisters were less cooperative than the average.

Maller's study has been quoted for decades as a "final" word on the effectiveness of competition and cooperation, in motivation. Though it was a careful experiment it has recently come up for criticism. As thorough and painstaking as it was, everything is based on the original scores of self interest and group interest behavior. Whether the students were cooperating or competing when they followed the instructions of experimenters is open to question.

Allport, Murphy, and May\(^2\) reported the findings of a sub-committee working on the larger problem of Personality and Culture. Like the Maller study, the work carried on here was very extensive. Research

\(^2\)Gordon Allport, Gardner Murphy, and Mark May, Memorandum on Research in Competition and Cooperation, Social Science Research Council, New York, April, 1937.
assistants were employed to survey the literature in seven areas:
(1) Cooperative and competitive behavior of children; (2) cooperative and competitive habits and motives in life history documents; (3) cooperative and competitive behavior of adults; (4) cooperative and competitive behavior in primitive societies; (5) sociological studies of cooperative and competitive behavior in schools, churches, families, etc.; (6) economic cooperatives; and (7) Russian studies.

A review of the contributions of the various research assistants is given first. The author attempts to draw conclusions through a synthesis of the findings of the others. He points out that competition and cooperation are overlapping and not antithetical. They are both modes of behavior which are striving for the satisfaction of needs.

Individuals will compete for, (1) immediate goods or values inherent in objects; (2) property rights in such objects; (3) power over other persons; and (4) the gratification of vanity. Most important of these is the struggle for power and prestige over other people.

People will not compete if there is no scarcity of the above four items, and it is felt that a cooperative society would provide these things in sufficient abundance to virtually eliminate the need to struggle against one another for them. It is also shown that intimate acquaintance with one's competitors reduces the harshness and extremes to which the competition can go. The cooperative society also would limit competitive struggle if this is true.
It is not possible to determine whether or not there are inherent traits of cooperativeness or cooperativeness. The environment too obviously determines the responses for the most part. Yet, a fertile field for research and speculation is the differences in individual personality which call forth cooperative responses in one and competitive responses in another in very similar environments.

The section concludes with selected problems for investigation which was one of the stated objectives for the research. The suggestions are very comprehensive and point up the lack of information available in the area of cooperation and competition.

The appendix makes up the bulk of the monograph. Reports from the various research assistants are reproduced in full. A short summary of these reports will be presented here and directly follow.

Cooperative and Competitive Habits in Childhood. (Barbara S. Burks) Cooperative behavior appeared in infants at four months (anticipatory postural adjustment on being lifted). True rivalry appeared in the second half year of life (observed when a toy was given to one child of a pair) according to Gesell and Buhler. (However, some definitions of cooperation and competition would not include this behavior.) Others found first appearances after two or three years. Much space is given to trait development which is differentiated from habit. Little is found in the literature which would permit inferences as to whether cooperative and competitive tendencies are ever innate and relatively unchangeable.
Miss Burks makes more of the problem of culture and personality than that of cooperation and competition. She records a careful survey of the literature and it is concluded that the research done at this time had not separated inherited personality traits and those inflicted by the culture. This, of course, included competition. The studies summarized in the report are finally abstracted individually.

**Competition and Cooperation--Adult Quantitative Studies** (Leonard W. Doob). Doob criticizes the experimental evidence because it has mostly been done on American students of psychology and social psychology and because the tasks assigned in experimentation were generally tedious and without interest.

In almost all areas the lack of experiments was decried. However, he concluded that cooperative group thinking is superior to that of most any individual, but that an expert may rise above the group. He very cautiously concluded that the introduction of competition into a social situation will produce a change in behavior but what that change is did not appear conclusive. It is clear that stimulation is received by the presence of other people even if competition is not induced. The quantity of the work will increase, but the measure of quality is in doubt.

The amount of research in industry is more plentiful but the role of competition is not made clear even here. It is not possible to distinguish when a person feels he is competing and when he feels he is not. This makes measurement difficult if not impossible.

The relationship of competition and cooperation to leadership
is shown. High correlations in "cooperation" and "capacity for leadership," and low correlations in "cooperation" and "self confidence," were found to be of interest.

Sociological Studies of Cooperative and Competitive Behavior (John H. Useem). Existing research is most often an incidental part of other problems. As a result, it has not been precise nor has a body of knowledge been built up.

The literature is organized around a series of problems, first under cooperation and then under competition.

Women are more cooperative than men, but young girls are no more so than boys. People join cooperatives and remain members for such reasons as: moral and social duty, personal loyalty, mutual protection and aid, etc.

People compete for similar reasons: imitation, desire for superiority, and as an end in itself.

Definitions of terms and other characteristics of the two terms are helpful.

Cooperative and Competitive Behavior (Clarence Q. Berger). These studies were essentially concerned with the competitive and cooperative behavior manifest in groups. Behavior in family life, gangs, religions, and communities, is discussed. While much of the information was not pertinent for this study, the summaries of the various communist societies which have been organized in the U.S. was of importance. Marion Kenworthy's theory that the instinctive forces underlying the adaptation of the individual to life are self-maintenance and self-
advancement remind one of much more recent theories.

Some of the conclusions drawn by Berger follow:

1. Common interests will increase cooperative traits.

2. Rural women are generally more cooperative than rural men; the same may probably be said of urban populations, also.

3. Cooperative and competitive traits are "general" (show in all fields, not just a few) and not "specific."

4. A certain minimum of cooperative and competitive traits are to be found in all individuals.

5. Formal schooling increases cooperative traits.

6. Training in cooperation or competition increases cooperative or competitive traits.

7. Small size groups assure greater and more intensive cooperation.

8. Inter-group competition develops intra-group cooperative traits.

9. Strong leaders aid in developing cooperative and competitive traits.

**Economic Cooperation in Relation to Individual Cooperation and Competitive Habits** (D. W. Oberdorfer). Cooperation is quoted as being on three levels: (1) any kind of combined action; (2) the Utopian or altruistic usage, devoid of any competition; and (3) the ordinary business usage of a combination of individuals in a business enterprise, owned and operated by and for its members.
Reviews the attempts at cooperative communities and concludes: "The only communities which seem to be successful for any length of time are those which were produced by a personality strong enough to gain the obedience of his followers, and even this discipline has hardly ever been obtained except where it was founded upon religious discipline or even fanaticism."

It was noted that another type of cooperative that sometimes worked was one which falls under the third definition above. This classification has obvious competitive characteristics.

Recent Materials on Competition and Cooperation in Russia (John W. Boldyreff). Abstracts of the Russian literature were of great interest since, they, more than others, defend the cooperative or collective living. At the time this material was written (1937), the content would have been much more acceptable than now.

Boldyreff presents an interesting etymology for the words cooperate and compete. He sees them as "strive together," and "work together," with more or less emphasis on the solidary versus the antagonistic characteristic.

His historical sketch of "individual and collective aspects of interaction," was very helpful. Aristotle, he says, maintained that association is the basis for the social life of men who are essentially political (social) animals. Man has a desire for association (cooperation) which is part of the larger drive to satisfy needs.

The position of many other philosophers was given but Hobbes alone stood out in final opposition. He believed that men were natural
enemies. Darwin's position was not discussed, but it seems that he too would be in disagreement with Aristotle.

The author shows reason for his definitions. Summarizing the theory of Marx, he points out that the group (collective) is more than the sum of its members. Yet the reason is that competition is engendered among the members. This justifies the inability to separate competition and cooperation. Life is thought of as continuous progress from instinctive struggle among brutes to conscious cooperation among men.

There was no experimentation in this report. The purpose was to organize the knowledge which existed at the time and to recommend further research problems. These objectives were very amply achieved.

May and Doob present a more formal report of the sub-committee on cooperative and competitive habits, working under the broader problem of Personality and Culture.

The authors relate cooperation and competition to the wider field of personality and culture, present a theory of cooperation and competition, organize existing knowledge that is relevant, and finally select promising research problems.

The reports of this committee have all given the feeling that
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it is cooperation that they are most interested in. For example:

Leaders of thought at the present time nearly all agree that in the Western World competition has produced a rich technological culture which now, because of radically altered conditions, can be enjoyed by men only if they learn to displace the no longer productive competitive practices with new, as yet only partially discovered, cooperative ways of living. Formerly, nearly all the virtues of society were attributed to individualistic competition, but now the reverse judgment prevails. . . . The very term "competition" has become dyslogistic, and "cooperation" has become freighted with eulogy. (pp. 2-3)

In defining competition and cooperation it is pointed out that they are not polar concepts and are derived from terms meaning to strive together and to work together. They are distinguished, however, in that in competition the end sought can be achieved in equal amounts by some and not by all; whereas in cooperation it can be achieved by all or almost all of the individuals concerned.

The theory of competition and cooperation is discussed under four questions: (1) What makes people compete or cooperate? This is a function of motivation, which is described as the discrepancy or gap between one's aspiration and achievement. When a person competes or cooperates he does so to close the gap between aspiration and achievement.

(2) For what things do people cooperate or compete? They compete or cooperate for objects (material gain) and prestige which tend to raise their level of achievement closer to their level of aspiration. There are exceptions in that people compete or cooperate as ends in themselves. They compete if the goals are scarce. They cooperate if they can profit by sharing.
(3) With what persons do they cooperate or compete? This is determined by the "attitude" of the individual toward his fellows and toward his aspirations. The attitudes are formed and held both consciously and unconsciously.

(4) In what manner do individuals compete or cooperate? This is a product of their past culturally conditioned experience and their skills.

At the beginning of this section the authors stated that it was too simple merely to state that people will cooperate or compete for what they want. Yet, it appears that they have said very little more than this. Most commendable is the portion which separated the social behavior from the psychological. This is a separation of the observable from the unobservable, or perhaps the conscious from the unconscious. While insufficiently clarified, it is felt that within this area lies fruitful material for the explanation of cooperative and competitive behavior.

A summary of the existing knowledge presented by the authors is as follows:

(1) Humans are neither cooperative nor competitive by nature. Both are learned forms of behavior. It cannot be shown whether cooperative or competitive traits will appear first.

(2) The rudiments of competition and cooperation appear during the first year of life; are apparent at about the third year, and are observable in nearly all children at about age six.
(3) The social form of the behavior and the performance of the individuals concerned are changed by the presence of other people or by the knowledge of the opinions, judgments, or attitudes of others concerning the situation. The quantity of work was not conclusively increased or decreased. The quality was decreased with some exceptions. Judgments tended to "level," and changes were most abrupt at first and then tended to taper off. In general, however, American students in psychology and social psychology courses do more and poorer work in a group than in isolation, and approach greater uniformity and conformity.

(4) Individuals do more and better work (with some exceptions) in both competitive and cooperative situations than they do in isolation.

(5) Students work more efficiently in competition than in cooperation.

(6) In the competitive or cooperative situation, the individuals estimate of his chances of securing objects or prestige influences his decision to enter the situation as a competitor. If he can select his competitor he will select one of approximately equal skill and will enter the competition only if he feels he has a reasonable chance for success.

(7) In a cooperative situation the presence of an outside competing group changes the social form of the behavior and performance of the cooperators. In general it will cause the group to do more and to be more cooperative.
(6) Size, sex composition, and participation of the group will alter behavior, as will the nature of the task. However, the findings were not conclusive as to the direction.

**Sociological approaches.** The behavior of people in military organizations, clubs and associations, economic cooperatives and education are discussed in light of the foregoing postulates. Education is most pertinent and it is shown (conclusively) that education can promote either cooperative or competitive behavior. The techniques for this are of importance for this study.

**Anthropological approach.** The general theme of this section is the fact that behavior in a particular culture is a result of the experiences peculiar to that culture. Proposition thirteen points out that people will compete for objects and prestige when those items are scarce and tend to cooperate when the items are plentiful.

Kinship, caste, clan, class, etc., determine who competes or cooperates with whom.

The authors state that competitiveness and cooperativeness are a result of the educational system of the culture. However, they broaden the educational system to include all learning from birth to adulthood. In so doing they make the statement much less important, as this seems to say no more than a previous statement, that such behavior is a result of the experiences in the culture.

Behavior can be changed from cooperative to competitive or vice-versa. The way to approach this new socialization is through a study of life histories and noting the manner in which knowledge,
attitudes, and values are built.

The section on prediction and future research contains a kind of self evaluation of the theory developed and its adequacy for prediction and as a foundation for setting up research. Many of the research problems seem interesting but strangely appear to contradict some of the propositions previously stated and supposedly substantiated.

In many ways this report duplicates the preceding one. However, it makes a unique contribution in the presentation of a theory of competition and cooperation and in the greater depth of approach. It points up rather sarcastically at times ("The aroma of the type of research carried on here is obvious . . .") the inadequacy of the research reviewed. The problems suggested for further investigation are very thoughtful.

Vaughn and Diserens begin with an extremely interesting historical approach to the concept and process of competition. The work of economists, sociologists, biologists and others, is reviewed concerning the matter. They conclude that, "Competition may be regarded as a universal principle, one fundamental to all natural sciences . . ." (p. 76)

The point of view taken in the section on the evolution of the process of competition was especially noteworthy. In its simplest
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form competition is carried on without psychological control. It is a mere interaction and modification of movements, due to the presence of a number of organisms in a circumscribed area, each following the laws of its nature or the direction of the forces inherent in the system. (p. 76)

As examples, billiard balls appear to compete as the player breaks the set. There is constant interference and modification of movement as the balls move toward the sides of the table.

In mixtures of chemical solutions the constituents seem to compete in ionisation. In the animal body cells, tissues, and organs often seem to compete for mastery. In any event the result is equilibrium in the inorganic world, in physiology, and in animal and human society competition is always a way of attaining some kind of equilibrium. It is a resolution of forces. (pp. 76-77)

From this foundation, a more conscious form of competition evolved. Powerful males sought leadership in the groups. Males and females competed for mates. When competition turned from achieving satisfactions of basic urges such as sex, self-preservation, and mastery, to competition for objects, it was often practiced as an end in itself. At this point man was required to develop a "competitive consciousness." Failure to do this meant rigorous elimination by "natural selection."

Turning to the use of competition as a means for motivation in education the authors say,

The general sequence in the development of educational practice is from a stage where punishment is the chief motive to a stage where many motives are called upon, but competition is always one of the motives involved because it is inherent in the social system. (p. 78)
A worthwhile contribution is made in the analysis of the experimental literature. This is done under six headings. The following conclusions are selected from the findings as being of importance.

1. A competitive situation is not good for all persons. Nervous and excitable people appear to show a social decrement.

2. Individuals are willing to do more for themselves than they will do for a group.

3. Competition does not affect mental test scores.

4. Differences of response to competition according to race, age, and sex, are not conclusive.

5. Research shows conflicting results concerning whether children are more competitive at an early age or later, or whether or not there is a particular age when children are most competitive.

6. Better results are obtained when people compete. Less capable students benefit most.

7. Work for the self is more efficient than work for the group.

8. Praise is generally better motivation than reproof but the young and the gifted were motivated more by reproof than by praise. All students did more when praised or blamed than when left alone.

9. The capacity for development of competitive attitudes resides in all individuals but a competitive environment is necessary to produce them.
10. The complex mental processes are involved more in disruptive social effects than in those of a facilitating character. This possibly means that when competition produces emotional feelings that the higher mental processes are the ones disrupted.

In the summary, one conclusion was especially interesting:

The results on one series of experiments suggests very strongly that the anticipation of failure in overt behavior results in the deflection of the energy of conation to internal bodily organs and mechanisms, and that these become more active than under non-competitive conditions or conditions that promise success.

This conclusion appeared to be of great interest to the authors and holds promise of an interesting field of research in the relationship of personality and competitive situations.

While this study was not so extensive as the others, it made a contribution in several fields. It presented a synthesis of several areas of knowledge and offered a point of view concerning competition. Experimentation was also contributed.

Mead's study, in addition to the others listed, grew out of the larger study of Personality and Culture sponsored by the Social Science Research Council. Together with four graduate students, Mead studied thirteen primitive cultures to determine the relationship between the cooperative and competitive habits of the people and (1) the economic and technological basis of the society; (2) social structure; and (3) the types of personality produced.
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The Arapeesh society was believed to be at one extreme in a very cooperative way of life. There appeared to be enough of all the status and material objects that were necessary. The Kwakiutl was at the other extreme in a very violent struggle for the things they considered important. The study is often quoted as indicating that it is the environment which causes a people to be either cooperative or competitive. Some have pointed out, however, that running through all these societies, whether judged competitive or cooperative, was a thinly veiled struggle for power and prestige among the members.

II. RECENT STUDIES

Experimental research in competition has been virtually nonexistent since the late 1930s. There have been a number of experiments conducted with animals which are cited elsewhere in the study, and a few with humans, but most of these have been incidental studies, being part of a larger problem.

Deutsch's study which appeared in two different issues of Human Relations was about the only study of any magnitude found. In this publication, he develops a theory of competition and cooperation and then conducts experimentation centered around the theory.

He says that the cooperation situation is one in which the goal regions for each of the individuals or sub-units can be entered into to some degree by any given individual only if all the individuals do so. This is characterized by "promotively interdependent goals."

The competitive situation is when the goal region is entered by one, the others are denied it to some degree. This he calls "contrarily interdependent."

In the experimentation the author found that if one is interested in group productivity then the members must be oriented toward "promotively interdependent goals."

"The intercommunication of ideas, the co-ordination of efforts, the friendliness and pride in one's group which are basic to group harmony and effectiveness appear to be disrupted when members see themselves to be competing for mutually exclusive goals. Further, there is some indication that competitiveness produces greater personal insecurity (expectations of hostility from others) than does cooperation.

"Also, in light of the results of this study, it seems that educators might well re-examine the assumptions underlying their common usage of a competitive grading system. One may well question whether a competitive grading system produced the kinds of interrelationships among students, the task-directedness, and personal security that are in keeping with sound educational objectives."

The study does not add much to existing knowledge. It is more
oriented toward the function of groups as is much of the more recent research.

Irving Braseh⁷ at the University of Cincinnati compared the relative effects of individual competition and group competition as motivational factors. His experiment involved selecting two samples each containing twenty sixth-grade classes taken one each from twenty different schools. After the schools were selected, a measure was taken of the number of arithmetic problems answered correctly for each pupil on a pre-test and on five subsequent five-minute tests. The subjects were divided into two groups: One was motivated by individual competition in that individual scores were posted and the winner was given a prize of a "certificate of improvement." The other group was motivated by group competition in that the individual scores were not revealed and only the group scores were shown.

Braseh found:

1. Significant improvement (.01 level) occurred with both forms of motivation and within all I.Q., age, and sex, sub-groups in each sample.

2. Improvement with group competition was much greater than with individual competition (.01 level).

3. For all comparable sub-groups, the group competition pupils improved significantly more than the corresponding sub-group of pupils

4. Pupils of higher I.Q. improved more than those of lower I.Q. with both forms of motivation.

5. The course of daily improvement showed a slight downward trend in all I.Q. sub-groups for both individual and group competition, except the superior I.Q. pupils who were motivated by group competition.

6. The superiority of group competition was especially marked with the high I.Q. pupils though not restricted to them.

This research perhaps indicates that competition which includes a cooperative effort is superior to that of individual competition. If this is the case, it fits well into the framework of our democratic society. However, the motivation in both instances of individual competition and group competition should be questioned. The title of the research indicates that it is the competition itself which is the motivational factor in each instance. Yet, it is not the competition as such which the subjects are striving for. Instead, they are striving for improvement in ability to do arithmetic problems, for a prize, to be better than others, or for their group to be better than others. This is different from engaging in competition for the sake of the competition itself. Next, the importance of these goals as means of motivation must be questioned. It was not demonstrated that these students wished to do better in arithmetic or that they desired to have a "certificate of improvement." There is no question but that when the common factor of working with
a group existed that that group improved more than when the common
factor of individual work existed. But the many other factors
which would be operating at the same time have not been, and probably
could not be, pointed out. Braseh does point out the operation of
group morale. It was not known whether there was a good deal of
"esprit de Corps" functioning in the various groups or not. If the
morale were high, initially, then the group improvement would be
higher than if the morale were low.

The effects of having individual scores posted where all
could see them was another factor not discussed. It is possible
that this would be a very discouraging thing for some of the
students who were not improving. When the individual's score was
lost in the group score, this factor might not operate.

In either case, this research does indicate that competition
produces improvement in performance when associated with both in-
dividual and group rewards.

Phillips pointed out in a very neatly designed study that
the emphasis in research concerning competition and cooperation has
shifted from quantity of work which can be gotten from an individual,
to their relation to personality and culture, to the present time in
which the emphasis is upon the behavior of groups. His study is
concerned with the task efficiency and the process behavior (among
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other things) of groups when they are competitively or cooperatively motivated.

One hundred twenty third graders were used as subjects. Twenty-four groups were set up with five children in each group. For the experiments with cooperation and competition, these groups were paired for intelligence and cohesion and were assigned to either a competitive or a cooperative experimental situation. A variation of the game "twenty questions" was used in the experiment and the competitive group was rewarded with pieces of candy on the basis of points given for the number and type of questions they asked in the game. In the cooperative situation the entire group shared the reward.

Phillips found:

1. Competitive groups were superior to cooperative groups in task efficiency.
2. High intelligence groups were superior to low intelligence groups in task efficiency.
3. The three independent variables had no differential effects on process behavior.
4. Competitive groups had a higher level of motivation than cooperative groups.
5. High cohesive groups were more motivated than low cohesive groups under competitive conditions, but under cooperative conditions low cohesive groups were more motivated than high cohesive groups.
6. Task related communication and reward satisfaction were positively related to task efficiency.

7. Level of motivation was positively related to reward satisfaction, but was not significantly related to other process behaviors or task efficiency.

8. The three independent variables had no differential effects on the relative frequency of participation of individuals in a group.

9. The frequency of participation of individuals in highly efficient groups was more uniform than it was in low efficient groups.

Phillips used the mean performance to indicate the performance of the group in these instances. This differs from Brasch's study in that Brasch was interested in the improvement of the individuals as much as in the groups. It is important to note that the results were opposite. Brasch found that improvement with group competition was much greater than with individual competition, while Phillips found that competitive groups were superior to cooperative groups. (In this instance group competition and cooperative groups are the same.)

Summary. Research before World War II concerning competition was rather extensive, and in some instances was very well done. More recently the trend has been away from the behavior of the individuals involved and toward the behavior of the group as a whole and the quantity of the research has been extremely limited.
Overall, the findings have been characterised by contradiction. May and Doob in the very careful summary of the research of that time were very cautious in the conclusions which they drew. Studies conducted since that time have likewise drawn dissimilar conclusions as evidenced by the results of observations of experimental group behavior as set up by Phillip, Bratsch, and Deutsch. This necessitates cautious conclusions at this time, as well. However, it appears that there are certain generalizations which do appear and they are listed below:

1. The efficiency of work for self is conclusively higher than that of work for a group.

2. A certain minimum of cooperative and competitive traits are to be found in all individuals.

3. It is possible to either increase or decrease cooperativeness and competitiveness through formal schooling, though if left as it is, formal schooling tends to increase cooperativeness.

4. Small size groups secure greater and more intensive cooperation.

5. Inter-group competition develops intra-group cooperative traits.

6. Strong leaders aid in developing cooperative and competitive traits.

7. Cooperative societies have generally failed.

8. There appears to be a preference for cooperative behavior over competitive behavior among researchers.
9. People either cooperate or compete for a position of status among their fellows.

10. Humans are neither cooperative nor competitive by nature. Both are learned forms of behavior. It cannot be shown whether cooperative or competitive traits will appear first, but rudiments of competition and cooperation show during the first year of life; are apparent at about the third year, and are observable in nearly all children at about age six.

11. Subjects will do a greater quantity of work under competitive conditions than under cooperative conditions, but the quality of the work is in doubt.

12. In the competitive or cooperative situation, the individual's estimate of his chances of securing objects or prestige influences his decision to enter the situation as a competitor. If he can select his competitor he will select one of approximately equal skill and will enter the competition only if he feels he has a reasonable chance for success.

13. Competition can be regarded as a universal principle, fundamental to all natural sciences. It is inherent in the social system.

14. Competition has been used as a means for motivation in education from the very beginning.

15. There are extreme differences in the usefulness of competition among individuals. Some show a decrease rather than an increase in effectiveness under competitive conditions.
16. The capacity for development of competitive attitudes resides in all individuals but a competitive environment is necessary to produce them.
Charles F. Phillips wrote:

To ask an American business-man if he believes in competition is almost like asking for a sock on the nose. Of course he believes in competition—and he raises his voice to add emphasis to his answer.¹

To ask most any member of our society if he believes in competition would probably bring forth a similar, if less heated reply. People have come to think of our economy as competitive and are proud of the results. If any one of us were actually put to the test of describing this economy, however, he might be hard put. In general terms, most of us think of competition as being associated with freedom. Competition means freedom to enter and retire from business endeavors; freedom to choose among products and services; and freedom for the laws of supply and demand to work in producing better products at better prices. When preserving the American competitive way of life is spoken of, it is believed that this is the kind of thing that is considered desirable for preservation.

The questions which will be raised in this chapter are these: Does the freedom stated above accurately describe the competitiveness of our economy? Do the laws of competition operate freely in our society? Are we, as a people, in favor of competition?

¹ Charles F. Phillips, "We All Like Competition, But..." Reader's Digest, 66:46, June 1956.
It is necessary for us to have a clear concept here in order to think clearly concerning the role of competition in the schools. That is, the critics say that the schools are falling down on their job of preparing the students for life because they are failing to teach them to compete. But if life is not made up of the kind of competitiveness that most of us have come to think of, then perhaps we do not really want the schools to train for competition after all.

While competition will be considered in this chapter, primarily as it applies to economics, the discussion will not be limited to this field. Competition must be appraised as it works in all aspects of life. It is not just the competitive activity of certain businesses, though this is by far the most important in the eyes of the most of us. In addition, those who advocate a continued stress on competition want it to permeate all walks of life. It is the thing that has made us successful in all our endeavors.

Rivalry is Dad forgetting his stiff back to grow the best tomatoes in town. Rivalry is Mom's determination to make a better cake than Mrs. Brown. From County Fairs to quiz programs, from baseball games to business, rivalry is in America's blood...a thrill and a challenge. We've outdistanced the world because we like to outdistance each other.2

Even a casual look at American life will have to admit a liberal sprinkling of competition in all of our endeavors. Business firms do not pretend to be anything else. A man would be a fool in the field of business to make decisions which would benefit his

colleagues and which would in turn run him out of business. While
we extoll the virtues of athletics and talk about the sportsmanship
and the cooperativeness that are developed, we all know that the
important thing in athletics is to win, as witness the rapid turnover
of coaches throughout the country, in high school, college, and pro-
fessional ranks. Staying or leaving is usually determined on the
basis of ability to turn out winning teams. This same feeling is
carried down into the intramural and sand lot games. It is not a
matter of getting together and playing for the sport of it, but it
is a matter of who won the game, and whether or not one is identified
with, or is a member of, the winning group.

Where can one look for activity that is not shot through with
this seemingly greatest of motivators? One might look into the
midst of the larger competitive giants. For instance, it might be
expected that the people working for a firm that is in competition
with another firm would exemplify the very essence of cooperation.
Granting that a goodly share of this must operate for the firm to
compete successfully, one also finds that one of the factors that
makes the big machine run is the competitiveness of the individuals
within it. For that reason businesses have sales contests, and pro-
duction quotas, and awards and the like. Consequently there is very
keen competition at work among the individuals. It is on the basis
of ability to do his individual job that the individual is able to
stay on the payroll. The feeling is encouraged that there is always
somebody waiting to take the job of anyone who cannot produce.
It is the same in athletics. Everyone recognizes the necessity of cooperative effort in team play. However, the manner in which a particular player achieves and maintains his position on the team is through competition. And it is commonly understood that the threat of losing one's position on the team is the motivation that causes some players to hit a bit harder, or to run a bit faster.

Neighbors cooperate and have friendly associations. Yet one sees some of the same factors at work here as mentioned above. People buy automobiles, not always because transportation is needed, but in order to have a nicer car than the other people they know. Clothing, food, and any number of things are bought on the same basis. The "conspicuous consumption" appears to be aimed at winning out in the competition for prestige and status in the community.

Even in the churches, people are not content with adequate buildings. Congregations tend to compete with the buildings which are erected by other congregations, and the "best" preachers are found in the areas that can pay the most. "Selling the most tickets" and "having the most successful bazaar," are common expressions within the activities of our houses of worship.

Admitting once again that woven into all of this is a very real emphasis on cooperation, one must nevertheless conclude that competition is virtually everywhere present in our modern American way of life. It therefore appears that we must pay some attention to the critic who was bemoaning the lack of competitive emphasis in the schools and said, "We want our children, when they take over as
adults in our community, to have been trained for our American competitive way of life."

So once again we return to the question concerning "the American way of life." Is it a competitive way of life? and if so, how can that competition be described so that all of us have a common understanding of it?

**Historical development.** Anyone tracing the development of our competitive system of free enterprise sooner or later gets around to the contribution of Adam Smith in *Wealth of Nations*. His thinking fathered the system which we refer to as our competitive way of life. Smith believed that the economy must be geared to benefit the consumer not the producer, but in doing so, both the producer and consumer would benefit. A nation would prosper by allowing the producers to seek greater profit so long as they would allow the Market to operate freely in that the laws of supply and demand could function without interference. When producers acted to create monopoly, they violated the natural laws of economics and a less efficient economy would result.

Smith believed that if individuals were left to seek their own best interests, the best interests of all would ultimately be served. He wrote:

> He intends only his own gain, and he is in this, as in many other cases, led by an invisible hand to promote an end which was no part of his intention . . . By pursuing
his own interest he frequently promotes that of the society more effectually than he really intends to promote it.

In such a plan as this, the individual grows more prosperous as he helps the nation to become more prosperous. One immediately thinks that the normal thing would be that some of the producers would prosper and would grow much larger than the others. This seems to be the natural trend following the theory that weak and inefficient producers would tend to be eliminated. Soon only a few, or even one, of the most efficient of the producers would survive and then a kind of a monopoly would exist. Adam Smith felt that this would not take place because production firms, like other organisms, would tend to grow to maturity and then to die. A firm would be efficient largely because of the leadership of the founder and operator. When this leadership passed on, it was unlikely that similar leadership would continue for very long, and other firms would rise and push it out.

A complete exposition of the economic theory of Adam Smith is not necessary here. The important things are that he believed that pricing, demand, supply, and the number of producers involved in the transactions all operated automatically to produce an economy which was beneficial for all. There was no need for governmental intervention, or for any other kind. For this reason his system came to be known as a **laissez-faire** system and was characterized by a free and open market. In this system a man is free to enter any
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kind of business undertaking he wishes to. By the same token he is free to withdraw at any time as well. The incentive that keeps producers scrambling for the custom of the consumers is profit. The more efficient they are, the more goods they will sell, and even though the margin of profit might not be large, they would sell enough goods to make it worth their while.

This condition of pure competition has rarely existed, if at all, even though in the early days of the operation of the grain market, and certain other commodities, conditions possibly approximated true competition. In reality, our economy has passed through several stages since the introduction of the thinking of Adam Smith. John Maurice Clark\(^4\) traces this development for anyone who is interested. The important thing is that the picture which was painted by Adam Smith of the operation of a perfect economy is the one that has remained in the minds of the most people. When a person says he wants to preserve the American competitive way of life, it is the free and open competition which was described by Adam Smith that he usually is talking about.

What is the nature of the changes which have taken place? First of all, natural control of the growth of power of business organizations did not follow. Instead of growing to a moderate level of power, and then, like an organism, dying, business enterprises tended to continue to grow. The day of overgrown blacksmith shops
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and general stores soon passed, and rather than have a single person or even family at the head of a business, the days of the corporation soon arrived, and the increased capital for operation, and the increased resources for leadership made some of the business firms capable of withstanding the rigors of time.

Stuart Chase described it in this manner:

With the development of the railroads in the 1840's and '50's, a huge new industry was added to the economic system, one which was in many respects a natural monopoly. Railroads widened markets to a continental scale. Bigger markets called for bigger firms and bigger blocks of capital. The fluid atomistic society began to thicken into monopolistic lumps. The 'trusts' were forming in the United States, and combinations and cartels in Europe.

Wise old Adam Smith, even while he celebrated free competition, was aware that human nature seems to be frequently allergic to its charms. "People of the same trade," he said, "seldom meet together, even for merriment and diversion, but the conversation ends in a conspiracy against the public, and in some contrivance to raise prices." 5

In another section Mr. Chase quotes Wooten as saying,

The tendency of enterprisers is constantly to create situations toward exclusiveness or monopoly, either as buyer or seller; whereas collectively . . . as applied to all others except themselves, the benefits of competition are clearly recognized. 6

Wooten says further:

But since a monopolist is always in a more advantageous position than a competitor among competitors, we are jus-


6 Ibid., p. 59.
tified in saying that there is always a certain instability about the state of competition, and an inherent tendency for competitive markets to become monopolized.\textsuperscript{7}

It was the early shift back to the monopolistic practices such as the East India Company and the China trade had practiced, that first spelled doom for pure competition. And according to Adam Smith, this was a "natural tendency" among human beings. Stuart Chase further points out that it is not the nature of human beings to sit by and see their business go down, through the workings of natural law or anything else, if it is possible for them to stop it. The theory of capitalism and free enterprise says that it is for the benefit of all society that the laws of supply and demand are allowed to operate unhampered. But when a man is facing the loss of his business, he ceases to think about the good of all society and begins to think of himself. This immediately led to the formation of organizations or agreements which would prohibit the free operation of supply and demand, and therefore, of competition, and led instead toward its opposite--monopoly. While people continued to manipulate the economy to insure a continued profitable operation for themselves whether pure competition was preserved or not, they nevertheless continued to claim that it was the American competitive way of life that had made the country what it was at the time, and that it must be preserved as a way of life.

Chase is impressed with the explanation which is offered by Polanyi for the inability of people to allow the Market to operate freely even though it was supposed that it was for the best in the long run. The principal problem lies in the fact that under this system human beings are just as much a commodity on the market as are other goods and services.

In order to have a truly self-regulating and flexible system, Polanyi points out, everything must obviously be included, because everything must be treated as a commodity with a price. Otherwise the mechanism will not work automatically. Labor must become a commodity; so must land; so must money. As a result, industrial workers, with nothing but the Market to depend upon, were stripped of human dignity, to be disposed of like so much pig iron. Their less negotiable qualities tended to disappear. Similarly the buying and selling of natural resources, removed from the ancient protection of society, amounted to summoning the demons of flood, fire, erosion, dust storm, stream pollution.

Money was made a commodity by tying it to gold. Gold was bought and sold like anything else, at so much an ounce. Its behavior was naturally uncertain, with alternate gluts and shortages. This caused recurring shocks to the money supply, and threatened the stability of industry. Businessmen, according to Polanyi, were the first victims of the money-commodity theory. 'The Market required that the individual respect economic law even if it happened to destroy him.'

Under this theory it was the industrial worker who was first exploited and often destroyed. It was he who was at the mercy of the machines and the business that operated them. But it was not the worker who was the first to effectively resist the economic law and organize against it. Instead it was the businessmen themselves who

8Chase, op. cit., pp. 63-64.
organized to insure that their businesses would not fall prey. Cartels and trusts were formed to see that the price of goods did not fall below a profitable level. The workers, however, were not long in following suit, and labor unions soon began to appear on the scene.

The resistance of the people involved in the working of this economic law in allowing it inexorably to grind out its results whether it consumed them or not is understandable. It should be pointed out at this time that this is another manifestation of the motivation within all of us to elevate, rather than to debase or even preserve our position in society. The thing that seems to cause all of us to behave, is a desire for a place among our fellows and for certain satisfactions of pleasurable sensation.

I. SOME NON-COMPETITIVE ELEMENTS IN OUR CULTURE

Monopoly. It has been shown above that in order to maintain a competitive economy we must constantly be alert to prevent the establishment of monopolies. Yet it seems to be the natural thing for businesses to work toward monopoly. We have also pointed out that our economy is not purely competitive, and this means that there is a certain amount of monopoly and other factors present which are not competitive. What is the nature of the monopoly which does exist?
Arnold found that under ingenious and illegitimate use of otherwise legitimate devices the following types of monopolies developed:

1. The monopoly. Curiously enough this type is rare. The Aluminum Company of America and the United Shoe Company are listed as examples.

2. The control of the supply by a few large concerns which decline to compete in price. The oil industry is an example.

3. The control of the system of distribution. The plumbing industry is an example in that the manufacturers, jobbers, master plumbers, and journeymen have all been accused of conspiring to adhere to a wasteful and expensive five-step system of distribution in getting the material to the consumer.

4. The Chinese Bandit system of restraint in unorganized industry. Threat and force are used to limit producers and maintain prices.

These descriptions of monopoly tend to operate from a definition of competition which is perfect and not unlike what Adam Smith was talking about. However, there are many economists who would say that within most of these descriptions, competition was actually operating when one was thinking in terms of a more liberal definition of competition. Having given up pure competition as an impossible ideal, writers today talk about a "dynamic and a workable" kind of

competition. Here, they do not expect always to have a large number of firms selling the same commodity, and they do expect that in some instances the entrance or the withdrawal of goods or firms from the economic scene may have an effect. It is also felt that there must be some regulation on the part of government or some other neutral organization. Accepting these qualifications, the test of a competitive situation is described in the following manner by Kaplan.

The iron test of the competitiveness of big business, therefore, is whether it makes available increasingly numerous, varied, and significant market alternatives— or whether, instead, it tends to narrow and degrade the range of choice.\(^\text{10}\)

Following this line of thinking, monopoly exists when there is a lack of significant market alternatives. When the limits of these alternatives reach significance is not discussed, but one immediately thinks of the plumbing trade which was described by Chase. Also the shoe manufacturing, and in another place he describes the activity of the Diamond Match Company in prohibiting the manufacture of a repeating match, calling it the "rottenest kind of competition."\(^\text{11}\) One also thinks of the automobile trade whose products are virtually the same year after year, including design, horsepower, price, and other improvements. A designer for Studebaker, at one time, said that he could take the three most popular 1955 model low


\(^{11}\) Chase, *op. cit.*, p. 47.
pried cars, strip the chrome from them, and he didn't think anyone could tell them apart.

It is concluded that whether we are thinking of competition in the perfect sense of the word or whether we are thinking of it merely in terms of providing a choice among products for consumers, its basic foundations are violated to some extent in our economy and monopoly does exist.

**Patents.** Issuing patents is held up in our economy as a means of encouraging creativity, and as a means of improving the standard of living of society at the same time. The principal reason for the success of the scheme is that the inventor is assured of the protection of the sole right to manufacture the product and therefore to reap the monetary rewards that accompany it. This scheme is also upheld as a basic factor in our competitive system of free enterprise. That is, the persons who are contemplating the development of a new piece of machinery, or a new formula for the manufacture of a product, or any other innovation, are in competition with one another to produce the best item. The incentive that is at work is generally thought to be the financial reward that awaits the winner. The competitiveness of this sort of activity can be recognized so long as these participants are struggling to perfect their inventions, but the actual protection which is offered by the patent itself appears to be far more monopolistic than it does competitive. For as soon as the patent is taken out, then the danger from competitors is greatly reduced, if not eliminated.
Stuart Chase says,

The patent law had the estimable purpose of protecting the inventor, and encouraging technology. How big business concerns seem to have annexed the law and run it as a profitable subsidiary. Their engineers get up minor improvements and their lawyers patent them, until a given manufacturing process is surrounded with legal barbed wire. Nobody can get into it, any more than the Germans could get into Moscow.

Wendell Berge of the Antitrust Division reports in The New York Times, "There is no opportunity for a new company no matter how great its resources to manufacture: An electric lamp, a glass bottle, an aluminum pot, a pair of spectacles, any vitamin product, a radio set, or numerous other things which form a part of our daily lives." 12

Evidently the monopolistic effects of patenting have been extended as the holders of these patents have banded together and have used a variety of legal procedures to insure a continuation of the monopoly and to prevent any kind of future development. Once again, it should be pointed out that it is the business firms themselves who are engaging in these practices. They are the group that ories the loudest for the preservation of our competitive way of life, yet it is within their own ranks where some of the widest departures from this system seem to exist.

Fair Trading. This practice has been known by several names other than fair trading. Resale-price maintainance, and minimum-price fixing are among the better known ones. The practice got its greatest impetus during the last depression period when severe price

12 Ibid., p. 50.
cutting put a number of business firms out of business. At this time it was considered a beneficial practice and got the sanction of law in most of the states.

The purpose of the law is to protect the good will of trade-marks to set minimum resale prices of trade-marked merchandise after title to the merchandise has passed to wholesalers and retailers.

The owner of the trade-mark is free to set any minimum resale price that he wants to, and the retailer is free to sell the merchandise to the public at the minimum price or any price above the minimum. 13

However notable the intentions regarding the protection of good will and trade marks, it is clear that when a minimum price is established free competition is thereby violated. That fair-trading did not comply with free competition is made clear by the passage of the Miller-Tydings amendment to the Sherman Anti-Trust Act which exempted fair trade agreements from prosecution under Anti-Trust laws.

In essence, fair trading allows the manufacturer to set minimum prices on their products. If a retailer enters into a fair trading contract with a firm, then he must not violate the price structure which the manufacturer has set. In at least forty-five states there has been legislation to back up the manufacturer.

One wonders how such laws could be established in the economy and still have people think of it as a competitive free enterprise type of system. However, at the time the practice became the most

prevailed, there was a good deal of sympathy for the small businessman who was being crowded out of business. Large retail organizations such as the chain stores would offer well-known merchandise at prices less than the wholesale cost. It was not possible for the small retailer to meet this kind of competition for very long, and he was soon crowded out. It was charged that as soon as the big retailer had eliminated the small competitors, he would then raise his prices again, and the consumer was ultimately the one who suffered. This was called "unfair competition," and "loss leadering," and was branded undesirable. Those who advocated the enlargement of fair trading practices said that severe price cuts degraded the products and that this ruinous price cutting would destroy the "backbone of American business—the small retailer. The terms monopoly, and competitive, were shifted about until it became difficult to determine who was monopolistic and who was competitive. The manufacturer said that "ruinous price cutting" would lead to monopoly because it stifled "real competition" and left all of the retailing in the hands of a few of the large chain stores. The retailers and consumers who opposed the fair trading practice claimed that it was monopolistic in that it did not allow the laws of supply and demand to work freely. They said that the consumer did not run the risk of big retailers running small retailers out of business and then raising the prices, because this would then open the door for a new retailer to enter the field and to sell the merchandise at a lower figure. They said that fixing the price was far more monopolistic and that it
stifled "real competition."

It is apparent that few could defend fair trading as being purely competitive. It might be defended as being of benefit to the economy. Certainly it can be defended in the interests of the manufacturer who wants to have the greatest coverage that is possible for his products. He wants to have both large and small firms handling his merchandise in all parts of the cities. For the purposes of the chapter it can at least be concluded that fair trading is a non-competitive element in our culture when competition is spoken of in its pure sense. It can also be concluded that fair-trading instead of being aimed at the preservation of the competitive system of free enterprise, is aimed at manipulating the economy to insure its good health, and perhaps it is aimed at the preservation of certain selfish interests.

Protective tariffs. If our economy were truly a freely competitive economy, we would not fear the entry or withdrawal of competitors. Any producer who could bring the product to the American scene in any better quality or at a cheaper price would be welcome, and we would take our hat off to him.

Very early in the history of this country, we found that this manner of thinking would not be tolerated. We can come much closer to such an ideal so long as we stay within the confines of our own country, but when producers from other countries bring products which have been produced by workers whose standard of living is much lower than the standard of living of the workers of this country, then the
competition is "unfair." We have not been willing to sit by and allow the businesses of this country to be ruined and our profits go to businesses outside our boundaries, simply because they have cheap labor and other resources available. And so it did not take long for us to take steps to insure that foreign producers would not ruin our own firms. Protective tariffs against foreign competition were passed as early as 1814, and arguments such as the following were offered in their defense.

This restriction may increase the price of a few articles, but in the long run may not the country benefit greatly by this sacrifice, if by reason of it the industrial and cultural developments are made possible?\textsuperscript{14}

We can conclude that protective tariffs are another example of non-competitive elements in the culture. They are an artificial factor which have been introduced because they were considered healthy for the overall economy. But there is evidence here, too, that the best interests of all is not the only factor which influences people to be either for or against protective tariffs.

The Randall Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, appointed by President Eisenhower, proposed a program in January 1954 which could be described by the phrase, "more trade, less aid." For a time many felt that this slogan would be a good one to put into practice. It looked as if we might make progress in minimizing some of our tariff barriers which limit competition and result in lower standards of living both here and abroad.

Yet when a specific program to accomplish these ends was proposed two months later, many of those who, at

their trade-association meetings, are warm advocates of competition, suddenly found there were certain wage-cost differentials which led them to oppose lower tariffs "as posing a grave threat to the domestic economy." 15

The question which determines whether or not a person is for or against something like protective tariffs is not whether it supports competition and free enterprise in the economy. Instead, the question seems to be whether or not the practice will benefit the individuals who are considering it.

Government Subsidy. We think of the American farmer as operating within about as much freedom as anyone. Individuals who are unable to tolerate the restrictions of city and industrial life sometimes find more happiness on the farm where they are "their own boss" and where they can be more or less self-sufficient. At first glance, this appears to be a bulwark of the system of free enterprise--the same as the small business man. Perhaps this was the case at one time, but not so now. The farmer, like other groups, has not been willing for his standard of living to rise and fall with the whims of business cycles. He feels that he deserves a share of the available wealth, so long as he is making a contribution, and has therefore put pressure on for government help to insure a satisfactory standard of living. By a curious irony the individualistic, freedom-loving, leave-me-alone farmers of the nation were the first major group to become integrated in an overall national plan. 16


16 Chase, op. cit., p. 92.
Another writer has said:

Then, of course, there is the farmer—the so-called individualist, the man who stands on his own feet, and as the politician puts it, "is the backbone of the nation." Here, of course, is someone who believes in competition. Yes, he does, but again there comes that but—and in his case a big one. It is so big that his powerful lobbies have forced through Congress price-support laws which give him protection far in excess of even that provided for the retailer through Fair Trade.17

At the present time this help for the farmer is generally well accepted as a necessity. The only question that seems to remain is how much and of what kind. The government has tried a variety of things to insure that the price of agricultural products would not fall below minimum levels. They have plowed under crops, destroyed livestock, bought up and stored vast quantities of foodstuffs, and then have given it away or sold it again at a terrific loss. One of the most recent recommendations is to establish "Soil Banks." Under this plan, the government would prohibit the planting of some thirty or forty thousand acres of land over the nation, and would let it sit idle for five years or more with only soil building crops allowed to grow on them.

The farmer has been non-competitive in another area as well. The very name of the "cooperatives" which he has organized over the country denies their basic competitiveness. Thought it should be pointed out that these cooperatives are in competition with some of the other large organizations in the country, such as the labor organ-

17 Phillips, op. cit., p. 49.
isations, industrial organisations, etc.

The level of the parities for the farmers which have brought such a lot of criticism in the past and at the present, along with the other helps which have been mentioned for farmers do not make up the only non-competitive elements in the field of government subsidies. Almost the same kind of help has been given to the veterans in the form of guaranteed loans and free education. Low interest loans have been given to countless small and large business firms. The Henry Kaiser Corporation, and the Lustron Housing Firm, are two extreme examples. Probably none of us is above "stooping" to cooperation when competition does not serve us so well. In fact, the switch-about is very striking in some instances. For example, in New England, in 1954 the unemployment problem became very acute. Industries in rather large number were moving to the South where they could find cheaper labor, more room, and more adequate water supplies. The shift in activities is well described by Time magazine at that time.

But it gave the U.S. a reminder of how fast a region can change its line once it changes its economy: Yankee New England was now openly in the lists for federal help, while the South and West, which used to yell for federal help against the East Coast octopi, now speak in the phrases of laissez-faire.\textsuperscript{18}

Another example of a switch in attitudes which occurred when the conditions became adverse, is cited by Phillips.

\textsuperscript{18} Time, 63:15, January 11, 1954.
Or, again, talk with the president of one of today's drug chains. Twenty-five years ago his organisation was the culprit, he was the unfair competitor, the price-cutter. But today he finds that the supermarket has added a drug section and is underselling him. Whereas he opposed re-sale price-maintenance laws 25 years ago, today he is one of their strong advocates. His definition of unfair competition has shifted; it depends upon who is being undersold.19

And the individual, or the individual firm, is not the only one whose attitudes concerning the effectiveness of competition shift when things are going against them. Our whole nation has tended to lose confidence in the system of competitive free enterprise in different times of crises such as war and depression. Our thinking has altered at times to consider such things as the NRA and even the national chartering of industry. Kaplan says:

The crisis of 1929 halted the absorption of capital into progressively larger corporate units. The prolonged depression shook public confidence in the efficiency of large-scale enterprise, in the economic justification of its expansion, in the contribution of big business to steadiness of production and employment. A series of exposures of poor business judgment, if not moral delinquency, undermined the faith in the captains of industry that had been built up in the 1920's and dramatized the opportunities for manipulation of corporate structures through the stock market, the banks, and their investment affiliates. . . .

The hearings on the crash before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, reported about three years after the collapse of the stock market in 1929, called forth comments of the following order from contemporary journals: "We wonder if it is really possible to read what . . . all the 'good' and the 'bad' capitalists did in the heyday of

American prosperity and still have any confidence in capitalism. Surely it must be increasingly apparent that the system is morally as well as economically bankrupt and that it corrupts the souls of its beneficiaries as much as it destroys the bodies of its victims. 20

**Pressure group organization.** Today we have the members of the industrial group organized into the National Association of Manufacturers. The doctors are organized into the American Medical Association. Labor is organized into the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations, both of which have recently merged into the AFL-CIO. The educators have the National Education Association, and the farmers have the Farm Bureau Federation. There are countless other organizations on a smaller scale, perhaps, but all with the same objective in view—to put pressure in the proper place to see that the group they represent gets the best possible kind of a deal. Oftentimes the activities of these groups results in a violation of what has been called competitive free enterprise. Doctors are not going to allow unlicensed doctors from other countries to come into this country and compete for patients. The NAM will advocate protective tariffs when a number of its members appear to be suffering from the importing of Swiss watches, or English bicycles, shoes or automobiles. Competition or the lack of it is not the private domain of retailing. Bartering for jobs, and the general interaction of people also falls in this category.

We do not have to limit ourselves to illustrations from what we normally consider the retail field. Did you follow the ten-month strike of Local 16 of the United Hatters, Cap and Millinery Workers International of America? The strike started in July 1953, brought on basically by the union's demand that the company sign a contract which would prohibit it from transferring work now done in Norwalk to any outside plant. The union also feared the plant would move its entire operation out of the area.

What the union wanted was a limit on competition. It did not want its members competing for jobs with workers in some other area.21

Others. These few examples do not begin to exhaust the possibilities of non-competitive elements in our culture. In addition there are such things as:

1. The deliberate restriction of output for a product in order to keep the supply low, and the price high, e.g., allowing citrus to rot in the fields.

2. Suppression of invention such as the suppression of the repeating match by the Diamond Match Company, calling it "the rottenest kind of competition."

3. The organization of cooperative communities such as Amana in Iowa.

4. The introduction of heavy brand name advertising so as to dominate the market.

5. Business mergers.

6. Controlled markets in which the price of the products is

agreed upon by all of the producers beforehand. The cheese industry is an example of this according to Chase.

7. The use of copyrights in the field of publishing.

8. Social security and veterans' pensions.

9. The existence of monopolies such as the Post Office and public utilities.

10. Entrance of the government into fields like insurance on a non-profit basis.

The foregoing information rather conclusively establishes that our culture is not competitive in the pure sense. There is a great deal of control and manipulation and priming of the market which would not be defensible under Adam Smith's system of competitive free enterprise. But is the system competitive under a more liberal definition? A.D.H. Kaplan has studied this and other related questions for seven years and the results of his investigation were published by the Brookings Institution in 1954. Mr. Kaplan's test for a competitive economy was cited earlier in the chapter and will be repeated here in slightly different wording.

Business competition can be defined in a very general way as the process of exchanging goods or services in a market where there is a choice of rival bids and offers.

... In terms both of the way in which competition works and the results which it is supposed to achieve, the more numerous, varied, and significant the market alternatives, the more convincing is the objective evidence of effective competition.

It is not expected that the progressive enlargement of the areas of choice will be realized by merely leaving competition to take its own course. Considering how imperfectly human society approximates the sequence out-
lined above: the sequence of pure competition at work from the pursuit of self-interest to attainment of the maximum common weal, our economy is vitally concerned with the conditions under which the competing is done. With faith in the ability of competition to effect optimum utilization of our resources goes faith in the ability of men to create institutions under which competition may work effectively in a framework of social order.  

Mr. Kaplan was primarily interested in whether or not the growth of big business has eliminated competition from the American scene. He says:

Thus the issue of big business breaks down into two basic considerations: First, has the growth of big business tended to narrow the opportunities for new enterprise by concentrating employment, assets, and market control in the hands of a few industrial giants? This is the problem of the structure of industries and markets in which big business operates. Second, is the competition in which big business engages of a kind that is regulated in the last analysis by big business policies or by the market forces inherent in the system itself? This is the question of competitive performance.

Following the discussion of these problems, Mr. Kaplan comes to conclusions concerning each of them. The conclusions are stated below:

... The overall pattern that emerges from an analysis of the statistics of concentration, whether of employment, production, or financial resources, represents a balance of economic power continually reasserted in an environment of dynamic change.

Thus both concentration and opportunity for self-employment have persisted side by side in the American economy.

---

23 Ibid., p. 234.
Pressure to compete may be exercised by distributive organizations, and powerful buyers force competition in markets where producers are few. .. /But/ With well-defined products, in which total demand is inelastic, oligopoly may, as in the cigarette industry, lead to stagnation of product and process development, to monopolistic pricing, and to wasteful methods of competition.

The rise in the financial power of big business has apparently been accompanied by at least comparable gains in the rest of the economy.

There is no reason to believe that those now at the top will remain there unless they keep fully abreast of competitive products and processes.

The ease with which industry and product boundaries can be crossed by firms of large resources and know-how has lessened the likelihood of successful insulation against competitive markets. It has increased the number of participants even in markets where a few dominant firms have accounted for the bulk of the output.

The big business will be asked, as before, whether it is becoming too big for competition with it to be practicable. So far the market forces have effectively maintained the balance of competitive strength, and big business growth has proved compatible with workable dynamic competition.

In the United States it has been possible so to mix dispersion with centralization that the major job can be left to private competition, under government regulation. Big business has not merely been kept effectively subject to a competitive system; on the whole it has also made an essential contribution to its scope, vitality, and effectiveness. 24

Other economists have pointed out that while there have been a great number of changes in our system, the economy remains healthy. The introduction of the seemingly non-competitive factors listed earlier has not necessarily spelled doom for our system.

24 Ibid., Chapter XI.
The U.S. economy has become so complex—and strong—that the parts no longer necessarily move in the same direction all at once. ... Says Summer Slichter: "The old-fashioned business cycle is being destroyed."  

Conclusions. While our economy is not competitive in the idealistic sense, it seems reasonable to assume that competition remains a vital force in the success of our system. Kaplan says, "... the competitive system is intended to maximize efficiency of output commensurate with the preservation of certain social values."  

It is the preservation of these certain social values wherein the difference lies in the older and newer conceptions of a competitive system. John Bates Clark says, "... that only from a strife with the right kind of rules can the right kind of fitness emerge. ... the prize of victory shall be earned, not by trickery or mere self-seeking adroitness, but by value rendered."  

It was shown that as non-competitive elements appeared in our economy, it was man's self-interest that seemed to be the motivating force responsible for their appearance. People like competition so long as it serves their own purposes. When things go adversely, then the individuals involved seek some change in the way things are going. But as it has worked out, the well being of the most of the people has been served, essentially, in the end. Our democratic

25 *Time*, 64:94, October 18, 1954, p. 94.  

26 Kaplan, op. cit., p. 233.  

system has allowed us to have competition and, to a degree, to
preserve the dignity of the individuals at the same time, as we have
established rules which have kept the strife within bounds. But in
the preservation of these values and in the establishment of the
rules we have necessarily had to sacrifice idealistic competition.
Thus, man has not remained a commodity on the market but has claimed
the right to be considered above the market.

Nevertheless, it is important for us to point out that the
self-interest of man has remained in either way of looking at com­
petition. Perhaps when we think of the role of the school in
regard to training for life, this will be a key factor. It is the
old argument of self-interest versus mutual-interest, or self-interest
versus altruism. In the old manner of looking at competition, self­
interest happily worked for the ultimate mutual-interest, but it
meant that the individuals must allow themselves to be subject to
whatever fate the Market willed for them. In the newer approach,
we recognize that it is the same self-interest that motivates the
producers in the economy, but this is an "enlightened" self interest.
It is self-interest which is willing to give and take a little for
the sake of mutual-interest. And in the thinking of some writers
this is the most intelligent kind of self-interest.

From the standpoint of economics, our culture is not com­
petitive in the pure sense. There are regulations and controls
which are designed to preserve certain social values. The culture
is competitive in that self-interest motivates man more than does
altruism. It is the nature of people in society to try to place
themselves in a position which is superior to that of others.

In the next chapter the nature of man will be investigated.
An attempt will be made to determine whether man is naturally co-
operative or competitive.
In determining the role for competition in the schools a question which must be answered is whether or not man is born inherently competitive. For if he is naturally competitive, then much of the problem is solved, and the job of the educator is then merely to determine how to cope with this inherent drive.

A look at the literature quickly determines that it is far from conclusive as to what the basic competitiveness of man actually is. Some think that he is naturally competitive; some think that he is naturally cooperative; some think that he is born neither competitive nor cooperative, but learns both or either form of behavior from the environment; and some think that he is born with a natural disposition for one or the other, and that there is a great difference in men.

In this chapter, evidence for each of these four positions will be presented. In addition, certain theories of behavior will be discussed, which shed light on competitiveness. The subject of motivation will also be discussed in connection with man's behavior. From this information, conclusions will be drawn which are considered helpful in determining the role of competition in the schools.
I. EVIDENCE THAT MAN IS NATURALLY COMPETITIVE

This point of view is probably the one which is most widely held. Especially among business men, competition is considered as the "natural way of life." Life is a struggle, and the best man will win. This way of thinking originated in part with the evolutionary writings of Darwin, Huxley and others. Economists who followed these men have been influential in constructing our economic culture around this same theory.

Natural selection. Darwin, more than any other man, is held responsible for the common belief that man is naturally a competitive animal. In his book, *The Origin of Species*, the theme is presented that competition is a universal element. Through competing for survival, all varieties and species gradually weed out the unfit, and cultivate the fit. Darwin's term for the process was "natural selection," but he liked the term used by Herbert Spencer, "survival of the fittest." Whether we like it or not, Darwin says that this is the way of things:

Nothing is easier than to admit in words the truth of the universal struggle for life, or more difficult—at least I have found it so—than constantly to bear this conclusion in mind. Yet unless it be thoroughly engrained in the mind, the whole economy of nature, with every fact on distribution, rarity, abundance, extinction and variation, will be dimly seen or quite misunderstood.1

Built for aggressiveness. It was a very difficult thing to find authors who were willing to state categorically that man was inherently competitive. More often they skirted the issue, and spoke of what later developed. LaBarre, in his recent book, *The Human Animal*, does state that primitive man was so constructed that he could aggressively compete. He confines this description to the male of the species, however.

In fact, the male in the old-style mammal was largely structured for aggressive competition with other males of its own species, as well as for fighting its natural wild enemies of other species.²

While this evidence is meagre, it does point up the fact that man was endowed with the equipment for competition. The forces that would impel this equipment into actual competitive behavior are not so clearly defined.

Brain operations. Interesting information concerning the changes which occur in the personality after certain brain surgery is performed contribute rather significantly to the theory that man is naturally competitive.

Every person must be somewhat obsessed to achieve his goal in life. A certain amount of tension and drive is socially acceptable and, in some communities, desirable. In fact, man alone of all species seems to have built into his nervous system something which keeps him on the go exploring, competing, learning, theorizing. Most lobotomized patients have lost the ability (or desire?) to keep up with the Joneses or seek out new experiences.

They live almost completely in the present and their capacity for caring is impaired. The future is of little concern, so they do not plan for the future or look ahead— or worry or fear. This is strong evidence that nerve cells in the frontal cortex are important in enabling us to plan and predict.

The brain, then, was originally constructed to include these nerve cells in the frontal cortex of man which "...keeps him on the go exploring, competing, learning, theorizing." This is the part that makes him wish to keep up with the Joneses, and to try to do better than his fellow man in general which appears to be strong evidence that man is born with a desire to compete.

**Love and hate.** The statements of Freud do not fit well into any one of the four categories being used here, and perhaps another should be formed for him alone. In a broad interpretation, he can be thought to believe that man is naturally both cooperative and competitive. But rather than create a separate category, his name will be given in both the sections of man being naturally cooperative and naturally competitive.

Freud said:

...After long doubts and vacillations we have decided to assume the existence of only two basic instincts, Eros, and the destructive instinct.

The Eros instinct was the libidinal or the love instinct, and the destructive instinct was hate, aggression—even an urge to

---


death. This aggressive instinct is equated with competition and as man goes about striving to beat others, it is this instinct that impels him.

Freud arrived at his conclusions in a rather subjective, observational, introspective, manner. If one accepts his theories, it must be done in the light of this fact. It should also be pointed out that competition is not the only behavior that can result from this aggressive instinct. Sometimes it is not the objective of the individual to overcome his fellows, but he often turns his energies toward the destruction of objects, or of himself.

Drive for superiority. Adler disputed certain of the beliefs of Freud, but felt that there were two main determinants for behavior. These were the drive for power or superiority (and this was the basic drive) and an altruistic tendency. The altruism of man belongs under the section on cooperation, but here is a statement concerning man's drive for superiority.

It is the feeling of inferiority, inadequacy, insecurity, which determines the goal of an individual's existence. The tendency to push into the limelight, to compel the attention of parents, makes itself felt in the first days of life. Here are found the first indications of the awakening desire for recognition developing itself under the concomitant influence of the sense of inferiority, with its purpose the attainment of a goal in which the individual is seemingly superior to his environment.⁵

The competitive state of nature. Sherrington follows the "survival of the fittest" doctrines of Darwin and considered the natural state of nature in the following manner:

It was a strange misapprehension on the part of Rousseau that the native state of Nature is a peace. Nature in the primeval African forest as observed by a versed and sympathetic naturalist of today is found to present an appearance, "sinister, hostile and horrible."6

In this point of view, if things are left to operate in a natural or primitive state, the results are a condition of intense competition for survival. This natural state would include a "natural" condition for man.

Instincts. McDougall wrote a great deal in the psychological literature concerning instincts. At one point he discusses whether or not competitive behavior is instinctive or not.

But in games the competitive motive is easily first. What then is this? Is it the impulse of a distinct instinct, an instinct of rivalry or competition? That view is temptingly easy, but there is serious objection to it. It is not clear that any wild animal displays competitive behavior. . . . Every instance of competitive behavior may be attributed to the instinct of display or self assertion, and seems to be adequately explained in this way. Competition is an effort to assert our superiority to others, and by so doing, to throw others into a submissive uplooking attitude which gratifies or brings satisfaction to our impulse of self-assertion.7


7 William McDougall, Outline of Psychology (New York: Charles Scribners and Sons, 1923), pp. 172-175.
At first, this appears to be evidence against man being naturally competitive. However, closer examination of the instinct of self-assertion makes it difficult to separate an inherent competitiveness from this instinct. Self-assertion is an effort on the part of man to "assert our superiority to others," and in order to do this, we must compare ourselves to others, and as is said in the definition for competition, "attempt to place ourselves in a position which is superior to that of certain other persons."

_Animal studies_. While it is not at all conclusive that the behavior of animals and the behavior of humans will correspond, nevertheless there is considerable psychological research which has been offered in that light. If rats, cats, and other animals will behave in a certain manner under certain conditions, then it is thought that humans will do the same. Winslow points out that it makes a difference in the behavior of animals when other animals are around. The social stimulation of having other animals there makes the situation more aggressive, and competitive.

The feeding of hens under the conditions of a social facilitation situation has been studied by Bayer who found that the amount of food ingested was always increased by the presence of other hens, and that 60 percent or more would be eaten by the already satiated bird under the social influence of another hen brought in when hungry. Welty observed that fish devoured more food in groups than when isolated. Harlow has shown that in rats the individual is affected by the group in the same way.8

---
In some of the studies on insight it was also discovered that one of the apes in the cage would not make any effort to obtain an orange which was just out of reach outside the bars of the cage, when alone in the cage. However, when another ape was introduced into the cage, the first ape immediately began to try to get the orange.

Perhaps this means that these animals are greedy, and not necessarily competitive. It does indicate that there are changes brought about when the situation becomes social. These changes possibly indicate that animals are so constructed that when the situation is social they will always compete.

In the case of humans, there are several studies available such as the one by Moede\(^9\), in which it is shown that the introduction of other people or of a specific competitor will greatly alter the performance of the individuals. In Koede's experiment it was found that the ability of boys of 12 to 14 years to endure an electric shock was greater when a group of onlookers was present than when alone, and highest of all in the case of competition between two boys.

**Egocentrism.** Freud, Gesell, Ribble, and most others who write on the early growth and development of humans point out the complete egocentrism of the newborn infant. At this time the infant is con-

---

cerned only with his own wants, and actually has not differentiated himself from the environment. It is this egocentrism which develops into competitive behavior as growth advances. For some people it is much stronger than it is for others. Even as they advance toward maturity of growth, they continue to be strongly impelled by egocentric wishes. As an infant this egocentrism was satisfied by loving attention and personal contact. In one sense, this is a cooperative response, but there is stronger indication that it is behavior which is aimed at pushing aside all the things and all the people who will prevent the satisfaction of these wishes. In this sense it is competitive. Crying, pleading, smiling, and such, were the infantile means of achieving satisfaction here, and when a person persists in seeking such responses in such ways, he is continuing on an infantile basis, but when he gets satisfaction for his own selfish desires through aggression and by ignoring the rights of others, it carries the mark of greater maturity, at least. In both instances the behavior is egocentric and is competitive. Since this egocentricity is something that all humans exhibit at birth, and since this kind of competitive behavior grows out of it, we can say that man is naturally competitive to this extent.

It should be said, however, that cooperative behavior grows from the same beginning, even though it is not so closely related. Considering the smiling, and the reaching out for people, as cooperative behaviors, they develop even before the more aggressive competitive behaviors.
Cooperative communities. Thinking that the better state for man was one of cooperation rather than competition, there has been many attempts in the past to form idealized communities in which the individuals were no longer threatened by one another, competition was minimized, and all things were held in common. Gide\textsuperscript{10} made a careful study of such communities which occurred in the nineteenth century and concluded that communal living was not a practical plan. The success of communities depended, in most instances, on the strength of leadership of the founders, and when they passed away, the community failed to continue. Of more importance to this section is that the members were not able to overcome their individualistic "tendency," and so were not able to become good members of cooperatives. This tendency is taken to mean that the members were naturally individualistic and were looking out for themselves.

It will also be noted that in Russia, the cooperative groups that are formed are formed in such a manner that within the group itself competition is emphasized.

Instinctive forces. Marion Kenworthy\textsuperscript{11} concluded that the instinctive forces underlying the adaptation of the individual to life are: (1) drive toward self-maintenance; and (2) drive toward

\textsuperscript{10} Gide, Charles, Communist and Cooperative Colonies (New York: Crowell and Co., 1930), Chapters 1-8.

\textsuperscript{11} Marion E. Kenworthy, "The Logic of Delinquency," Proceedings of the American Sociological Society, 1921, 16, 197-204.
self advancement. It is pointed out that both of these are spheres of highly competitive activity.

**Prevalence of competition.** There is something to be said for the fact that competition is so universal a means of motivation. This does not necessarily make it the nature of human beings to compete, but it at least adds evidence in that direction.

Vaughn and Diserens\(^\text{12}\) in tracing the evolution of the concept of competition show that it has always prevailed. It has been motivation for education for all peoples: the Egyptians, Greeks, Australians, Early Americans, and all the others. Hobbes and Machiavelli offering the theory of society as a "war of each against all" probably began an application of the concept to economic thinking. Malthus then applied the principle to explain the cause of survival in human population and Darwin carried the same thoughts to the survival of plants and animals. They conclude:

> Competition may be regarded as a universal principle, one fundamental to all natural sciences.\(^\text{13}\)

It is clear that social scientists seeking a basic determinant of social phenomena might find in competition a more important factor than complacency, consciousness of kind, cooperation, and other characteristics of men which have been put forward as fundamental.\(^\text{14}\)

---

\(^{12}\) Vaughn and Diserens, *op. cit.*, pp. 76-97.

\(^{13}\) Ibid., p. 76.

\(^{14}\) Ibid., p. 78.
It seems clear from this careful study that competition in some form is inevitable in every social situation.\textsuperscript{16}

Allport believed that the reason men competed or cooperated was to obtain objects or prestige. Inevitably, the objects were entwined in the status or prestige. While he did not believe anyone could rightfully conclude that men were either cooperative or competitive by nature, he did write that a drive for power which is a part of the object and prestige picture mentioned above, would occur in all cultures.

It appears from this analysis that the need for prestige or status of some sort is as primordial as food and drink. The form of the struggle is culturally determined, if not the nature of the object sought. Admitting the analysis of the power drive to be incomplete, we nevertheless incline to the opinion that some drive for power is going to appear wherever there is interference with one's movements; and we therefore regard this "drive" as essentially bound to appear in all cultural settings.\textsuperscript{16}

Murphy and Murphy said:

It is apparent that from two years of age and upwards, the pattern of our life is drawn largely in terms of an almost unceasing effort to excel . . . ours is . . . a society in which the child who can hardly talk has already learned that among the sweetest of life's satisfactions are the satisfactions of individual prestige.\textsuperscript{17}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., p. 79.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{16} Allport, Murphy, and May, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 20.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{17} C. Murphy and J. B. Murphy, \textit{Experimental Social Psychology} (New York: Harper, 1931), p. 447.
\end{flushright}
Sohwendener studied the behavior of 10,000 fourth-grade children in playground activities and found that all of the most popular activities contained four common elements. Competition was one of these elements.

Self-interest. In the chapter on the competitiveness of the culture it is shown that the behavior of man is generally oriented toward his own well being. This is by no means a new concept. Philosophers, ancient and modern, have spoken of this tendency in man. Even our seemingly most generous acts, when traced to their ultimate beginning, show that the person is only demonstrating what is called "enlightened altruism" at best, and actually his motives are for his own personal elevation. If this is the case, then competition is inevitable for man. For any time another person gets in the way of the satisfaction of desires, then competition will follow, and in a social situation such interference is, likewise, inevitable. This means that man is born such that he wishes to elevate himself. He wishes to maintain and to enhance himself in the eyes of others. In that he is born into a social situation which requires him to compare himself with all of the others in maintaining and enhancing himself, then in this social situation, he is a competitive animal.

II. EVIDENCE THAT MAN IS NATURALLY COOPERATIVE

The quantity of evidence for man being naturally cooperative,

18
is not so great as that for competition, but the material that was found was just as convincing. It is somewhat more desirable, in the minds of most people, that man would be a cooperative animal, rather than a competitive one. Especially in the field of sociology, the feeling is made plain that since man has always been a social animal, he should be built to live in that manner. It is thought that man's extreme competitiveness is but an accident, and if the way could be discovered, he could live a much happier life in cooperation.

The flame of love. One of the most recent and talked about of the theories is that of Ashley Montagu. He has said that Malthus, Darwin, Huxley, and others, have made mankind the victim of false thinking. In the philosophy of the "survival of the fittest," men have been made to believe that life is a vicious battle, and that only those who conquer others will survive. Montagu believes this is not true. Instead of war and struggle being the nature of things, love and cooperation should take their place. He does not actually state that he feels man is born a cooperative animal, but after debunking the theory that man is competitive by nature, the inferences which follow are clear.

One thing, however, is certain; the scientific validation of the idea of the innate competitiveness of man was provided in the nineteenth century by Darwin and his supporters, and particularly by Spencer and the whole school of Social Darwinists who followed his lead. "Competition" was the cornerstone of the whole edifice of the theory of evolution by means of natural selection... What Darwin and his supporters, in fact, demonstrated to the satisfaction of most of his contemporaries was that competition is inherent in the nature of living things. At the height of the industrial revolution this was a demonstration which fitted the book of lаissеz-fаїrе
capitalism to perfection. It was accepted with enthusiasm. In the struggle for existence the fittest came out on top.

The probability of survival of individual living things, or of populations, increases with the degree with which they harmoniously adjust themselves to each other and their environment. This principle is basic to the concept of the balance of nature, orders the subject matter of ecology and evolution, underlies organismic and developmental biology, and is the foundation for all sociology.

The nature of life is interdependency, and the organism called man is born in a state of dependency which requires interdependency if it is to survive.

We live by a pure flame within us; that flame is love.

Montagu believes that the emphasis on hostility and aggression has been greatly overdone. Because of the extreme interdependency in which man lives, the "flame of love" must direct us, not hate and combat.

Infants and children. Burks has extensively investigated the literature in regard to the cooperative and competitive, social development of infants and children. Her findings did not show conclusively that children are born either cooperative or competitive, for at birth the personality is not definable. She does cite research which indicates that cooperative and competitive behaviors do appear.


20 Ibid., p. 75 (citing Warder & Allee)

21 Ibid., p. 76.

22 Ibid., p. 78.
at a very early age. Summarizing from Gesell's study in 1925, she says:

Gesell's 1926 normative study of mental growth in the pre-school child enumerates and describes basic social responses that appear from the fourth month on. Examples of primitive cooperative behavior are: anticipatory postural adjustment on being lifted at 4 months; "peek-a-boo" game at 9 months; cooperates while he is being dressed at 12 months. It could be argued as to whether or not this actually constituted cooperative behavior, but other studies are cited as well, e.g., Parten who concluded that cooperative group play seldom occurred in children of less than three years. Research showing the occurrence of competitive behavior in children was much more prevalent, but is not pertinent to this section. Suffice it to say that this behavior, by whatever researcher being cited, showed first a desire for objects, and then behavior directed at gaining victory over any individuals who might keep him from getting the object.

While this information establishes that very early in the life of the infant, behavior occurs which could be interpreted as cooperative, Burks has suggested other more important information for purposes of this section. She suggests that the theory be followed up that man's behavior is determined by a central "radix, or core of person-


24 Barbara S. Burks, op. cit., pp. 3-4.

ality which is largely hereditarily determined. From this radix
certain traits of personality develop. Here are her own words:

Some psychologists have sought by a diversity of
approaches to uncover the functioning of traits through
actual observation. Some have gone so far as to posit
a "radix" or central core of personality which determines
the constellation of all the personality traits of the
individual. Out of a wide range of experiments per­
formed with a given child, it may be possible to establish
associated clusters or constellations of behavior which
are demonstrably organized in a focal sense for that child,
and then from this evidence to arrive inductively at a
psychologically meaningful trait concept.28

Citing the studies of the Character Education Inquiry27, 28, 29
and Berne30 she says that high correlations were found in the case of
service, and for cooperation in general, in the case of Berne. She
felt that the correlation was of such significance that it "suggests
the possibility of a genuine trait-entity in the domain of coopera­
tion."31 Gordon Allport showed interest in the concept and spoke

26 Burks, op. cit., p. 12.
27 H. Hartshorne and E. A. May, Studies in Deceit (2 vols.)
28 H. Hartshorne, E. A. May, and J. B. Waller, Studies in
Service and Self Control (New York: Macmillan, 1929).
29 H. Hartshorne, E. A. May, and F. A. Shuttleworth, Studies in
the Organization of Character (New York: Macmillan, 1930).
30 E. V. C. Berne, "An Experimental Investigation of Social
Behavior Patterns in Young Children," University of Iowa Studies:
31 Ibid.
of the possibility of cooperation being a "true" trait. He speaks first of the generalized character of cooperativeness which does not show up in competitiveness.

Habits of competing are, nevertheless, carried over from one situation to another, often rather blindly; . . . . It must be emphasized, however, that this is rather exceptional; in general, competitive habits are largely specific to situations and to the persons competing. There is no clearly isolable and measurable trait of "general competitiveness" in most children. Meagre data now available do, surprisingly enough, suggest, however, that cooperation is often highly generalized in small children so that high scores on several tests of cooperativeness permit fair prediction as to behavior on further tests relating to other forms of cooperative behavior.32

And later he says:

Now it is possible, Miss Burks thinks, that cooperation may be one of the true "traits" or organized subgroups of dispositions within the individual, as suggested by Berne's study; but there is no direct evidence as to whether competitiveness is a "trait" in the sense of being an organized group of dispositions having stability and recognizability. In everyday language, cooperative behavior in three or four situations would permit prediction that we would find cooperativeness in three or four new situations, while competitiveness in three or four situations would give no clear prediction.33

It is recognized that this "trait" of cooperativeness is being spoken of as it develops in the environment. Nevertheless, it is offered here as a "true" trait, or one that is "generalized" and predictable. In this sense, it is more natural to the human being than is competition.

32 Gordon Allport, Gardner Murphy, and Mark May, op. cit., p. 4.

33 Ibid., p. 41.
The fifth wish. For a number of years the "four wishes" of W. I. Thomas were considered responsible for human behavior by a great number of people. To some extent, these four wishes of (1) new experience, (2) recognition, (3) security, and (4) response and affection are still held in high repute. In 1931, Emory S. Bogardus pointed out that all four of the wishes were directed toward the self-interest of the individual. None of them took into account the behavior which he called altruistic. He formulated "the fifth wish," called the urge to aid or cooperate, which he felt would take care of the neglected area of altruism. The following gives in part his justification.

That there is a basic urge to help, to aid, to cooperate, was first suggested to the writer, when reading Prince Kropotkin's Mutual Aid. Its origins may be found in the "automatic cooperation" that exists among animals. It is this automatic cooperation which W. C. Allee in his recent work on Animal Aggregation asserts "ranks as one of the fundamental qualities of animal protoplasm, and protoplasm in general." Many types of animals "are largely group-centered rather than self-centered." There are "in-nate tendencies toward cooperation." 34

According to Bogardus, then, there is a basic urge to cooperate. It is a fundamental quality of all animal protoplasm.

Animal cooperation. The research of Allee is often quoted in the literature on cooperation. His work has been essentially with animals, but recently he published "some implications for humans" from his conclusions. He recognizes that there is a fundamental

struggle for existence, but he feels that the other side of the picture, that of cooperation, has been neglected. He feels that it is the nature of all life to live together. Without this dependence, organisms could not survive. There is an optimum number that can live together, however. Overcrowding can be just as deadly as too few, and there is a great difference among living things, as to what this optimum number is. His work did not clearly state that organisms were born with a clearly cooperative urge, but the following quote suggests that cooperation is everywhere present.

... I must recognize these two fundamental principles, the struggle for existence and the necessity for cooperation, both of which, consciously or unconsciously, penetrate all nature.  

Eros and altruism. The contributions of Freud and Adler were given in the section on the natural competitiveness of man. But in each instance there is a case for man's natural cooperativeness as well. This is strongest for Freud who thought the Eros drive was just as strong if not stronger than the destructive drive. In Eros are all the love and upbuilding characteristics of men. He is born with these urges. Adler, feeling that the basic drive for man was overcoming his natural feelings of inadequacy by demonstrating a superiority over all his environment, felt that some people accomplished this through altruistic behavior. This would be the cooperative side of man.

---

III. EVIDENCE THAT MAN IS NEITHER COOPERATIVE NOR COMPETITIVE BY NATURE

There is rather strong evidence that neither cooperativeness nor competitiveness is natural in man, but whenever either one or both of these characteristics appear, it has been environmentally produced. Most students of anthropology and sociology, as well as psychology would share this view. The fact that it is not possible to rear a child outside of an environment makes it difficult to experimentally document this point, but the opinions of some of the experts in the field and a look at some of the cultures that are more cooperative than competitive will help.

Competitiveness of children. Greenberg studies the competitive behavior of 65 children ages 2 to 7 who were living in an institution. She concluded that competitiveness increases directly with an increase in age. The very young children exhibited no competitiveness (ages 2-3), and from age 3 to 5 the amount of competitiveness grew. From ages 6-7, there was a growth in competition with critical judgment.

This research may indicate that competitiveness is a factor that must wait for physical development before it can be exhibited. However, the study is sometimes quoted as evidence that when children are born they are neither competitive nor cooperative, but must learn these behaviors. The fact that competitiveness increased with age would indicate that this was the case.

---

Lueba believes that incentives of an external or symbolic sort have largely replaced organic needs as motivating forces. Competition, of course, is one of these external motivating forces, and as such is a culturally induced factor. In a study of thirty-two children at Antioch College, he found, as Greenberg did, that competitiveness increases with age, which once again points to the environment as being responsible for its appearance.

Cooperative cultures. In our culture we find a good deal of both cooperation and competition. From one point of view this is evidence that man is either both cooperative and competitive by nature, or else he is neither one, and has learned both behaviors from the culture. If cultures could be found which were either wholly cooperative, or wholly competitive, it would make this argument even stronger. Anthropologists and other writers have published what they believe is evidence of cultures which abhor competition. The Sioux Indians, in the Dakotas, who were carefully observed, "did not respond to competition as set by teachers." Other passages from the study verify this:

Yet many withdraw from competitive activities, and some refuse to respond at all. "To be asked to compete in class goes against the grain with the Dakota child, and he criticizes the competitive ones among his fellows." 39


Misbehavior at home still consists primarily of selfishness and competitiveness, the seeking after gains based on the disadvantage of others. Another group which has been singled out as cooperative and not competitive, is the Hutterites:

The Hutterites are distinguished by their belief in economic communalism. They believe private property to be sinful; they are certain that salvation can be obtained only by living in a community and sharing all earthly goods with one's brethren, as did Christ and His Apostles.

Of passing interest is the fact that the article points out that crime, delinquency, neurosis and psychosis are at a minimum among the Hutterites.

Ruth Benedict describes the resistance of the Zuni Indians to competition:

The ideal man in Zuni is a person of dignity and affability who has never tried to lead, and who has never called forth comment from his neighbors. Any conflict, even though all right is on his side, is held against him. Even in contests of skill like their foot races, if a man wins habitually he is disbarred from running. They are interested in a game that a number can play with even chances, and an outstanding runner spoils the game; they will have none of him.

Importance of the environment. After an extensive and thorough investigation of the same question which is posed in this chapter, May

40 Ibid., p. 382.


and Doob made the following statement:

Human beings by original nature strive for goals, but striving with others (cooperation) or against others (competition) are learned forms of behavior.\(^{43}\)

Since the tendencies to strive with others, or against others, for desired goals are not represented in original nature by specific instincts or drives, neither one nor the other can be said to be the more genetically basic, fundamental or primordial.\(^{44}\)

Cole and Bruce\(^{45}\) point out, much as we have pointed out here, that it is clear man learns competitiveness and cooperativeness from his environment. As examples of opposite extremes, they cite the culture of the Kwakiutl Indian of Vancouver Island, British Columbia. They are an extremely competitive people. At the other extreme is the Zuni tribe, already cited, who are extremely cooperative. Bruce and Cole say that the American boy is in the middle. There is abundance of both cooperation and competition in our culture, and he learns both of them, though they conflict, and cause him trouble.

Blair, Jones and Simpson say it in this manner:

Competition gets its strength from the ego and social needs of the individual who comes to value his place in a particular group or groups, and who strives to maintain that place or better it. As with other important incen-

\(^{43}\) May and Doob, op. cit., pp. 23 and 25.

\(^{44}\) Ibid.

\(^{45}\) Lawrence E. Cole and William P. Bruce, Educational Psychology (New York: World Book Company, 1950), pp. 242-244.
tives, its roots grow in the soil of basic needs, but its form and consequences are culturally determined. 46

IV. EVIDENCE OF INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES

This final section regarding the competitiveness of man operates from the position that there is an inherent factor connected with man's competitive behavior, but it is not the same for all men. The basic temperament of people differs in that some are dominant and some submissive, some extroverted, and some introverted, etc. Connected with this difference in temperament is a strong tendency among men to seek either highly competitive activities or highly cooperative activities, depending upon their individual inheritances. The evidence for this position is not extensive, but what exists is stimulating.

Competition and the body build. Following his widely read volume on the varieties of human physique, Sheldon attempted to classify men into varieties of temperament. This is by no means the first time this has been tried; Hippocrates, Spranger, and Kretschmer are but three names in a longer list. But Sheldon's classifications are the best known at this time, and after going through a period of relative disrepute, now seem to be gaining a new acceptance. Sheldon's newest publication The Atlas of Men 47 is replete with a number of photographs documenting the conclusions.

Sheldon believes that from the standpoint of temperament, men can be categorized into roughly three types: (1) Viscerotonia, having traits related to a predominance of the digestive viscera; (2) Somatotonia, having traits associated with functional predominance of the somatic structure; and (3) Cerebrotonia, having traits showing predominance of conscious attention. In order to show tendencies toward one or the other of these types, and because it was not possible to classify everyone into one or the other of the three categories, Sheldon offered a number of related characteristics which would allow the classifier to give the person a rating showing his tendency toward one or the other of the types. The ninth characteristic which he listed is pertinent here and shows that the Viscerotonic person will demonstrate "indiscriminate amiability" in his behavior, the Somatotonic will demonstrate "competitive aggression," and the Cerebrotonic will demonstrate "inhibited social address." 48 This typing has been corroborated by others 49 and is of current interest. Since a man's physique is an inherited factor, and since men of different physiques demonstrate different behavior patterns in regard to competition, then it can be concluded that as we inherit different physiques, we thereby inherit differing temperaments, and


some of us will be more aggressive and competitive than others, by nature. Sheldon says:

Viewed in this fashion, physique and temperament are clearly two aspects of the same thing, and we are not surprised if we are led to expect that the dynamics of an individual should be related to the static picture he presents. It is the old notion that structure must somehow determine function. In the face of this expectation it is rather astonishing that in the past so little relation has been discovered between the shape of a man and the way he behaves.  

Animal studies. Once again we turn to studies which have been performed on animals. Recognizing that there are differences, it is nevertheless considered further evidence, even though it is not conclusive.

The cat is a favored experimental animal because of its anatomical similarities to man, and because of its high intellect. Winslow found individual differences in temperament with regard to competition, altruism, and aggression in the cats used in the experiment quoted here.

In all three of the experimental situations competitive, aggressive, and altruistic behavior appeared, but individual differences in the form and the extent were marked. In the straight-runway, for example, continuous winning tended to produce faster running, whereas continuous losing caused loss of interest or hostility toward the winner.

Altruistic sharing of the food occurred more frequently than fighting when two cats had pushed levers in problem-boxes to reach a single piece of food placed in the middle. In the string-pulling situation some animals fought for a position before the string or for the food when obtained by

---

80 Sheldon, op. cit., p. 4.
another, while other oats stood aside without opposition and let their companions pull the string and devour the food.

The reaction patterns of the oats were correlated with their relative positions in the scale of dominance. 61

Doner 62 found the same kind of result in experiments with different strains of mice. He found that the performance of mice in different complex competitive social situations is partially dependent upon strain differences.

Sibling rivalry. A quotation from a recent publication by Miss Brickner clearly establishes her as a believer in the individual differences of men when it comes to aggression and competition.

The constitutionally aggressive, demanding type of child, for example, is sure to experience more jealousy and frustration than the constitutionally gentle, tender one, no matter what sort of family he lives in. He will feel more threatened by the arrival of a new babe. He will feel more anger at his parents when they thwart him in any way. Because of his demanding nature, they will be forced to thwart him more often, and he will need constant proof of affection and more assurance of parental love than are necessary for the less aggressive children. He will be driven to compete with older, or abler, or more attractive brothers and sisters no matter how uneven the odds. The child of gentler disposition can often accept such realities with little stress and no great need to struggle. It will take the most extreme type of family situation to call forth hostility in him. 53


Hormonal influences. Closely coupled with the idea that men are born with differing physiques and therefore with different temperaments, is the function of the body chemistry. Jones\textsuperscript{54} says that boys are more aggressive than girls and attributes this difference to the release of male and female hormones in the body. When there is a great deal of testosterone, the male hormone, released then the individual is more aggressive. A certain amount of testosterone is present in both men and women, and the masculinity and feminity is partially dependent on the amount of this hormone which is produced. Bize and Moricard\textsuperscript{55} experimented with young boys and found that giving injections of testosterone produced a definite increase in aggressiveness in all social relations. Clark and Birch,\textsuperscript{56} experimenting with Chimpanzees got similar results.

So the amount of testosterone which is released in the body determines, to some extent, the aggressiveness of the individual. Since all people do not have the same amount of this hormone released in their bodies, and since aggression is closely associated with com-


petition, it can be concluded that there is constitutional difference in individuals regarding their disposition toward competitive behavior.

Which of these four approaches to the competitiveness of man is most tenable? No one of them conclusively demonstrates that it is the answer to the problem, so one is left with the alternative of choosing the position which sounds most acceptable. Pfeiffer's conclusions concerning the effects of lobotomy on the behavior of men is strong evidence that there is an inherent force in people which impels them to want to "be something" in the world. Satisfying this desire, inevitably, will involve competition. A good case is also made for cooperativeness, when one is made to realize the interdependence of all living things. Though the environment will direct the extent of the cooperativeness or the competitiveness of people, the position that men are born neither way is not so convincing. For example, the tribes which were cited as being cooperative rather than competitive were never wholly so. War, and hunting games, coup-getting, and scalp-taking were all highly competitive activities. The Arapesh, cited by Margaret Mead as the most extreme cooperative tribe, still maintained a competition for prestige and status in the tribe, often by exhibiting much cooperation.

The position that there are individual differences in people regarding competitiveness is the most acceptable of the four, even though the evidence at this time is not extensive. This position allows for the prevalence of both cooperation and competition in the
world today, and at the same time, explains the somewhat contradictory research which has been gathered for one or the other. In accepting the position of individual differences in the competitiveness of men there are certain parts of the other positions which are included. The position is stated in this manner: A like amount of competitiveness or cooperativeness is not given to all human beings at birth. Instead, it is a matter of individual difference determined by the physique, interest, endocrine system, and other personality factors of the person. It is impossible to speak or think of competition or cooperation independent of the social situation. Until there is interaction of individuals there is no cooperation or competition. Therefore, the extent and nature of the competitiveness of man is also largely determined by the environment into which he is born.

V. THEORIES OF BEHAVIOR AS EXPLANATIONS OF COMPETITIVENESS

Another approach to the explanation of competitiveness is through the various theories of the causes of man's behavior. Only the highlights of this extremely wide field will be given here, but enough will be offered to afford conclusions.

Behavior has been explained in a great number of ways. Many of the theories overlap with the discussion of individual differences, above. For example, men are thought to do as they do because they are either "sanguine or choleric," "endomorph, mesomorph or ectomorph," "tough minded or tender minded." Behavior has been traced to a single cause such as a "life urge," or an urge to "perpetuate the species."
The "four wishes" of W. I. Thomas, mentioned earlier, have been held responsible for man's actions, and for a time, instincts were held to blame.

None of the things mentioned have been so universally accepted, however, as has the needs theory of behavior. Under this theory, man is believed to have certain basic needs which are common to all. Like instincts, the classification of these needs has been subject to a variety of interpretations, but there has been far more agreement than disagreement. Needs are generally classified into at least two categories. There are the basic tissue needs, which are variously called biological, inherited, or physical. In addition we have a group of psychological, or emotional, needs. The need for these things is inherited by all but the manner of satisfaction is widely divergent. Many writers include a third group of "learned" needs which are strictly a product of the environment.

Taking these three groups one at a time, some examples will help in the understanding of the concept. In the case of the basic tissue needs there is very little disagreement. These are the things that the organism needs in order to sustain life. Things like food, air, water, constant body temperature, and elimination of wastes are most often listed. Our emotional needs include such things as love, affection, security, status, belonging, and some list sex in this category, while some list it as a tissue need. Last, we learn a variety of things as a result of the environment into which we happen to be born. Hunting, smoking, the love of music, or of certain foods, all come in this category.
The attempt to simplify the list of these things into needs that are common to all has produced a number of sets. Raths and Burrell admit the obvious tissue needs and group the emotional and the learned social needs into what they call the "psycho-socio" needs:

1. For belonging
2. Achievement and recognition
3. Economic security
4. Freedom from fear
5. Love and affection
6. Freedom from guilt feelings
7. Self-respect and for sharing the values that direct one's life.
8. Guiding purposes in understanding the world in which one lives.

Bruce and Cole, citing Maslow, list five needs which are listed in levels of importance to the person and are called a "hierarchy of needs." These five are:

1. Gratification of bodily needs
2. Safety
3. Love

---


58 Bruce and Cole, op. cit., p. 252.
4. Self-esteem

5. Self-actualization

Symonds elaborates on the concept of the hierarchy of needs, and says:

It would seem that needs arrange themselves in a hierarchy from the basic physiological needs to those which are of a more derived and secondary nature. Where several needs are aroused at the same time, behavior is dictated by the dominant need. The dominant need at any moment tends to be the strongest need and also the need which is closest to the physiological. For instance, if a person is simultaneously in need of self-esteem, security, and food, other things being equal, the food requirement will have the right of way in determining behavior.\(^5^9\)

Cannon\(^6^0\) in *Wisdom of the Body*, was a pioneer in this field and said that the reason the needs determined the behavior was because the body was constantly trying to achieve or maintain homeostasis or equilibrium. As needs arose they created frustration or tension within the person, which in turn called for behavior which would reduce the tension and restore equilibrium.

If one accepts this theory, then the reason that man competes is because he is trying to reduce tensions caused by unsatisfied needs. Running down the examples of needs which have been given, competitive behavior would be appropriate for virtually all of the needs listed. Anytime any of the elements listed such as food, air,


water, love, security, prestige, and all the rest, was scarce, then
the individuals would compete for their share. In the case of the
actualization of the self this would be true only to the extent that
competing for other things would contribute to this self-actualization.

In 1949 Syngg and Combs in Individual Behavior\textsuperscript{61} published a
theory which refuted the needs as a satisfactory explanation for
behavior. A more recent statement by Snygg\textsuperscript{62} which he says represents
the rather simultaneous thinking of a number of people will be re­
ferred to here.

Snygg reviews several of the explanations, widely held, of
man’s behavior: Common-sense explanations are not dependable, and
such beliefs as that red-headed people are always quick tempered are
founded in superstition. Competition is not a satisfactory motive
for behavior because of the threat it produces to most of the compet­
itors. Stimulus-response theories do not explain the problem because
there is no reliable way of predicting which of the great variety
of stimuli the individual is going to react to. Homeostasis is not an
adequate explanation because even a casual glance at man’s behavior
shows that he is not behaving so as to maintain equilibrium in the
body. Snygg says:

\textsuperscript{61} Donald Snygg and Arthur W. Combs, Individual Behavior

\textsuperscript{62} Donald Snygg, "The Psychological Basis of Human Values," A Dudley Ward, editor, Goals of Economic Life (New York: Harper and
A large part of human behavior and even some animal behavior cannot be explained by or even reconciled with the purely physiological needs. It is not uncommon for people to eat when they have already eaten more than they need or can comfortably contain. It is not uncommon for them to refuse food when they are famished. People drive too fast for safety, they mutilate themselves for beauty, they give their lives as heroes, as martyrs, and as suicides, all activities which are hardly consonant with maintaining the physiological balance.63

The concept of psychological needs is not sufficient because, like instincts, the list of needs grows and grows, in an effort to explain all behavior. More serious than this, psychological needs are often set up on a conflicting basis. It is said that we need activity and rest, self-assertion and self-abasement, emotional security and excitement. Such conflict makes it impossible for the clinician or anybody else to predict behavior when it cannot be determined which of the needs is operating at a particular time.

The group, likewise, is not a good means for determining behavior. Man belongs to many groups, and usually these groups have conflicts. At this point the individual must be loyal to one or the other of the groups and from time to time his loyalties will change.

The answer to the problem, Snygg calls "The Individual-field Approach"64 and briefly it is as follows:

1. The behavior of human beings, although it is often not appropriate to the immediate physical environment, is always appropriate to what is variously called the individual's psychological

63 Ibid., p. 341.

64 Ibid., p. 348f.
field, behavioral field, private world, assumptive world, perceptual field, or phenomenal field.

2. The psychological field is an organized dynamic field. The immediate purpose of all of an individual's behavior, including his behavior as a perceiver, is the maintenance of organization in his individual field. If the field organization should disintegrate his physical organization could not be maintained. If he loses faith in his perceptions organized behavior becomes impossible.

3. The perceptual self is the part of the field which is perceived as behaving. As a result it is the focal part of the field.

4. Because human beings are aware of the future, at least of its existence and uncertainties, it is not enough to maintain the perceptual self for the present moment. It has to be maintained in the future, built up and enhanced so that the individual feels secure for the future. And since the future is uncertain and unknown, no degree of self-actualization is enough. The ideal state in which the individual feels so much in harmony with the universe, so much a part of it, that he does not have to defend himself against any other part.

Behaviors which man uses to accomplish the above are:

1. Change in body state leading to change in the perceptions of the self. This is done by eating, breathing, avoiding pain, and by entering dangerous or irritating situations like speeding and gambling in order to mobilize and increase organic body strength.
2. Gaining self-reassurance by demonstration of mastery, control, or superiority over people and objects, through competition, scapegoating, giving gifts, gossip, doodling, nailbiting, and accumulating property.

3. Reassurance and enhancement by association and identification with respected individuals and groups.

4. By changing the non-self part of the field which places the self in a less threatened position. Travel, moving, daydreaming, and entertainment, are examples.

Snygg then concludes:

1. The basic goal of all individuals is for a feeling of increased worth, or greater value.

2. This goal is never completely reached. Given one success, one degree of self-enhancement, human beings will always aspire to more.

3. Satisfaction of the need for greater personal value can be and is sought in a number of ways. Goods and experiences are of value to the individual only as they contribute to the feeling of personal worth.

Snygg's theory has been reproduced here in some detail because it is believed that it is a sound explanation of behavior. However, of greatest importance, once again, for this study, is how competition fits into the picture. It was noted that competition is one means of gaining self-reassurance, by demonstrating superiority over worthy opposition. It was also said that the basic goal of all individuals

---

65 Ibid., quoted in part from pages 348-354.

66 Ibid., p. 355.
is for a feeling of increased worth, and greater value. It would appear, then, that competitiveness is an essential part of man's behavior, for how else can he feel of greater worth and value unless he demonstrates his superiority over other people? This leads us to one of the most important conclusions of the study. It is the age-old question of self-interest versus altruism. People who wish to supplant competition with cooperation wish, essentially, to supplant self-interest with altruism. Snygg's theory, which has been called sound above, apparently says that man is saddled with self interest because the basic goal of all humans is completely self-oriented. In addition, the economic behavior which is described in the chapter on the competitiveness of the culture fits very neatly into the theory. Man does not compete in our society because he feels there is anything sacred or inherently good in competition itself, but he competes because he wants to place himself in a position which is superior to that of others.

The question is whether competition can be replaced as a means of achieving this feeling of increased worth and greater value. Snygg thinks that it can be minimized and points out the inadequacy of competition as it operates at present.

However, basically, competition would be difficult to eliminate. Until man achieves the ecstasy of the saints, or until he "... feels so much in harmony with the universe, so much a part of it, that he does not have to defend himself against any other part,"67

67 Ibid., p. 352.
we must content ourselves with accepting a certain amount of competitive behavior in life, and we must learn some better ways of utilizing it in as positive a manner as possible. As a first step we can acknowledge that man's worth and dignity are greatly enhanced when he can demonstrate cooperative behavior.

The self-enhancement which accrues from an experience of being needed, from feeling part of a great movement, from contributing to something nobler and more important than our own lives, is just as natural and probably more lasting than the self-enhancement gained through successful aggression.

This is the direction which must be taken, but at the same time it is recognized that the present nature of man is such that without a spur as is given through competition, the chemistry of the body fails to activate the person and he becomes lethargic. Whether it is fear of conquest or desire for victory, it is known that these feelings quicken the heartbeat, and heighten the blood pressure, and the individual is able to respond more efficiently. It should also be pointed out that underlying the behavior which is aimed at being needed, and feeling part of a great movement, there still lies the desire on the part of the individual to enhance himself in the eyes of others.

In Chapter IV it was shown that the behavior which man demonstrates in society indicates that self-interest, or self-enhancement is the motivating force. In this chapter it is concluded that man is neither cooperative nor competitive by nature. Nevertheless, he

---

68 Ibid., p. 359.
does have a desire to be something in the eyes of his fellow man. At present, competition is the means employed for determining what that place is. So our conclusion for both chapters is that self-enhancement is what makes the individuals in the society behave as they do, and it is therefore what causes the culture to be what it is.

In Chapter VI the effectiveness of competition as a means of motivation will be investigated. The conclusions thus far have shown that a certain amount of competition is inevitable in society. Understanding how it works in motivation will help establish the amount of emphasis to place upon it.
CHAPTER VI
THE EFFECTIVENESS OF COMPETITION IN MOTIVATION

It has been shown that man is probably not a naturally competitive animal, though there appear to be some who are more responsive to it than others. Instead, competition is an extrinsic factor which has been introduced into daily life either as a result of the nature of social living or else as a purely artificial factor to accomplish certain ends. However it came to be, it is a fact, and is found extensively in most cultures. The schools, especially, have utilized competition from the earliest times, and today, it is commonly accepted.

By placing a high premium upon individual achievement the school generally assists in the development of a keen sense of rivalry among students. There can be little doubt that competition operates as one of the outstanding incentives in school learning.¹

The reason that competition occupies such a respected position in the culture today, is that it carries the reputation of getting things done. It is believed that people will do more and better work under the influence of competition. This is the problem of this chapter, and it is a very vital one for the study as a whole. Unless conclusions can be drawn about the effectiveness of competition in motivation, it will be difficult to suggest a role for competition in the schools.

Motivation. Before proceeding to the discussion of competition in relation to motivation, it is necessary to clarify the term motivation itself. In order to do this, motivation must be shown as it differs from the closely related term, motive.

Motives are said by Hilgard and Russell\(^2\) to be most nearly synonymous to needs. Sherif\(^3\) equates motives with basic drives and describes them in the two categories of biogenic and sociogenic. Maslow's "hierarchy of needs"\(^4\) puts needs on five levels of importance, and they are discussed as motives for behavior. Blair, Jones, and Simpson extend the concept slightly, but speak in the same general orientation as they say: "Arising from our basic needs, motives are the energies which give direction and purpose to behavior."\(^5\)

In general, motives are discussed from the standpoint of what causes man to behave. In most instances, the motives are divided into two categories as Sherif has done. The first group are the unlearned, tissue needs of the biological organism. This includes air, water, constant body temperature, sex, and elimination of wastes. The


\(^5\)Blair, Jones, and Simpson, op. cit., p. 151.
second group is learned, and in Maslow's "hierarchy" take a position which is secondary to the physiological desires. These are the motives which a person learns as a result of the culture in which he is born. They have genetic roots, but the direction of their development is determined by the environment. Affection, security, value-objects, and status, all fall under this heading.

While few would dispute the importance of air, water and food in the life of an individual, the abundance of these things reduces their importance except in times of crisis. Money and prestige mean nothing to the man who cannot get enough air to breathe and the same goes for the other physiological needs. But in terms of everyday life, people often relegate the physiological needs to a secondary level in terms of quantity of behavior. And more than that, people will go hungry in order to become slim, or will endanger their lives for the respect and admiration of their fellows. When they do this, they place the learned or sociogenic needs ahead of the biogenic needs. (Snygg and Combs have described this as necessitating a theory of behavior other than the needs theory. See previous chapter.) For this reason, many authors believe that the learned motives are the stronger when viewed in terms of the everyday life of man. Hilgard and Russell says, the acquired motives may or may not be derived from primary needs but are none-the-less "so strong as to be prepotent over the basic needs upon which they rest."  

---

6 Hilgard and Russell, op. cit., p. 40.
When discussed in this manner, motives activate the organism toward need-satisfying behavior. It is a kind of a "deficit" theory of motives in that there is a lack of the thing needed and the organism acts to remedy the lack.

A motive, then, is a source of energy. It is a condition or state within the organism which initiates activity or behavior.

As distinct from motives, motivation has to do with the organization of this energy. Since there occurs simultaneously, in the body, motives of greater or lesser intensity, the person must choose which motive he will act upon. This choice is quickly settled when we simply say that he acts upon the motive of greatest intensity. But the question is what makes one motive more intense than another. It is apparent that it is not a one to one relationship as Maslow's list would indicate, for as has been pointed out, the individual does not always eat when he is hungry, but will often deny himself food for one reason or another. Motivation is whatever it is that causes the person to seek a particular goal. It is the process of organizing and directing the energies which exist inside the organism and which have risen from the needs or motives.

Motivation occurs at that moment when the person chooses his goal and acts.

Intrinsic and extrinsic relationships. If left to himself the life of a person would be made up of a continuous series of, first, feeling the press of certain motives, and then behaving to satisfy them. In this way there would be no pre-described means of satisfying
motives. Methods of achieving satisfaction would come through experience. The organism is first of all concerned with the removal of the feeling of need and is concerned with the particular means employed only in a secondary manner.

But life in society is not as simple as this. First of all, people are required to do a great number of things for which they originally felt no inner need. These are tasks which are imposed from without and the reason the person does them is because he realizes that in order to achieve something which he really does feel the need for, he must first perform this task which has been imposed.

It is the nature of these seemingly unrelated tasks which is of concern to educators. For students must be motivated to say and do things which they have no felt need to do. There is no problem with the person who is hungry. He will usually seek food. But all the students who come to school do not have the desire to learn rules of grammar or mathematical symbols. The desire to perform these tasks must, in some cases, be instilled.

In this sense, the desire to perform the task is extrinsic. This differs from the desire held by the other person for food, which is intrinsic, or comes from within.

There is another, perhaps more important, distinction for intrinsic and extrinsic relationships. This has to do with the relationships between tasks and goals.

Using "self esteem," one of the hierarchy of needs described by Maslow, as an example, let us assume that a citizen aspires to the
position of director of the local community chest drive. He feels that his need for self esteem will be served if he performs this service for his fellow man.

His goal in this instance is to be thought well of by his fellows which in turn will cause him to think well of himself. His task is to become the director of the community chest drive. There is a logical relationship between becoming director of a community chest drive and being thought well of by the other members of the community. Therefore, in this case, the relationship is intrinsic.

But assuming that "self esteem" as a basic motive is still being utilized, let us change the goal. Keeping "becoming director of the community chest drive" as the immediate task, let us assume that the community offers a salary of $10,000 to whomever becomes director. This, then, is a new goal. There is no logical relationship between the goal of earning $10,000 and the task of becoming director. Therefore, in this case, the relationship is extrinsic.

When the goal becomes the prize, or salary, as in this instance, then it must also be concluded that the satisfaction for self esteem is being lessened at the same time. The person will still perform the public service as director of the drive, but the energy which was directed at obtaining the $10,000 was probably aimed at the satisfaction of another motive.

Much of what is done in school must accept the above limitations. If educators operate from the standpoint of meeting needs, then the relationship between tasks and goals should be as nearly
intrinsic as possible. For example, if the school wishes to meet the need for self actualization and feels that a knowledge of mathematics is necessary for a person if he is even to approach his potential, then the student must be made to accept the task of learning mathematics. In the sense in which we first spoke of intrinsic and extrinsic relationships, the learning of mathematics is inherently extrinsic for it is imposed from without.

However, in the case of the relationships between tasks and goals, the situation is not inherently extrinsic, and the teachers or others can do a great deal to make things more meaningful and logical. For example, still using the instance of mathematics, the teacher can help the students establish the goal of having an adequate understanding of mathematical concepts. Then let us assume that the task is to be able to handle problems in long division. In order to see that all the students develop this skill, the teacher might keep reinforcing the desire to achieve the goal by showing the students the necessity for an understanding of mathematics. He might let them make certain purchases, or figure the income tax for their parents, or budget their allowances, or the like, and in performing these actual jobs, point up the necessity for understanding mathematics in our society. So long as the students perform the task of long division in order that they can reach the goal of proficiency in mathematics, the relationship between the task of long division and the goal of proficiency in mathematics is an intrinsic one.

But when the teacher turns from this sort of motivation to the
use of grades, failure, and other devices, he turns from intrinsic relationships to extrinsic ones. In doing so, he channels off a portion of the energy from achieving the goal of mathematical proficiency, to whatever artificial goal has been introduced. For example, many teachers will punish the students who are not able to get the school work by keeping them in after school, or denying the privilege of doing something they really wish to do. When this is done, the goal changes to some degree. Instead of directing energy toward proficiency in whatever school job they are working on, the energy is now directed, in part, toward avoiding the punishment. This is in satisfaction of another motive as well.

Some would say that whatever the goal, it does not matter so long as the particular task—in this case, long division—is performed. But when the task is performed to reach an illogical and unrelated goal, such as the avoidance of punishment, the learning is not as permanent, and the wholeness of the situation is destroyed.

The difficulty, of course, with sticking to intrinsic relationships, lies in the prior establishment of the goal with the students, and then with constant reinforcement of that goal. For many of the things that we ask the students to do in school, the goal must be established. That is, the goal is not something that the students normally feel a need for, and it must be imposed. As has been said, this means that they are inherently extrinsic in this sense. But since it is rather well demonstrated that there is a need for these things in the life of the students, the teacher must accept the chal-
The challenge of the establishment of such goals, call upon his skill as a professional person, and do so. This is motivation in its highest sense. It is a basic justification for having teachers.

The question for this chapter is whether or not competition is intrinsic or extrinsic as it operates in the classroom. Competition may be either intrinsic or extrinsic. First of all, competition, in one way or another, must be present. It is a consequence of our social living and the nature of our particular culture. Competition functions to allow the members of society to find their places in that society, and the only alternative is to have a rigid caste or status society in which every member's position is predetermined. However, the manner in which competition is used may take more than one form. It follows closely the pattern discussed above for intrinsic and extrinsic relationships. If the competition is for a goal which is intrinsically related to the task being performed, then the competition is intrinsic as well. For example, if the students have accepted the goal of proficiency in mathematics, and then endeavor to do as well as they can, using the performance of the other members of the class as a measure of the success of their performance, then this is intrinsic competition. But when a prize is offered, or a punishment is threatened, and the performance is aimed at the achievement of the prize or the avoidance of the punish-
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ment, then the goal for which they are competing has shifted to an illogical and unrelated relationship in respect to the task being performed. In this instance the competition is extrinsic.

A certain amount of competitiveness will always be present, but the teacher can use it to achieve the goals which have been set, or it can be used in the extrinsic manner described, and energy channeled off toward unrelated goals.

This is not to say that all of the goals which the school works toward are inherently extrinsic. There are a number of motivations such as the need for security, independence, and safety, which come from within the organism, and which are therefore intrinsic. This is a more vital field for students, but one, strangely enough, which is sadly neglected. The schools are much more concerned with seeing students achieve proficiency in things which must be imposed upon them from without, and are inclined to neglect the areas of real felt need. Little has been done in recent years to locate the common needs and problems of the various ages of students, and little has been done to provide means of seeing that proficiency is acquired to deal with these problems as well.

**Effectiveness of competition in motivation.** Having defined the above terms, and having shown the importance of intrinsic and extrinsic relationships in school learning, it was stated that competition was ever present in our society, and was something that must be dealt with in the classroom, rather than ignored. It was stated that competition could be either intrinsic or extrinsic and that
teachers should try to utilize it as an intrinsic force. But intrinsic or extrinsic, the next question is how effective competition is in getting things done. While it is present in the society, is it a valuable source of energy?

Research has been quite extensive in this matter, but not always conclusive. May and Doob\(^8\) complain bitterly about the quality of the research after a careful investigation of the literature up to that time (1937). They say,

Their work, as they have left it, is one of the clearest examples of the insidiousness of a short-sighted methodological approach that the literature most unfortunately possesses. . . . Two studies are sufficient to reveal the aroma of this type of work.\(^6\)

By far the greater part of the research that has been done on the effectiveness of competition in motivation, was done prior to 1937. The committee, of which May and Doob were a part, accumulated and analyzed this research in a very thorough manner, and that job will not be repeated here. In the most recent publications concerning competition the classic studies such as Maller's,\(^9\) Moede's,\(^10\) and Hurlock's,\(^11\) occur again and again, and so are considered as current evidence for the effectiveness of competition in motivation. The conclusions, therefore, drawn by May and Doob are still of importance

\(^8\)May and Doob, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 38.
\(^9\)Maller, \textit{op. cit.}
\(^10\)Moede, \textit{op. cit.}
for us today. An early conclusion which is drawn by these authors is that in a competitive or cooperative situation the presence of other people, or the knowledge that other people will be present changed the social form of the behavior and the performance of the individuals concerned. They conclude, however, that it is not certain just what that change will be, for the procedures, tasks, and subjects are so mixed that it is hard to draw conclusions for all of them. Pointing out that the results of the research are conflicting, some of the conclusions they were able to reach are as follows:

1. The quantity of work in the social situation was increased in some experiments whereas it was left unchanged or decreased in others. The improvement seemed more noticeable in tasks involving physical movement or simple mental processes rather than "intellectual" manipulation.

2. The quality of the work in the social situation was decreased in some experiments, although there were exceptions.12

And farther on, though dissatisfied with the quality of the research, the following conclusion was reached:

In the American public schools children work more efficiently in competitive than in cooperative situations.13

Research by Vaughn and Diserens14 was published shortly after that of May and Doob. Some of the same studies were reviewed in their

12 May and Doob, op. cit., p. 33.
13 Ibid., p. 38.
14 Vaughn and Diserens, op. cit.
paper and very similar conclusions were reached. Vaughn and Diserens said that better results are obtained when students compete, but it appeared that the less capable students benefited most. They also concluded that work for the self is more efficient than work for the group.

Since the time of the studies mentioned above there has been a surprisingly small amount of experimental research on the effects of competition in motivation. This, despite the very careful job done by Allport, et al. in lining up needed research in 1937. A dissertation, however, done by Phillips in 1954 shows similar results. Phillips concluded:

1. Small groups seem to perform intellectual tasks more efficiently under competitive conditions than under cooperative conditions.

2. Cooperation and competition, intelligence, and cohesiveness do not appear to have different effects upon the process behavior of small groups.

3. Groups appear to be more motivated in competitive situations than in cooperative situations.

7. Close friends are more motivated in competitive group situations than children who either dislike or feel neutral toward each other, while close friends are less motivated in cooperative group situations than children who either dislike or feel neutral toward each other.

It appears that, at present, competition does produce a greater quantity of work, and that the work is more efficient, than
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15 Allport, op. cit.

16 Phillips, op. cit.
under cooperative conditions, or when the individual is working alone. It also appears that there are a great number of individual differences. Most investigators discovered that competition benefitted the less capable student more than the capable ones. Keller further concluded that there were a great number of individual differences in response which made it difficult to generalize on the results. Vaughn and Diserens said that a competitive situation is not good for all persons. Nervous and excitable people appear to show a social decrement.

Hilgard and Russell\(^\text{17}\) point out that competition implies reward, punishment, praise, blame, success, and failure. Here the research of Schmidt,\(^\text{18}\) Thompson and Hunnicutt,\(^\text{19}\) Sears,\(^\text{20}\) and Keister\(^\text{21}\) are pertinent. It is generally held that praise is better than blame, reward better than punishment, and success better than failure. In and of themselves, this may be the case, but as they are

\(^{17}\) Hilgard and Russell, \textit{op. cit.}


related to competition and motivation, this is not always true. After a look at the above research one discovers that personality makes a difference, for as in the Thompson and Hunnicutt study it was found that extroverted children responded better under conditions of reproof than of praise. So once again the plans of the teacher must turn toward a sensitivity for individual differences when employing competition, or the related factors listed above. He cannot conclude that what is good for some is good for all.

A final question is to ask what it is that takes place when competition is employed that produces the change that enables the person to do a greater quantity and more efficient work. If it can be accepted that there is such a thing as good competition, then it is important that one sees the effect of this force on the body. It is believed that because of the fact that our society is not a caste or status society, each member soon learns that it is through competition and comparison that one finds his place in the society. Therefore the mere presence of other members of the society, or even the knowledge of one's progress as he compares himself with others heightens the interest and sharpens the reactions of the person as he endeavors to make the best place for himself that he is able.

Triplett says, "The bodily presence of another contestant participating simultaneously... serves to liberate latent energy not ordinarily available..."22

Specifically, it is known that under competition, the blood pressure is raised and the pulse becomes more rapid. This same condition in the body is found when the person is afraid, or is mobilizing for some unusual effort. It is not unrealistic to liken the effects of competition to the effects of fear. When we switch the concern of the individual in competition from the anticipation of victory to the fear of defeat, it is seen that the conditions of fear are probably always present in a competitive situation.

Boulding says:

> Often it is not the prospect of reward as much as the prospect of disaster which spurs us to effort, and failure is often the goad which has spurred a man on to success.\(^{23}\)

Jersild\(^{24}\) makes a similar point in a recent publication, when he shows that while anxiety is one of the great problems which mental hygienists have to deal with, at the same time, it is necessary that certain amount of anxiety be in existence at all times. A minimum amount of anxiety is what makes us act and accomplish things.

The negative side of competition as a motivation has been neglected thus far, and certainly the case should be stated, if only in summary form. The arguments against competition can be quickly made for the adverse effects of competition are easily seen. The

---


\(^{24}\)Arthur T. Jersild, In Search of Self (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1952. 141 pp.)
scheme, if carried too far, presents a picture of all mankind in the shape of a pyramid with only one person at the top. All the others would fail. And depending on how keenly the contestants feel, in some instances the effects are very detrimental. Instances of suicide over grades in school, and feelings of great inadequacy are common. The mental hygienists feel most strongly about the stress on competition, pointing out that it is the cause of much mental trouble.

But the criticisms of competition in the society can be confined to competition in its extreme form. When the mental health of the contenders is being damaged, the tension of the conflict should be relieved. It is then obvious that the situation has not been healthy and that competition was not being wisely employed. To eliminate competition, however, as some infer they would like to do, is not realistic and perhaps not even desirable at this time.

Summary. A motive is a condition within the organism produced by needs or drives which initiates activity or behavior. Motivation is the process of organizing and directing the energies which arise from motives toward a particular goal. A goal is that particular thing which the organism strives for in order to satisfy the drives which he feels from within. The achievement of the goal ordinarily involves the performance of a number of tasks.

The terms intrinsic and extrinsic can be discussed from two points of view. First, a need is said to be intrinsic if it comes from within the organism. That is, it is intrinsic if it would be felt independent of the influence of the environment. Examples are
food and air. There are other needs which are intrinsic in that they will always occur in human beings, such as safety, self-esteem, and self-actualization. But there are also extrinsic needs which have been imposed on people, and are strictly the result of the environment. Many of the things that are taught in school fall into this category. Social mores, in general, would be so classified.

Second, the relationship of tasks and goals is intrinsic when the relationship is logical. When a person performs a social service as a task in order to reach the goal of achieving status in the community, the relationship between the task and the goal is logical. But when a prize or a punishment is introduced in order to obtain social service from people, and the goal shifts to gaining the prize or avoiding the punishment, then the relationship between the task and the goal is extrinsic and illogical.

Competition can be used in either an intrinsic or an extrinsic manner. When the relationship between the task and the goal is intrinsic and competition is introduced among the people who are trying to achieve that goal, then the competition is being used in an intrinsic manner also. But when competition is introduced in obtaining a goal which is not logically related to the task, then competition is being used extrinsically.

Competition produces a greater quantity of work and the work is more efficient than when competition is not present. It raises the blood pressure and increases the pulse rate. It releases latent
energy which, otherwise, would not be available, and mobilizes the individual for action. Its effect on the organism is similar to the effect of fear and anxiety.

But in addition, competition has detrimental effects on many individuals. When forced to compete against odds which they feel they cannot overcome, individuals develop debilitating mental problems. Some withdraw and refuse to participate. Also, there are great individual differences in the response to competition as a motivation. Some nervous and excitable persons lose control of motor functions in the pressure of the competitive situation. Research shows, as well, that young people, and less capable people profit from competition more than do others.

In Chapters IV and V it was learned that a certain amount of competition will inevitably exist in society. In this chapter it was shown that competition is effective in motivation. It works best when tasks and goals are intrinsically related. However, competition can be detrimental when the contenders are unwilling, or are not relatively equally matched. Therefore it is concluded that the schools should accept competition but should guard against unfavorable competitive situations.

It is believed by some that the schools do not accept competition. In the next chapter some of the writings of leaders in educational theory and practice will be surveyed in an effort to determine their general attitude regarding the place of competition in public education.
CHAPTER VII
ATTITUDES REGARDING COMPETITION AS REVEALED IN THE LITERATURE

In the chapter on the competitiveness of the culture it was shown that there are some widespread misconceptions concerning the prevalence and the type of competitiveness which exists in our society. It would be a desirable thing if the people who call loudly for a renewed emphasis on competitive free enterprise were aware of the inconsistencies in their demands.

On the other hand it is necessary to examine the position of those who defend a greater emphasis on cooperation. In particular, the attitudes of the educators must be surveyed to determine whether their minds are closed to competition in the same way that the attitudes of others are possibly closed to further emphasis on cooperation. Emphasis on cooperation to the exclusion of competition amounts to indoctrination, which is hardly the prerogative of the schools.

Such an investigation of the attitudes of educators is difficult and amounts to a task worthy of a dissertational study of its own. However, in this chapter a sampling of the statements of educators and other influential persons is offered and conclusions are drawn with the above limitations in mind.
I. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

Forces favoring competition. Historically, writers in all fields have favored cooperation as an ideal state. However there have been notable exceptions, and these exceptions have been powerful influences despite the scarcity of their numbers.

Many writers have allowed a place for competition in the scheme of things, but Thomas Hobbes in the seventeenth century was one of the few philosophers who stood firm for the primacy of competition in the motivation of man. He believed that the avoidance of pain and the desire for power motivated all of man's behavior. This desire for power resulted in a constant state of competition among men. This, then, was the nature of things and there have been many who followed the teachings of Hobbes.

Some two hundred years later Charles Darwin, acknowledging the influence of Malthus and Spencer, implanted very deeply in the minds of the world the idea that man must constantly be engaged in competition if he is to survive. Competition was described as nature's way of gradually bettering the world and all the things that were upon it. Darwin's theory of natural selection has made man more conscious of the importance of competition than has any other one thing. In later years Darwin and some of his followers did tone done the harshness of the emphasis on competition and showed a place for cooperation as well, but the strong influence for favoring competition has remained.
More recently Adam Smith described the laws of supply and demand and glorified the operation of competition in the free market. From the thinking of Adam Smith the competitive system of free enterprise was born in this country and has flourished from the beginning. Obviously the influence of Adam Smith for acceptance of competition has been strong. The system has succeeded well, and the citizens of the United States enjoy a standard of living which is not matched anywhere. In doing this, competitiveness has reached a peak in the United States which has not been seen at any other time in history for so large a number of people.

Finally a strong force for the acceptance of competition is the fact that it has always existed in the societies of men. Some writers believe that it is a universal principle which exists everywhere. The fact that it has always been present where men have lived together has made it a difficult thing to change.

Forces favoring cooperation. Despite the ever present existence of competition and the strong personalities who have advocated an honored place for it in society, the forces which would eliminate it and substitute cooperation have likewise been strong. Thinkers since the beginning of recorded history have held that competition is a lesser law of social interaction and that as soon as man is able he must eliminate the evil factor and begin to live under laws of cooperation. This manner of thought is implicit in virtually all of the religious beliefs and has received great encouragement from the pulpits throughout the ages.
About one hundred years after the time of Hobbes, Rousseau exerted a strong influence for the acceptance of cooperation over competition. He believed that the natural state of man was a state of love and harmony. The ugliness and hate of the world was a result of the inadequacy of men and the corruption of the natural state. He urged a return to the natural state which meant a return to a cooperative way of life.

Sociologists have been very active in campaigning for increased cooperation over competition. One writer reviewing the literature of the sociologists concerning competition and cooperation said,

The basic but unexpressed problem running through much of the sociological literature seems to be "What is the maximum extent to which human cooperation can go?" In spite of the countless failures of cooperative enterprises in the past and in the present, the commonest view holds that the upper limits have by no means been reached, and that social progress is hereafter to be measured in terms of the effectiveness of collective action in the interest of common goals.\(^1\)

A quotation from Ward, an early sociologist, substantiates the conclusion drawn by these men.

Once, when herborizing in a rather wild neglected spot, I collected a little depauperate grass that for a time greatly puzzled me, but which upon analysis proved to be none other than genuine wheat. It had been accidentally sown in this abandoned nook, where it had been obliged to struggle for existence along with the remaining vegetation. There it had grown up and sought to rise into that majesty and beauty that is seen in a field of waving grain. But at every step it had felt the resistance of an environment no longer regulated by intelligence. It missed the fostering care of man, who destroys competition, removes enemies,

\(^1\) May and Doob, op. cit., pp. 2-3.
and creates conditions favorable to the highest development. This is called cultivation, and the difference between my little starveling grass and the wheat of the well-tilled field, is a difference of cultivation only, and not of capacity.

... I look upon existing humanity as I look upon a pristine vegetation. The whole struggling mass is held by the relentless laws of competition in a condition far below its possibilities. Just as what might be grain is mere grass, just as the potential greening is a diminutive crab-apple, so the potential giants of the intellectual world may now be the hewers of wood and the drawers of water.2

Allport, Gardner, and May have a similar conclusion concerning leaders of thought in general as that cited for sociologists:

Leaders of thought at the present time nearly all agree that in the Western world competition has produced a high technological culture which now, because of radically altered conditions, can be enjoyed by men only if they learn to displace the no longer productive competitive practices with new, as yet only partially discovered, cooperative ways of living. Formerly nearly all the virtues of society were attributed to individualistic competition, but now the reverse judgment prevails. ... The very term "competition" has become dyslogistic and "cooperation" has become freighted with eulogy.3

The above summarizes to some degree the strong influence for cooperative living which has come down to us as a result of the philosophies of leaders. At times the influence of the thoughts of these people has been abetted by the circumstances of the times. Especially in times of crisis, people are more inclined to turn to some change in the way of things in order to provide a better existence. Such has been the case in times of depression. During the 1930s when making a


3 Allport, Gardner, and May, op. cit., pp. 2-3.
living was so difficult in most parts of the world, it was much easier to influence people in the acceptance of a cooperative way of life over competition. It was during this period that there was the most activity in research and in writing concerning the building of attitudes for producing more cooperative citizens. So as we look at the attitudes of educators at the present time it must be recognized that there have been at least two strong forces at work influencing them to emphasize cooperation over competition. One of these has been the thinking and writing of the majority of the leaders of the world, and the other has been the results of the unusual conditions brought about by the great depression and the consequent dissatisfaction with the capitalistic system.

II. THE ATTITUDES OF EDUCATORS

We turn then to the present time and look at the attitudes of educators as they are revealed in their writings. Educators should stand as impartial elements in the process of learning to the extent that this is possible. It is not the function of teachers to indoctrinate the students with one point of view to the exclusion of the others. When they fail to be impartial, their function as educators in a democracy where men should be allowed to make up their own minds is thereby seriously impaired. It has not been possible in this study to examine all of the literature of all of the leaders in education, but a sampling has proved adequate in determining where the majority of the attitudes lie. The citations which follow are representative of several areas of education. An effort was made to
look at writings which would have been influential in the professional education programs of the teachers of the nation. Once again it should be said that this group of quotations is not considered comprehensive. However it is considered indicative of a trend.

**Educational philosophers.** It is understandable that it might be difficult to find occasion in the writings of these leaders where they would take a stand either for or against the inclusion of any competition in our society at all. This proved to be the case. So the influence of these people either for or against competition usually took the form of a discussion of their beliefs concerning the place of cooperation. While competition was seldom mentioned, the term cooperation was found often in all documents which were examined. Therefore, the emphasis upon cooperation will be considered as evidence of the rejection of competition as there seldom is any statement that the two could exist comfortably together. At any rate, by producing a substantial amount of material in the literature favoring cooperation, it is logical that the term competition would fall into disrepute.

In the eyes of the critics, John Dewey probably carries the blame, more than any other person, for the attitude of educators toward competition. However, the word is seldom found in his writings. That he considered cooperation to be a superior way to competition, however, seems clear:

Democracy . . . means voluntary choice, based on an intelligence that is the outcome of free association and communication with others. It means a way of living together in which mutual and free consultation rule in-
stead of force, and in which cooperation instead of
brutal competition is the law of life; a social order
in which all the forces that make for friendship, beauty
and knowledge are cherished in order that each individual
may become what he and he alone is capable of becoming. 4

Otto, in presenting Dewey's philosophy had this to say:

... Democracy is not a mere association of individuals
whose purposes or acts are individualistic in the laissez-
faire sense. It is not even primarily a form of government.
It is an intelligent use of cooperative means for the pro-
gressive attainment of significant personalities. 5

The Commission on Secondary School Curriculum, Thayer serving
as chairman, felt that the conditions of American life call for refine-
ment of the concept of associated living. They wrote:

As members of an industrial culture, the American people
are undoubtedly becoming more and more interdependent. This,
as has been pointed out, calls for rather drastic modifica-
tion of the prevailing concept of individualism. The trend
toward a growing collectivism means that, if the democratic
tradition is to be maintained, new and more effective means
of working together must be devised.

Brameld 7 says the present bitter, ruthless competition is
unsuited to our shrinking world and will ultimately end in conflagra-
tion. He calls for renewed emphasis on cooperation though not in the

4 John Dewey, "Education and Social Change," Social Frontier,

5 Max C. Otto, "John Dewey's Philosophy," Social Frontier, 3:266,
June, 1937. (Italics in original.)

6 Commission on Secondary School Curriculum, The Progressive
Education Association, W. T. Thayer, Chairman, Science in General

7 Theodore Brameld, Ends and Means in Education (New York:
manner of those who would alter our form of government.

Bode stresses the importance of emphasizing cooperation in the following paragraph:

Regulation is necessary to keep open the door of opportunity for all, to keep vested interests and pressure groups from trampling on people who get in their way, and to foster the spirit of wider understandings and wider cooperation on the basis of wider common purposes.  

Hutchins felt that the hope of the world lay in cooperative world wide understandings. He wrote that the important task of the educational system was to establish peace. He spoke of developing a world government which would in turn create a peaceful world community characterized by communication among the members and by the understanding of a common stock of ideas and ideals. In this world community the common humanity of every man and nation would be recognized. The description stresses cooperative ideals. He says further:

The history of our own country from the Gold Rush to the Chicago newspaper wars shows that competition between states, as between individuals, can operate peacefully only with some difficulty, and then only within a framework of law.  

Breed, taking the other side of the controversy, decried the trend toward over-emphasis upon cooperation, socialism, and communism. He blamed the experimentalists for influencing the thinking of a large portion of the nation in an acceptance of communal thinking. It is

---


important to note that Breed apparently stood out against a widespread trend, toward cooperative thinking. His citation of a statement by John Dewey is also important in that it substantiates the statements cited earlier in this chapter. Breed says:

In the manner of statistical extrapolation, they assert that the trend is toward a more cooperative organization of society, and this trend should be recognized in planning the tasks of government and the schools. Says Dewey: "... a strong unified intelligence and purpose must be built up in support of policies that have a definite trend toward a socialized cooperative democracy. The schools cannot remain outside this task."

Curriculum and methodology. From the above it is apparent that a student subjected to the writings of the educational philosophers would come out with a preference for cooperation over competition. While the desirability of a cooperative way of life is not questioned the problem lies in whether or not anyone has been given a chance to decide for himself about the values of the two concepts.

In the areas of curriculum and methodology, the story is essentially the same. One of the most influential publications in the past ten years was the one done by the Educational Policies Commission entitled Education for All American Youth. Within this document "ten imperative needs" of youth are listed which have been as widely quoted as the "Seven Cardinal Principles" of 1918. The ninth need listed is Cooperation, which is described as "... to be able to live and work cooperatively with others."

---


Alexander and Saylor examine the present day secondary curriculum in terms of its provisions for each of these needs. In the instance of Cooperation they say:

"... Every element of the school curriculum offers opportunity for learning about and practicing cooperative action. We can analyze the essential characteristics of people whose way of life is governed by cooperation, and then note examples of how these characteristics may be exemplified or studied in each curriculum element."

Such an analysis is then made.

Alberty quotes The Philosophy and Purpose of the Ohio State University School in establishing desirable modes of behavior which the public high schools should strive for. In addition to others he lists:

"Developing cooperativeness. The school program should provide continuous opportunities for young people to work together toward common needs. This includes cooperative planning of programs in every area of school life, and the carrying out and evaluation of such programs."

Burr, Harding and Jacobs include a section in their book on group life. Missing in this section is any reference to the function of competition and therefore the inference is that there is no function. The place of cooperation, however, is suitably amplified:

"Group work is essential in a democratic elementary school. Modern schools are responsible for teaching children to assume shared responsibilities and to carry on cooperative activities, both of which contribute to

---


optimum development of the individual personality and to the common group life.\textsuperscript{14}

In another place in speaking of developing a proper educative environment, they say:

Utilize cooperative procedures which release group energies for the common good rather than competitive procedures that may cause tensions, aggressive behavior, or disintegrative feelings of failure.\textsuperscript{16}

Stiles and Dorsey speak favorably of cooperation and specify that it must be a part of the democratic school, but point out that undesirable results come from competition.

The democratic way places reliance upon respect for the individual, cooperation among individuals, responsible participation of all individuals, and the free function of individual intelligence directed toward the solution of problems of group living.\textsuperscript{16}

A democratic society, therefore, needs a type of teaching that emphasizes and provides opportunities for the development of individual initiative based upon attitudes and habits of cooperation, self-discipline, and objectivity of thought and action.\textsuperscript{17}

And for many who do receive passing grades this goal is accomplished only with a sense of discouragement and inferiority as a result of continuous competition with superior students.\textsuperscript{18}


\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., p. 103.


\textsuperscript{17} Ibid., p. 17.

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., p. 48.
Smith, Stanley, and Shores in discussing the nature of our economy point out that it was founded on laissez-faire capitalism, as outlined by Adam Smith. However,

Today the economic pattern outlined by Adam Smith—an economy characterized by vigorous price competition among many individual enterprises—has given way to a new economic structure, and corporate system. The fundamental concepts and rules of this system are in the process of development. Whatever these fundamentals may ultimately turn out to be, one thing now seems clear: The system will be characterized by cooperation among multitudes of individuals and by deliberate human management and coordination of major activities.¹⁹

A section follows closely in which the authors present the significance of this for curriculum development. It is their belief that while governmental structure has received attention in most schools "... there is a noticeable neglect and lack of concern about the economic system of the nation."²⁰ This is because for the last two hundred years the economic activity of an individual was considered an affair of his own. But "It is clear... that the economic structure is now highly interdependent, requiring the cooperative efforts of thousands of individuals."²¹

While the case is not clearly stated, it seems fair to conclude that the authors believe the economy has shifted to a dependence upon the cooperation of the individuals, rather than upon the "unseen hand"

---


²⁰ Ibid., p. 81.

²¹ Ibid., pp. 81-82.
of competitive individualism. They go on to say, "In light of these facts it is plain that the curriculum must be oriented to the economic life of the country." 22

Evidently this means that we must teach that the competitiveness of the old individualism is a thing of the past and that we must teach for the cooperativeness of the present.

Rugg decries the fact that "competition still underpins every culture-pattern of our lives," 23 and rejects allowing "the controls of the competitive give-and-take" 24 to produce our social welfare.

Kelley feels that though it is not desirable, the schools continue to produce competitive students. He says,

The unsocial character of what goes on in school gives rise to competition as a way of life. When one works by himself and does not give or receive help, the need to beat the other fellow who is working by himself at a similar task is sure to be felt. Indeed, it is the only recourse left. The idea of beating the other fellow is the opposite of helping him, and when helping is inhibited, competition is certain to take its place. It is implicit in the assumption. 25

Following the introduction for the ASCD yearbook for 1948, a full page is given to a quotation from Theodore Brameld which sets the tone for the publication. The implications for cooperation are

22 Ibid., p. 82.
24 Ibid., p. 345.
obvious here:

... this philosophy of education commits itself, first of all, to the building of a new culture. It is infused with a profound conviction that we are in the midst of a revolutionary period out of which should emerge nothing less than control of the industrial system, by and for the common people who, throughout the ages, have struggled for a life of security, decency, and peace for them and their children.28

Kilpatrick, in speaking of the role of education in a democracy, wrote:

... we must co-operate with ever-widening—not co-operate up to this line and stop—but co-operate with ever-widening social groups and agencies. If one had to choose a single definition of democracy, it would be hard to choose a better than this, co-operation in its broadest sense in ever-widening relationships.27

Douglas joins the majority of the other influential writers in education in stressing the importance of cooperation without determining a place for competition. He said:

Independence, self-reliance, and initiative were the mainstays of the pioneer. ... In order to carry on the magnificent work of their fathers and grandfathers, youth of today must possess another set of virtues, based upon the cooperative character of their age as differentiated from the more individualistic epoch which preceded it.28


Deutsch would like a re-examination of the school practices which utilize certain forms of competition with a view to reorganizing them. He says,

It seems that educators might well re-examine the assumptions underlying their common usage of a competitive grading system. One may well question whether a competitive grading system produces the kinds of interrelationships among students, the task-directedness, and personal security that are in keeping with sound educational objectives.

An article by Davis in Mental Hygiene is very clear in its rejection of competition in the schools. It says,

Since but a few may win, and since individual winning itself is not the most satisfying objective in a social world in which all seek and have a right to demand expression, is it not high time that this pernicious and narrow ideal be abandoned by educators and parents?

While technically not an educator, Montagu has recently been rather influential in establishing attitudes which favor cooperation over competition. As quoted elsewhere in the study, Montagu believes that cooperation is the normal way. He thinks man does not live by conflict and struggle, but love is the "pure flame of life."

In addition to the specific quotations above, the recent emphasis on social problems in the classroom, which has concentrated on

29 Deutsch, op. cit.

30 John Eisele Davis, "Are We Teaching Our Children To Fight in Their Play?" Mental Hygiene, 22:421-426, July, 1938.

31 M. R. Ashley Montagu, op. cit.
the problems of discrimination, scapegoating, and social living in general, is obviously directed toward regulating some of the unfortunate conditions which have resulted from allowing competition to operate without regulation or direction. Prolonged discussion of such material is bound to place great emphasis on cooperation. Moreover, the entire movement for improved group processes is heavily freighted with cooperativeness over competitiveness.

All this adds up to a conscious or otherwise "loading of the dice" for cooperation over competition. From the looks of things it would hardly be likely that a student of education and consequently the students of the public schools could come up against a good case made for competition in our schools. Even though we recognize the desirability of cooperativeness over competitiveness in many respects, it still is not sound educational procedure to present cooperativeness to the exclusion of competitiveness.

Influences advocating a place for competition. It would be unfair to infer that there was no voice for some competition in the curriculum. It is fair, however, to emphasize that these voices are few and far between. An example is the following statement by Burton:

History reveals a steady and increasing trend toward the proper control of detrimental types of competition, toward a world in which competitive and cooperative forces and processes are each given a rightful place. There will always be competition in the world, but the peoples of the world are increasingly refusing to accept
those forms of competition which involve exploitation of persons or of common natural resources. 32

Another such statement occurred in the 1965 ASCD yearbook. It says,

While we do not advocate the elimination of the kind of competition which provides wholesome incentive and adds zest and challenge to a learning situation, it is important to understand and avoid the damaging consequences of over-competitiveness. 33

It is rather certain there are other such statements, but they are at present a minority.

Conclusions. It is not likely that there is any kind of an organized program for the elimination of all kinds of competition from the schools. It is likely that the undesirable effects of uncontrolled competition have been apparent and that there has been a program for the elimination of these undesirable factors. However in doing this admirable thing, it is concluded that professional educators have been overzealous and in the process have neglected to give any place to competition at all. This is not sound, as it was shown in previous chapters that competition always occurs in society and in addition it is useful in motivation.

In the next chapter the attitudes of educators and laymen will be surveyed by another method, that of a questionnaire. An effort will then be made to put together the findings of both chapters.


CHAPTER VIII

THE ATTITUDES OF EDUCATORS AND LAYMEN TOWARD COMPETITION

In Chapter Seven quotations from the writings of some of the leaders in education and other fields indicated that for a long time there has been a belief manifest that competition is not an acceptable manner of behavior and that, therefore, cooperation should be made to take its place. While information was difficult to gather to substantiate the view that competition is rejected, it was concluded that for the most part this is the case. As further evidence as to whether or not educators look with disfavor upon competition, a questionnaire was designed to measure attitudes concerning competition and was administered to educators. In order to gather information relative to the problem, the questionnaire was administered to laymen as well. It was given to business executives because it was felt that the attitudes of this group would be representative of those most in favor of competition since it is through free enterprise that American business has succeeded so well. The questionnaire was also given to a group of wage earners believing that they would be somewhat representative of a rather large segment of our population.

I. THE DESIGN OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Purpose. It was the purpose of this questionnaire to determine whether or not the attitudes of educators differed from the
attitudes of certain other groups concerning competition. It was believed that this information would be important in determining whether the criticisms stated earlier were grounded in fact, and in providing a role for competition in the schools. Recognizing that the results of one questionnaire, using a limited sample, would not answer the charge conclusively, this information was nevertheless considered helpful in drawing conclusions.

First, the questionnaire will attempt to measure the attitudes of the three groups and determine whether there are significant differences of opinion, and then the question of the role of the school will be discussed (chapter eight) in the light of the results of the questionnaire and the facts revealed earlier in the study.

Procedure. Since there was no questionnaire available which measured attitudes concerning competition, an instrument was constructed. The questionnaire was constructed in three parts: (1) ten items concerning the competitiveness of man; (2) ten items concerning competition as a motivator; and (3) ten items concerning the competitiveness of the culture. Pre-tests were given (described below) to determine validity, and the verified instrument was then given out to three groups: (1) Educators (including teachers, supervisors, and administrators) selected at random from the state of Ohio; (2) wage earners, selected at random from the city of Columbus, Ohio; and (3) business executives, selected at random from the Ohio Directory of Industry.

Returns were tabulated on IBM cards and the results are treated later.
II. DEVELOPMENT OF THE INSTRUMENT

Measuring attitudes. Attitudes have been defined as "A consistency among responses to a specified set of stimuli, or social objects." An attitude is a customary and predictable manner of behavior of an individual when he is confronted with certain verbal, pictorial, or other social stimuli, which are familiar to him as a result of past experiences. Attitudes are charged with emotion, and while they can be altered, the individual will tend to respond in a consistent manner. That is, he will be inclined to retain his beliefs about the existence and the worth of things, more than he will be inclined to alter them.

Green says, "The concept of attitude does not refer to any one specific act or response of an individual, but is an abstraction from a large number of related acts or responses." It is the consistency and the relatedness of these acts which enables the investigator to say that a person has an attitude which favors a thing such as competition, or that he does not.

How does one measure such responses? Green and Ferguson have described several ways. The method most generally used is to construct a number of items which represent the controversial feel-

1 Green, op. cit., p. 355.

2 Loc. cit.

3 Ibid., Chapter 9, pp. 335-369.

ings about the concept which is under investigation (competition in this instance), then submit the items to the groups whose attitudes one wishes to compare and determine whether they agree or disagree with the statements in the items. A scale of responses are possible for the person reacting to the statements. He can "strongly agree," "agree," be "undecided," "disagree," or "strongly disagree." There are variations of this scale, but this is representative. Following Likert's method of summated ratings as given in Ferguson, weights are given to these responses and a numerical score results. The responses of the individuals can then be compared, and this reflects the attitude of the respondents toward the concept under investigation.

**Item construction.** The items in this questionnaire were built around three questions. They were: (1) Is man natively and inherently competitive? (2) Is competition a good means of motivation? and (3) Is the culture of the United States essentially a competitive culture? The responses to these three questions only do not make up the "attitude universe" as described by Green. That is, these answers are not the entire content of the competitive attitude.

This questionnaire will not attempt to measure all phases of attitudes toward competition. These three questions, however, are the important ones for this study, as it is felt that they will be of most

---

5 _Ibid._, Chapter 5.

6 _Green, op. cit.,_ p. 306.
benefit in helping to determine the role for competition in the schools.

The three questions represent two different aspects of an attitude. When it is asked whether or not man and the culture are competitive, beliefs and feelings about the existence of something are being inquired into. But when the worth of competition as a means of motivation is questioned, a concept of value is then measured. Both of these things go to make up attitude. In the case of a belief of the value of a thing (as with competition as a motivator), the application is clear. In the case of the other two, if the existence of fact were being measured, it would not fall under the classification of attitudinal behavior, but in this instance fact is not being measured. It is the belief of the respondents that is being measured. This may or may not be founded on fact, just as a person's belief about the intelligence of different races of people may or may not be founded on fact.

Preparation of the scale followed the procedure recommended by Likert and Sletto with some variations. The following steps were utilized:

1. Collecting the statements. The investigator made up the statements from controversial positions which were revealed in the

---

7 Ferguson, op. cit., pp. 124-140.

literature and in personal discussion. These controversial positions, of course, centered around the three questions mentioned earlier. When following this procedure, the collection of the statements is a very vital step for there is no check for ambiguity as there is in the procedure used by Thurstone. Ferguson says,

"Each statement should be one to which individuals having different attitudes will, if given a chance, respond differently. Therefore, we must avoid statements of fact, ambiguous statements, double-barreled statements, statements having several parts, and statements reflecting more than one attitude variable."

Care was taken to follow these instructions and in addition the opinion of others was solicited. Thirty-three statements were assembled and submitted to members of an introductory education course for their reaction. This first draft of the statements is reproduced below:

1. Competition has helped make our country great.
2. Competition is a vital source of motivation.
3. People will tend to do more, and to do better, when they compete.
4. The way a baby loves its mother and the fact that babies are so dependent upon others, indicates that we are naturally cooperative and that we learn to compete later on because of the way our society happens to be.
5. Competition operates as a kind of "natural selector" and results in better products and people.

---

9 Ferguson, op. cit., p. 124.
6. Competition breeds strife and contention among people.

7. Young children compete at a very early age when they try to be first and try to get the most and the best, which means that people are naturally competitive.

8. Teachers should post the results of tests and other performances so that the students who took part can see how well they did.

9. Since life is naturally competitive, parents would like to know how their children rank in regard to performance in school with other children.

10. Competition is natural with children and they would compete whether we encouraged them to do so or not.


12. People who lose in competition are usually motivated to try harder next time and resolve to do as well or better than the person who defeated them.

13. Cooperation and love is the natural way with children and competitive behavior is learned later.

14. All of us are born with an aggressive, competitive disposition and we learn to love and cooperate later as we find it will help us.

15. People who lose in competition sometimes become discouraged, lose confidence in themselves, and tend to avoid competition in the future.
16. Contests, honor rolls, prizes, etc., are in the true American spirit and should be fostered in our public schools.

17. Only the individual student should know the results of his performance on tests, assignments, etc., and these results should not be posted or compared.

18. Teachers should stress the achievement of the group as a whole rather than the achievement of individuals.

19. Stressing the achievement of the group and playing down individual achievement is a swing toward socialism.

20. Competition is helpful for capable people, but it is harmful for those who are not capable.

21. Human beings are such, and our culture is such, that competition is inevitable.

22. Democracy succeeds more because of cooperation than competition.

23. All of us are born with a disposition to love and cooperate with our fellow man and we learn aggression and competition from our environment.

24. Life has, and always will be a competitive struggle; therefore, children must be taught to try constantly to do better than others.

25. Modern educators are leading us toward socialism by trying to eliminate competition.

26. If you take away competition you take away a vital spark of accomplishment.
27. People by nature are not capable of working for the good of a group, therefore, each man has to look out for himself.

28. The way to get something done in a group is to promote a little rivalry among the members.

29. When people are born they are neither cooperative nor competitive by nature, but learn both behaviors from the environment.

30. Competition makes many children so afraid that they cannot perform as well as they are capable of performing.

31. The way to get something done in a group is to get them to accept a common goal and to help one another.

32. Failure in a competitive situation has stopped progress and development in many students.

33. Students should be taught to help their fellows. This cannot be done if we encourage them to compete with one another.

The students were asked to comment on each of the statements, telling whether they felt they were difficult, ambiguous, interesting, etc. This served as a help in the editing of the items, and a second draft of the questionnaire was constructed. A copy of the statements used in this first revision of the questionnaire are shown below. A comparison of the items in the two drafts of the questionnaire show the following changes: Items one and eleven were eliminated and new items made to take their place. Items four, five, and thirty-two underwent major rewording. Items eighteen, nineteen, twenty-five, and twenty-seven underwent minor rewording. The items which then resulted from the first revision were:
1. Competition is essential in our democratic way of life.
2. Competition is a vital source of motivation.
3. People will tend to do more, and to do better, when they compete.
4. The fact that as infants we are dependent upon the cooperation of others indicates that we are originally a cooperative animal.
5. Competition tends to eliminate the weak and inferior and results in better products and people.
6. Competition results in strife and contention among people.
7. Young children compete at a very early age when they try to be first and try to get the most and the best, which means that people are naturally competitive.
8. Teachers should post the results of tests and other performances so that the students who took part can see how well they did.
9. Since life is naturally competitive, parents would like to know where their children rank in regard to performance in school with other children.
10. Competition is natural with children and they would compete whether we encouraged them to do so or not.
11. We should reduce the intense competition in our society by teaching young people cooperation, and by minimizing competition in our schools.
12. People who lose in competition are usually motivated to try harder
next time and resolve to do as well or better than the person
who defeated them.

13. Cooperation and love is the natural way with children and com-
petitive behavior is learned later.

14. All of us are born with an aggressive, competitive disposition
and we learn to love and cooperate later as we find it will
help us.

15. People who lose in competition sometimes become discouraged,
lose confidence in themselves, and tend to avoid competition
in the future.

16. Contests, honor rolls, prizes, etc., are in the true American
spirit and should be fostered in our public schools.

17. Only the individual student should know the results of his
performance on tests, assignments, etc., and these results
should not be posted or compared.

18. In our democracy teachers should stress the achievement of the
group as a whole rather than the achievement of individuals.

19. Modern educators tend to stress the achievement of the group
rather than individual achievement, which is a swing toward
socialism.

20. Competition is helpful for capable people, but it is harmful
for those who are not capable.

21. Human beings are such, and our culture is such, that competition
is inevitable.

22. Democracy succeeds more because of cooperation than competition.
23. All of us are born with a disposition to love and cooperate with our fellow man and we learn aggression and competition from our environment.

24. Life has, and always will be a competitive struggle; therefore, children must be taught to try constantly to do better than others.

25. Modern educators are leading the country toward socialism by trying to eliminate competition in the schools.

26. If you take away competition you take away a vital spark of achievement.

27. People, by nature, are interested only in personal success and are not capable of working cooperatively for the common good.

28. The way to get something done in a group is to promote a little rivalry among the members.

29. When people are born they are neither cooperative nor competitive by nature, but learn both behaviors from the environment.

30. Competition makes many children so anxious and afraid that they cannot perform as well as they are capable of performing.

31. The way to get something done in a group is to get the members to accept a common goal and to help one another.

32. Failure in a competitive situation has caused many students to lose their self-confidence and has handicapped their progress and development.

33. In our democracy students should be taught to help their fellows. This cannot be done if we encourage them to compete with one another.
2. Preliminary try-out. The revised copy of the questionnaire was then submitted to thirty-one students of introductory education courses. The purpose of this preliminary try-out was to isolate and revise or throw out the items which did not give individuals who had different attitudes an opportunity to respond differently. The method of determining which items these were is shown in the next step.

3. Item analysis. The method of analyzing the statements followed what Sletto calls the "s.v.d." or item scale value difference. The purpose is to locate the items to which respondents consistently score both for and against. That is, the purpose of the questionnaire is to learn if there is a difference in the attitude of the three groups of people regarding competition. In order to find out if there is a difference, the questionnaire must have items which people, whose attitude does not favor competition, can disagree with. An equal number of items favoring competition, and not favoring competition were included. The respondents could check any one of five alternatives for each item. These were listed as "strongly agree," "agree," "undecided," "disagree," and "strongly disagree." Beginning with "strongly disagree," the alternative responses represent a scale of agreement with the item. Arbitrary weights were assigned to each of the responses. When the item favored competition, the "strongly agree" response was given a weight of five, the "agree" response, a weight of four, and so on to the "strongly disagree" response, which would get a weight of one. When the item did not favor
competition, the weighting procedure was reversed, i.e., the "strongly agree" response would have a weight of one, and so on up to the "strongly disagree" response which would have a weight of five. In both instances the "undecided" response carried a weight of three which cancelled it out.

Two items from the questionnaire which show the way in which they were scored will make it clearer:

SA 2 A 3 U 4 D 5 SD 14. People who lose in competition often become discouraged, lose confidence in themselves, and tend to avoid competition in the future.

SA 4 A 3 U 2 D 1 SD 15. People who lose in competition are usually motivated to try harder next time and resolve to do as well or better than the person who defeated them.

The letters, SA, A, U, D, and SD, stand for strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, and strongly disagree. The items throughout the questionnaire, alternated with one statement being pro-competition and one statement being anti-competition. The weights were assigned to the items in such a way that a high score meant that the person favored competition. For example, in the statements above, a person whose attitude favored competition would be inclined to agree with item 15, and disagree with item 14. His score for item 15 would be either a 4 or a 5, and his score for item 14 would be either a 1 or a 2.

Depending on which of the alternative responses the person checked, a score of one, two, three, four, or five was given to each
of the thirty items. When these individual scores were totaled up a
final score could then be assigned to each questionnaire which was
filled out.

The next step was to separate the ten highest and the ten
lowest total scores. Out of the thirty-one who filled out the
questionnaire, the ten who had the highest total score were the ten
who were most favorable to competition. The ten lowest total scores
were the ones who were least favorable to competition. The total
scores only served to distinguish individuals who favored competition
from people who did not favor it. The next step was to see how
these people reacted to each item. The problem was to find the
items that these two groups tended to agree on. These would be
items which would have no "scale value difference" and would have
to be either thrown out, or revised. The method for making this
calculation is shown in Table I. The item scale value difference
in this instance is .7 which shows a critical ratio of 2.25. This
is significant at the .05 level of significance which justifies
retention of the item. The item used as an example in Table I had
the smallest s.v.d. of any of the thirty items on the final revision
of the questionnaire. For all of the other items, the difference
was much greater.

Scale value differences were calculated for all thirty-three
items on the first revision of the questionnaire. The differences
are shown in Table II.
TABLE I

CALCULATION OF ITEM SCALE VALUE DIFFERENCE AND CRITICAL RATIO FOR ITEM NO. 7 OF "QUESTIONNAIRE ON COMPETITION" (FINAL REVISION)

Item 7: It is human nature to struggle more for the success of the group than for personal success.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Highest Ten</th>
<th>Lowest Ten</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>(fx)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean

\( \text{Mean} = 4.1 \quad 3.4 \)

Item scale value difference: \(4.1 - 3.4 = .7\)

Critical ratio = \( \frac{\Sigma fx_1 - \Sigma fx_2}{\sqrt{\Sigma fd_1^2 + \Sigma fd_2^2}} \) where \(\Sigma fd_1^2 = \Sigma fx_1^2 - N(M_1^2)\)

Critical ratio = 2.25

*Formula from Sletto, op. cit., p. 6.


TABLE II

SCALE VALUE DIFFERENCES FOR THE THIRTY-THREE ITEMS ON THE FIRST REVISION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE ON COMPETITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>s.v.d.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>s.v.d.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>s.v.d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not used

It was discovered through this technique that a number of the items were not usable. Items 19, 20, 25, and 28 turned out to be worded in such a manner that they would not show differences and were not calculated. Items 2, 7, and 31 were not showing differences either and had to be either reworded or thrown out. The wording of the items such as item 22 which showed a high difference, was studied and use was made of this in reconstructing the questionnaire.

A second revision of the questionnaire was then made up. This time the preliminary try-out was taken to a group of graduate students in education and a group of graduate students in business administration. It was felt that the reactions of these two groups would be more nearly like the reactions of the people for whom the questionnaire was ultimately intended. This time there was a marked
difference shown in the responses of the two groups. Out of the
ten who scored lowest on the questionnaire there were no business
administration students. The ten who scored highest were made up
of half business administration students and half educators.

The s.v.d.s. were calculated once again and the results are
shown below in Table III.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>s.v.d.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>s.v.d.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>s.v.d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As was stated earlier, item 7 had the lowest s.v.d. which
was .7. However, this was a significant difference and the item was
retained as were all the others. A duplication of the completed
questionnaire is included in the appendix.

It should be pointed out at this point that when the final
revision of the questionnaire was made up, the items were grouped
into the three categories mentioned earlier. The first ten items
were designed to measure attitudes concerning competition and the
nature of man. The next ten items (no.'s. 11-20 inclusive) were designed to measure attitudes concerning the effectiveness of competition in motivation. And the next ten items (no.'s. 21-30 inclusive) were designed to measure attitudes concerning the competitiveness of the culture. It was then possible to calculate a sub-total for each of these three groups and by comparing them, the attitudes of educators, wage earners, and business executives could be determined for these three sub-headings as well.

III. ADMINISTRATION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Selection of the sample. (1) Educators. It was decided to include teachers, supervisors, and administrators in the educator's sample as a cross section of the attitudes of the group as a whole was desired. In order to do this, the cooperation of a number of superintendents of schools was obtained. Copies of the questionnaire were placed in the hands of the superintendents and early in the school year, at orientation meetings or where it pleased them, they had some of the teachers, administrators, and supervisors, in their districts fill them out. The following table will show the districts which cooperated, and the number of questionnaires returned. In the case of the Truro Schools, the investigator took the questionnaires to the individual schools where they were filled out at staff meetings.
TABLE IV

OHIO SCHOOL DISTRICTS WHICH COOPERATED IN ADMINISTRATION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE ON COMPETITION SHOWING NUMBER OF RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Total No. of Questionnaires Sent Returned Teachers Administrators Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mount Vernon</td>
<td>100 21 16 4 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>50 29 25 4 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallipolis</td>
<td>65 37 36 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barberton</td>
<td>125 90 80 6 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>25 20 2 15 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truro</td>
<td>61 60 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>258 219 30 9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) **Wage earners.** Questionnaires were passed out at the Building and Trades Council of the American Federation of Labor to the representatives of the various locals and the representatives were asked to take them back to the local meetings and have the men fill them out. This was also done for the Columbus Federation of Labor. In addition, questionnaires were taken to North American Aviation Plant, The Battelle Memorial Institute (non-professional personnel only), and a few to smaller firms. In all, fifty-eight questionnaires were returned, out of a total of 500 which were given out.

(3) **Business executives.** Three hundred questionnaires were mailed out to presidents of manufacturing firms throughout the state of Ohio. Names and addresses of firms for this list were
obtained from the Directory of Ohio Manufacturers for 1954. A total of forty-six questionnaires were returned. As compared with returns from educators, the response from wage earners and business executives was very low. This is partially explained by the fact that mail-outs to these groups can usually only expect a return of from two to three per cent.

Tabulation of results. Responses were punched on IBM cards. The following information was recorded:

1. After assigning weights as described above to the alternative responses, a total score was recorded for each respondent.
2. Parents were distinguished from non-parents.
3. Occupation was distinguished for elementary teachers, social studies and English teachers, mathematics and science teachers, physical education teachers, administrators and supervisors, all other educators, wage earners, and business executives.
4. Male was distinguished from female.
5. Three groups were distinguished for age: those from twenty to thirty; those from thirty to fifty; and those fifty and over.
6. Protestants were distinguished from Catholics.
7. Sub-totals were recorded for the three groups of items in the questionnaire, i.e., items having to do with the competitiveness of man, items having to do with competition as a motivator, and items having to do with the competitiveness of the culture.
8. The weighted response for each item was recorded.

Using this information the following calculations were made:

1. Totals for Educators, Wage earners, and Business executives were compared.

2. Totals for the six groups of educators, described above, were compared.

3. Sub-totals for competitiveness of man, competition as a motivator, and competitiveness of the culture were compared for educators, wage earners, and business executives.

4. Responses for each item were compared for educators, wage earners, and business executives.

5. Total scores were compared for men and women.

6. Total scores were compared for the three age groups described above.

7. Total scores for Protestants and Catholics were compared.

8. Total scores were compared for parents and non-parents.

IV. RESULTS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Total Scores. Probably of most significance were the calculations on the total scores for the three main groups (educators, wage earners, and business executives). These total scores represented the attitudes of the groups toward competition. Table V shows the results of the calculations.
**TABLE V**

**COMPARISON OF TOTAL SCORES FOR EDUCATORS, WAGE EarnERS, AND BUSINESS EXECUTIVES ON "QUESTIONNAIRE ON COMPETITION"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number in group</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>t-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educators (1)</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>90.70</td>
<td>13.40</td>
<td>1.36 (1,2) 6.41** (1,3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage earners (2)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>93.31</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>1.36 (2,1) 4.15** (2,3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business executives (3)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>105.08</td>
<td>17.05</td>
<td>6.41** (3,1) 4.15** (3,2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The higher the score, the greater is the acceptance of competition.
**Indicates that figure is significant at the .01 level.

Table V shows mean scores, standard deviations, and t-s for each of the three groups. The mean score is a measure of central tendency which indicates the general acceptance or rejection of competition. If the respondents of any one group had been consistent in a strong agreement with items which favored competition and strong disagreement with items which did not favor competition then all of them would have scored 5 points for each of the 30 items. Adding up the 30 items each of the respondents would have had a total score of 150. A neutral or undecided score would have meant 3 points for each item and a total of 90. Anyone who was consistent in his rejection of competition would have scored a total of 30 points for the questionnaire since he would have gotten only 1 point for each item. Of course no one ordinarily scored as consis-
tently as this, but it is the tendency in one direction or the other which indicates their acceptance or rejection of competition. The mean score of 90.70 for educators, then, indicates that they appear to be undecided.

Table V also shows the standard deviations for the three groups which is a measure of the variability of the scores within the group. The standard deviations for all three groups show a rather high degree of variability in the responses. The ts indicate the significance of the difference between the means of the three groups. The mean of the wage earners is only slightly higher than that of the educators and the difference is not significant. The mean of the business executives is somewhat higher than either that of the educators or the wage earners. The t for both of these is significant far beyond the .01 level. This means that less than one time in a hundred would you expect to find differences which were this great if left to chance.

In light of the criticisms which have been made it is interesting to note that the attitudes of educators and wage earners do not differ significantly. However, the attitudes of the business executives differs significantly from those of both educators and wage earners. If one were to assume that the responses of the wage earners were somewhat typical of people in general, it would have to be concluded that educators were more in agreement with the people generally than were the business executives.
Attitudes of educators. Table VI shows a breakdown of the responses of six classifications of educators. The results are interpreted in the same way as those in the preceding section.

The reason these data are included is that it is the opinion of some people that physical education teachers have somewhat different attitudes toward competition than some others in education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number in group</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>F-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary teachers</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>88.16</td>
<td>11.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social studies and English teachers</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>91.53</td>
<td>17.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical education teachers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>95.57</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math and science teachers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>94.17</td>
<td>16.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other teachers</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>92.98</td>
<td>12.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators and supervisors</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>91.02</td>
<td>12.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same might be said of the other classifications listed in the table. However, the results indicate that there are no differences of significance. The variance of the scores of the six groups were analyzed by means of what is called an F-test. The F in this case was only 1.59 which was not significant. It is interesting to note, however, that the mean score of the elementary teachers was the
lowest. This is possibly accounted for through the fact that there are more women in elementary education. A succeeding table will indicate that the attitudes of women and men differ significantly. It is also possible that the professional education of elementary educators stresses cooperation more than other areas.

The competitiveness of man. As was said, the questionnaire was organized into three parts. The first ten statements were concerned with whether or not man is naturally competitive or if he becomes competitive for other reasons. For easier interpretation of Table VII which follows, these statements are reproduced below:

1. All of us are born with a disposition to love and cooperate with our fellow man and we learn aggression and competition from our environment.

2. Human beings are such that competition is inevitable.

3. The fact that as infants we are so dependent upon the cooperation of others indicates that we are originally a cooperative animal.

4. Competition is natural with children and they would compete whether we encouraged them to do so or not.

5. Cooperation and love is the natural way with children and competitive behavior is learned later.

6. We are naturally competitive as is shown by the intense competition of young children as they try to be first, get the most, the best, etc.

7. It is human nature to struggle more for the success of the group than for personal success.
8. All of us are born with an aggressive, competitive disposition and we learn love and cooperation from our environment.

9. It is more natural to cooperatively seek and give help to others than to competitively struggle to make ourselves superior to others.


Table VII shows the results of the responses of the three groups to the above ten statements which were designed to measure attitudes concerning the competitiveness of man.

### TABLE VII

**COMPARISON OF SUB-TOTALS ON "COMPETITIVENESS OF MAN" FOR EDUCATORS, WAGE EARNERS, AND BUSINESS EXECUTIVES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number in group</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>t-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educators (1)</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>34.11</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage earners (2)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>35.46</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business executives</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35.93</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.26*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates that the figure is significant at the .05 level of significance.

Mean scores in Table VII indicate that all three tend to believe that man is naturally competitive. This belief, however, is much stronger with business executives than it is with either educators or wage earners.
Competition as a motivator. The next ten items in the questionnaire were designed to estimate attitudes concerning the effectiveness of competition in motivation. The items are reproduced below:

11. Rivalry, in a group, usually promotes good fellowship and friendly feelings.
12. Competition usually results in strife and contention among people.
13. People will tend to do more, and to do better, when competition is stressed than when cooperation is stressed.
14. People who lose in competition often become discouraged, lose confidence in themselves, and tend to avoid competition in the future.
15. People who lose in competition are usually motivated to try harder next time and resolve to do as well or better than the person who defeated them.
16. Competition makes many children so anxious and afraid that they cannot perform as well as they are capable of performing.
17. Even the people who lose in competition benefit just from having competed.
18. You can get more done in a group by getting the members to accept a common goal and help one another, than by promoting competition.
19. You can get more done in a group by promoting a little rivalry among the members than by promoting cooperation.
20. Failure in a competitive situation has caused many students to lose their self-confidence and has handicapped their progress and development.

Results of the responses of the three groups toward these ten items are shown in Table VIII.

**TABLE VIII**

COMPARISON OF SUB-TOTALS ON "COMPETITION AS A MOTIVATOR" FOR EDUCATORS, WAGE EARNERS, AND BUSINESS EXECUTIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number in group</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>t-Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educators (1)</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>28.64</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>2.68** (1,2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.14** (1,3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage Earners (2)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>30.72</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>2.68** (2,1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.10* (2,3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Executives (3)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33.09</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>5.14** (3,1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.10* (3,2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicates that the figure is significant at the .01 level.**  
*Indicates that the figure is significant at the .05 level.

Results shown in Table VIII indicate that educators do not feel that competition is as effective in motivation as do either wage earners or business executives. Differences here are all significant.

**Competitiveness of the culture.** The next ten items having to do with the competitiveness of the culture are likewise reproduced below:
21. Contests, honor rolls, prizes, etc., are in the true American spirit and should be fostered in our schools.

22. In our democracy teachers should stress the achievement of the group as a whole rather than the achievement of individuals.

23. Our schools should try to produce individuals for our democratic society who are competitive, "rugged individualists," rather than individuals who favor the cooperative group effort.

24. Democracy succeeds more because of cooperation than competition.

25. Because of the nature of our capitalistic, free enterprise, democratic way of life, it is essential that we stress competition more than cooperation in the schools.

26. In our democratic society students should be taught to help their fellows rather than encourage them to compete with one another.

27. Since life itself is so competitive, our schools must prepare students for life by stressing competition in the classroom.

28. The intense competition stressed in our society is a violation of true democracy, and cooperation should be stressed instead.

29. Life has, and always will be, a competitive struggle; therefore, children must be taught to try constantly to do better than others.

30. Forcing students to compete in the classroom is not lifelike since in real life nobody is forced to compete in an occupation which he does not choose.
Table IX summarizes the results of the responses to the above ten statements.

**TABLE IX**

**COMPARISON OF SUB-TOTALS ON "COMPETITIVENESS OF THE UNITED STATES' CULTURE" FOR EDUCATORS, WAGE EARNERS, AND BUSINESS EXECUTIVES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number in group</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>t-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educators (1)</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>28.04</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage Earners (2)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29.46</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.06**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Executives (3)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35.39</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>7.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3,1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.06**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3,2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicates that the figure is significant at the .01 level.**

It was in respect to the competitiveness of the culture that there was the greatest difference of opinion. In this area the business executives strongly held the attitude that the culture was competitive. Both wage earners and educators disagreed. It will be noted that these differences were significant well beyond the .01 level.

Tables VII, VIII, and IX have shown the results of the attitudes of educators, wage earners, and business executives regarding the competitiveness of man, the effectiveness of competition in motivation, and the competitiveness of the culture, respectively. What conclusions can be drawn from the results shown in these tables? First, it is interesting to note that all three groups consider man
natively competitive. The business executives follow through the next two tables by indicating a belief that competition is a good motivator, and that the culture is competitive also. The educators and the wage earners are not so consistent. Both these groups are not convinced that competition is a good motivator, nor do they believe that the culture is a competitive one. The inconsistency of these results possibly indicate a somewhat confused state of mind concerning competition. Greatest differences existed for the subtotals on the competitiveness of the culture. It is the business executives who feel that life in our culture is competitive. Comments which were written into the questionnaires and other correspondence indicated that the business executives felt strongly about the matter of competition. This is borne out by the fact that the majority of the respondents from the group of business executives made comments. Some of them were very extensive, and several took the time to write separate letters stating their positions. One person felt compelled to contact the president of the university evidently to be assured that there was nothing subversive being carried on in connection with the study. Copies of some of the letters which were received are included in the appendix. These letters point up the intensity of the feeling concerning competition, cooperation, and possibly socialism which exists in the business group. This was not the case with the educators or the wage earners. Comments were seldom found and the majority of those that did appear were concerned with the mechanics of the questionnaire. The educa-
tors questioned wording and techniques while the wage earners who are undoubtedly a less verbal group essentially said nothing.

It is interesting, also, to note that even though these groups disagreed when it came to marking the questionnaire, in their comments, when they spoke of competition versus cooperation, they often agreed that we should have both in our society. An educator wrote: "For most of us, a little competition is probably a good thing but more is accomplished by cooperation." A business executive wrote: "In our society, competition and cooperation can and should go hand in hand. Free enterprise must be nurtured by the will to excel but not to destroy." The total score on the questionnaire for this business executive was 124 which placed him as strongly competitive.

More often, the comments of the business executives were strongly worded for competition. For example: "Strong aggressive and competitive spirit makes good leadership so essential in life when striving for either personal or group gain." And again, "In my estimation the greatest hazard to the future of this country is the trend toward syndicalism. It can be averted only by a strong independent spirit which was the basis of creation of this country."

Business executives are firm in a conviction that competition must be retained as a way of life, but they feel there is a place for cooperation within the framework. Educators and wage earners are not so firm. Their responses also indicate a lesser emotional feeling in regard to the concept. The slight inconsistency in the
response of the educators possibly shows a confusion concerning the term competition. Their response to a questionnaire is anti-competitive, yet their remarks show a place for it in society as well as cooperation. It is probable too that while attitudes cannot be divorced from emotionality, the responses in the case of all three groups are heavily emotional rather than intellectual.

**Analysis of individual items.** A detailed analysis of each item was made in the same way that was used for the totals. The results of this analysis are shown in a table in the appendix. Also included in the appendix is a copy of the completed questionnaire so that the results in the table can be checked with the individual items.

**Sex differences.** Most research has shown that the behavior of male and female does not differ in regard to competition. However, Table X indicates that when it comes to attitudes concerning competition there is a significant difference. Results show here

**TABLE X**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number in Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>95.77</td>
<td>16.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>89.83</td>
<td>10.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicates that the figure is significant at the .01 level.**
that there was nearly six points difference in the responses of men and women. This difference is significant at the .01 level. This same difference showed in the preliminary tryouts for the questionnaire which was done with college students.

**Age differences.** Table XI shows the results broken down into three arbitrary age groups. Indications here are that the older one is the more one favors competition.

**Table XI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Number in group</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29 (1)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>89.19</td>
<td>11.99</td>
<td>-1.96 (1,2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-49 (2)</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>92.87</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>-1.95 (2,1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-up (3)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>97.94</td>
<td>16.39</td>
<td>-3.68** (3,1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicates that the figure is significant at the .01 level.**

**Indicates that the figure is significant at the .05 level.**

There are at least two possible explanations for these results. One is that as people grow older they tend to prefer maintaining the status-quo rather than initiate sweeping changes. Since competition is recognized as the way of life here in the United States, perhaps they would tend to answer the questionnaire in
such a way as to preserve it. The other is perhaps as people grow older and have more experience that the consensus of opinion of this older and more experienced group is that a competitive way is a better way. In addition, since there is a trend in our society toward more cooperative behavior, it is expected that the younger people would be more cooperative in their attitudes than older people who lived in more competitive times.

Protestant and Catholic. Responses of protestants and Catholics did not differ. Both groups tended to favor competition. Results here might have been different if a more adequate sampling of Catholics had been taken. Those sampled among the educators were all teaching in the public schools and none were taken from the parochial schools. In the case of the wage earners and the business executives, however, the Catholics were from the general population. Results are shown in Table XII below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number in group</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>t-score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>92.81</td>
<td>14.37</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholics</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>94.70</td>
<td>15.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parents and non-parents. Table XIII indicates that parents are significantly more favorable toward competition in their attitudes
than are non-parents. This probably follows the results of the responses of age groups in that parents would be older than non-parents.

TABLE XIII

COMPARISON OF TOTAL SCORES FOR PARENTS AND NON-PARENTS ON "QUESTIONNAIRE ON COMPETITION"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number in group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>t-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>94.47</td>
<td>14.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-parents</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>89.95</td>
<td>13.83</td>
<td>2.27**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicates that the figure is significant at the .01 level.

Summary. Results from the questionnaire indicate the following:

1. The attitudes of educators are neither favorable nor unfavorable toward competition in general.

2. The attitudes of business executives strongly favor competition, their responses being significantly different from those of both educators and wage earners.

3. Wage earners tend to favor competition slightly, but their responses do not differ significantly from those of educators.

4. The attitudes of elementary teachers, social studies and English teachers, physical education teachers, and administrators and supervisors, do not differ significantly in regard to competition.
5. The attitudes of teachers, supervisors and administrators did not differ in regard to competition.

6. The attitudes of educators, wage earners, and business executives indicate agreement in the belief that man is naturally competitive.

7. Business executives favored competition as motivation, wage earners were undecided, while educators rejected it.

8. Business executives felt strongly that the culture of the United States is competitive while wage earners and educators did not.

9. The attitudes of men were significantly more favorable toward competition than were the attitudes of women.

10. The attitudes of older people were more favorable toward competition than were younger people.

In the previous chapter it was shown that educators are exposed to a great amount of material which favors cooperation, and seldom encounter material which favors competition. As a result it is expected that educators would tend to develop attitudes which did not favor competition. The results of the questionnaire which have been shown in this chapter indicate that educators are somewhat neutral regarding competition in general though showing strong disfavor for some aspects. The results also show that there is some indication of confusion concerning the term competition due to a tendency toward inconsistency in the responses to the various subgroups.
In the next chapter an attempt will be made to clearly state a place for competition in the public schools. This will be done in light of the material which has been gathered thus far.
CHAPTER IX

COMPETITION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: IMPLICATIONS

Information presented in previous chapters has prompted the following conclusions:

1. Competition is a universal principle found in all social living. It is the means whereby individuals find their place among their fellow men.

2. It is commonly believed that our culture is characterized by competitive free enterprise in the laissez-faire, free market sense. This is not the case since many non-competitive elements exist. Our culture is both cooperative and competitive, and our economy is predominately competitive.

3. While man is neither competitive nor cooperative by nature, there are great differences among individuals which predispose some to seek and thrive on competition, while for others it is less effective.

4. Competition serves to determine the position and function of individuals within the society. The only alternative for competition in this respect is a rigid status system which would determine one's position arbitrarily.

5. The writings of leaders in education are heavily weighted with information regarding cooperative behavior, yet the role for competition is seldom mentioned.

6. Attitudes of educators concerning competition, as shown
in responses to a questionnaire indicate that they neither favor nor disfavor competition in general, but do show strong negative attitudes toward competition as a motivator and do not feel that the culture is competitive.

7. Competition is effective in motivation.

Summing up these conclusions it is apparent that there is some inconsistency in our thinking and management of competition. The inconsistency could be stated in this manner: There is a certain amount of competition which is inevitable in social living. Competition is effective in motivation. Yet by virtually ignoring the principle in educational writings and training we consequently do not adequately prepare students to compete in society.

The present chapter will attempt to offer helpful suggestions for the resolution of this inconsistency. First, an interpretation of competition will be presented. This will be followed by a suggested role for competition in the schools.

I. AN INTERPRETATION OF COMPETITION

Definition. A thorough discussion of competition and its meaning was presented in Chapter II. The definition which was arrived at was as follows:

Competition is the behavior of a person, as he acts alone, or as a member of a group, attempting to place himself in a position which is superior to that of certain other persons.

This is the behavior of the individual as he attempts to take his place in society. At present, there is considerable conflict and
hostility involved as competition is carried on. This is not necessarily the case and through proper training and clarification of our thinking concerning competition, it is possible to make it an amicable testing and exploratory process which would enable each person to find the most suitable place among the members of society that potentially exists for him.

**Must competition exist?** It is concluded that competition must exist for two reasons. First, it is a means of motivation for which there is no substitute seen at this time. It produces changes in the body which activate the organism. Where there is no competition there is lethargy. Second, it is through competition that the individual members of society can find their place in that society. By finding what one can do best, and then doing that thing, all of society is benefitted.

**For what does man compete?** Man competes for a place of respect among his fellow men. Every man needs to feel that he makes a worthwhile contribution to society, and when he performs in a capacity best suited to his individual potentialities, he gains for himself the status and prestige which he seeks. At the same time, society is benefitted. It is status and a feeling of worth which lies back of all the striving. At present, this status is achieved through a variety of things many of which are not desirable. Certain objects of prestige gotten for conspicuous consumption are examples. It is the job of society to change the means whereby men achieve status. The energies of the members of the society can then be turned to more constructive pursuits.
How does man compete? Men use a variety of means to compete ranging from the violence of war to much more acceptable activities. Sometimes it becomes so important to win in the competition that serious damage is done to personalities even when the individuals are not in a state of war. The important point under this heading, however, is that men also cooperate in order to compete. It would be desirable to teach individuals that it is through cooperation and recognition of the worth of our fellows that we can compete most effectively.

Summed up, competition exists wherever societies exist. The members of society compete for a position of status within that society. They compete in a variety of ways ranging from violence to cooperative means.

II. THE ROLE OF COMPETITION IN THE SCHOOLS

The evidence gathered indicates rather forcibly that competition has not been shown its due respect in the public schools. Students in public schools who are taught how to cooperate and not how to compete have not been properly schooled to take a place in a society which must operate under a certain amount of competition. In this section the role for competition in the schools will be discussed under five headings. First, a case will be made for competition by reviewing the material which has been gathered for previous chapters and presenting it in condensed form.

Second, the paradox which is presented by the need for competition in society and the teaching against it will be discussed.
Third, a statement will be offered concerning the job of the school.

Fourth, the conflict which exists in the world today between individualism and socialism will be discussed as it related to the teaching of competition.

Finally, a series of problems will be presented which will point up the utilization of competition in the classroom.

The case for competition in the schools. It is concluded that the age-old emphasis on the idealized state of cooperativeness has produced a negative attitude toward competition among educators which is out of proportion to the facts that are available. Recognizing that in most respects cooperation is a more acceptable ideal, it is believed that the beneficial qualities of competition have been virtually ignored. Therefore, a review will be presented here summarizing some of the findings of research which would indicate that competition is a useful concept.

It should first be said that the case against competition is rather well known and will not be taken up here in detail. It is known that some individuals are not physically nor emotionally built for intense competition. It is also known that much unfair competition now exists in the schools where unwilling contenders are matched against one another and where the outcomes are well known before the competition is engaged in. We know that when a person is forced to compete against his will that harmful personality results become evident. Constant losers become unrealistic in the assessment of
future goals tending to set them either too high or too low. They appear confused by the pressure and the frustration. But since the case for competition is not so well known, it will be presented here in more detail.

1. Competition does produce results. Wolf found that it produced more persistent behavior than either praise or no incentive at all. Schmidt found that social classwork was superior to home-work, and concluded that competition and social stimulation was the cause. Maller found that efficiency of work is greater under competition. Allport, Gardner, and May, concluded that though the quality was in doubt, the quantity of work will increase when competition is utilized.

2. There are physiological changes which take place when competition is employed which enable the person to perform more effectively. Triplett showed that there was a release of latent energy which was not otherwise available, and Whittemore said that there was some evidence that the subject will undergo physiological changes which lead to a rise in blood pressure. This equips the person for more intense activity and attention.

---


3. There are rather extreme individual differences in people in their reactions to competition, though there is some indication that these differences might find greater homogeneity when sub-grouped. Thompson and Hunnicutt found that introverts responded better to praise, but extroverts to reproof. Maller found that cooperation increases with intelligence to a certain point and then decreases, the duller group being least cooperative. He also found that the competitive group displayed greater ambitiousness, showed greater persistence, were from wealthier homes, and had better health. Wickens\(^3\) showed that competition did not increase performance on problems to the same extent at all levels of difficulty, but was less effective for the more difficult problems.

4. On the other hand, Sears\(^4\) found that students who were unsuccessful academically tended to set future goals very high or very low. They were evidently unable to realistically appraise their own ability. Allport, Gardner, and May concluded that cooperative group thinking is superior to that of most individuals. Maller found that the individuals in the cooperative groups were more honest. Harrell\(^5\) found that among industrial workers, the

---


output would decrease as soon as a contest was over. And as was said, the quality of the work is in doubt, under competitive conditions.

These four statements simply add up to the fact that though there are individual differences, there are desirable and undesirable aspects of competition. The important thing here is that people cannot afford to ignore the desirable elements. In 1913 Ash said that energy is productive when there is urgency of suggestion. When there is no competition it is like "... men carrying a beam, if all but one bend over, he must bend too, and the tendency is to bend lower and lower." 6

Ash said further:

Communism in property and industry causes societies to move in lockstep fashion, thus making all to conform in their stride to that of the most feeble and lethargic.

The principal cause of the "mental dullness, physical laziness, and lethargy of primitive races" is due to communism in property and in all their enterprises and undertakings more than to any other cause. 7

Educators cannot conduct schools in which the students languish without enthusiasm or energy. If removal of competition from the school scene were accomplished, this kind of lethargy evidently would take its place.

On the other hand, competition cannot be allowed to run rampant,

7Loc. cit.
and uncontrolled. The evidence above indicates that the effects on some students are rather serious. An optimum amount and quality of competition in the school is the answer and this must at all times be nurtured and regulated. Just as competition could not be allowed to run free and unhampered in the economic scene, it follows that competition cannot be allowed to run without regulation in social interaction.

Accepting the presence of beneficial elements in competition, its operation must be elevated to a higher plane than in primitive times. Instead of man being restrained in competition by fear of retaliation as in animal-like fighting, competition must be thought of as a positive force which allows each individual to make the most of himself.

Competition: a paradox in our society. Throughout the ages thinkers in all fields have idealized the state of cooperation and have debased the operation of competition. Only in the field of economics have there been champions for competition in any significant numbers, and even here there are many who think that the cooperative is a higher level of social living. At the same time society operates in virtually all walks of life under competition. This produces a paradox which is difficult to justify or to explain. Either competition should be eliminated or people should recognize its place and should prepare individuals to operate within it. This paradox is found in most institutions. The home teaches the values of cooperation yet emphasizes the importance of competition when parents demand that their children do better than others and do more
than others. Parents make much of the competitive grades which are brought home. They compare their children in dress, speech, and manner, and yet continue to stress the fact that cooperation is the better way. The schools do the same. In the classroom, on the playground, or in the halls, the word is cooperation. Yet teachers continue to compare (often unfairly) students, to conduct intense competitive contests, and to send home competitive grade cards.

Once again, there should be some resolution to the paradox. Either educators should admit to the desirability of some competition, or halt the practice of it in the schools.

Actually, it cannot be an all or none proposition. It is necessary that the schools and every other institution continue to stress the importance of regard for the personalities of others. Cooperativeness is a worthwhile ideal which should be fostered. But one must admit also to the desirability of a certain amount of competition and train the students to utilize it toward worthwhile goals. It is not possible nor desirable to eliminate all conflict in the lives of students. The conflict of competitiveness and cooperativeness is one which must remain. It ceases to be harmful when the two forces are utilized toward the same goal of developing the individual personality. Much greater harmony can exist if individuals can learn the value of cooperativeness in competition.

The recommendation is then that public schools continue to teach students how to cooperate, but in addition they must teach students how to compete as well.
The job of the schools. The public schools are not an independent agency set up by individuals for profit or to achieve selfish aims. Instead the schools are a product of the democratic State and as such have an obligation to the perpetuation of the democratic way of life. Fortunately there is incorporated into the democratic way an emphasis upon individual thought and action. In addition, provisions for an on-going program of evaluation and refinement are built into the system. Therefore part of the job of the school is to maintain the delicate balance of insuring the perpetuation of the democratic way of life and at the same time fostering the individual attributes of inquiry, independent thought, and refinement. In a sense each generation must re-discover democracy for itself. If we indoctrinate its concepts into the minds of the members a vital part of the democracy is thereby lost and the members become somewhat like puppets who only repeat the cliches of the philosophy.

Another part of the job of the school is to liberate the intellectual potentiality which exists among its members. It is the intelligence of all the people through which democracy operates. When educators withhold discussions of the benefits of competition it does not serve democracy well in regard to either of these jobs listed. It is with competition as it is with democracy as a whole. That is, the members of the democracy must discover the merits and the shortcomings for itself. And certainly it is not conducive to the liberation of intelligence if the classroom teacher presents
only the rules of cooperation and does not allow for a critical
evaluation of competition. Evidence indicates that our approach
to the problem of cooperation and competition has amounted to a
near indoctrination for cooperation in theory even though much
competitiveness remains in actual practice.

The conflict between individualism and socialism. At the
present time there is a world-wide struggle which when traced to
differences of philosophy amounts to a struggle between individual­
ism and totalitarianism. This struggle involves great quantities
of energy and resources, and is by no means resolved. While there
is assuredly not a one to one relationship between the conflict of
totalitarianism and individualism, and the conflict of cooperation
and competition, there are elements of sameness which exist. For
example, the Soviet system wishes to require that the members of
society cooperate in that all things be held communally. On the
other hand, the advocates of free enterprise in the United States
wish to promote competition and individualism. The very seriousness
of this conflict makes it imperative that the school deal with the
problem and allow information from both sides to be carefully
scrutinized.

Following the problem through to within the borders of the
United States the controversy continues to rage. Though less so at
present, it has been the case that the major political parties of the
country were divided on the issue of how much free enterprise should
operate in the economy. For example, when the government steps in
and sponsors a non-profit insurance program, this tends to eliminate the privately owned insurance companies which must operate for a profit. In eliminating the individually owned insurance companies the government is substituting a form of cooperativeness for competition. Whether or not the government should enter into such functions as this is open to question and like the matter of individualism and totalitarianism is by no means resolved.

So the struggle between competition and cooperation is both worldwide and close to home. And since it is not resolved the schools should not operate as though it were. Each individual must grapple with this problem himself, and the schools must set the stage for an intelligent resolution. The school should operate as a working example of how competitiveness and cooperativeness can function successfully side by side. It is not proposed that this should mean to the students that totalitarianism and individualism can operate successfully side by side, but that there is a certain amount of both competitiveness and cooperativeness in our democratic way of living.

Utilizing competition in the classroom. In this section an attempt will be made to offer suggestions concerning the utilization of competition in the classroom. It is felt that this can best be done through the discussion of several of the problems which classroom teachers face which might involve competition.

1. Motivation. In a previous section it was shown that competition can be a valuable factor in motivation. It is known that
the desire to be something in the eyes of others is a basic force in all men. Therefore the teacher will find it worthwhile to utilize the energy which is released toward this goal of self enhancement. However this does not mean that any kind of competition is a good means of motivation. Competition is effective in motivation when: (a) the tasks and the goals are intrinsically related; (b) the contenders are known to one another and are willing to enter the contest; (c) each contender has a reasonable chance to win.

2. Marks and grades. If competition is to fulfill its major function of allowing individuals to find their places in society there must be some means of determining when one has succeeded and when he has failed. Our present system of grading is not justified for at least two reasons: First, the students who compete with one another in the classroom are not all willing contenders. Second, the stigma attached to failure in a classroom is out of proportion to its importance. If competition is to serve us as a means of amicable exploration and testing of one’s abilities, then it cannot be a shameful thing for a person to discover that he does not do well in some one area or another. At present the grade is usually used to frighten and punish or to exalt and reward the student. Instead of this, the grade should be a matter of information which tells the student how well he does in this area. To arrive at such an attitude toward grading will take a great deal of education, but it is this higher form of competition which should be sought. This
is not to say that the students should not be encouraged to improve in whatever subject area they are working. It is the job of the teacher always to influence the students in this direction, but when the teacher counts on the extrinsic motivation of a grade to whip a student into increased output, he is losing some of the effectiveness of his teaching.

3. Amount of status available. Studies of primitive cultures have shown that in some cultures there is a great deal of competitiveness and in others a great deal of cooperativeness. It has also been shown that one of the factors which causes the competition to become intense and debilitating is for the objects of value or the things for which the individuals are competing to be scarce. It has been proposed that the thing which man competes for is status in society. He is after a feeling of worth and his efforts are aimed at self enhancement. Therefore it follows that if the classroom teacher makes a great deal of status and feeling of worth available, then the intensity of the competition will be greatly lessened and the consequences will not be so harmful. To do so would be in keeping with one of the basic tenets of democratic living. All members of a democracy should share the belief that there is worth in the personalities of each individual. When we produce classroom situations which emphasize the worth of only those who are proficient in a few select academic subjects or those who are stars on the athletic field we deny individuality and we frustrate the potentiality of a majority of the other students. The teacher should develop the
acceptance of the contribution of all members of the class as things of worth and as deserving of recognition. In this way the amount of status available will be increased and the necessity for unfair competition lessened.

4. Contests. Contests, like marks and grades, serve a purpose for the classroom teacher. However some of the same precautions must be exercised here as was the case in motivation and grading. There is a place for scholarship contests, athletic contests, and spelling bees. However, tasks and goals must be intrinsically related and the contests cannot be confined to a few areas. There must be contests in a wide variety of fields so that status can be achieved by a great number of students. At present the contests are sponsored for a rather wide variety of interests, but they do not carry equal status. While equal status might be an unattainable ideal, educators should work toward the acceptance of excellence in any constructive field as a worthy accomplishment.

b. Individual differences. The teacher must recognize that some individuals seek and thrive on more intense competition than do others. Research has shown that the difference in the hormones released in males and females makes the males somewhat more aggressive than the females. Results of the questionnaire used in this study indicated that men favored competition more than women. There are also differences in temperament and some individuals do not respond well to pressure of competition. The teacher must recognize those who are not suited to conflict, and provide other means for them
to achieve recognition and status in the eyes of their fellow men.
The research on praise and reproof is further evidence of the point
of this section. Some individuals respond better to reproof than
they do to praise, and vice-versa.

6. Knowing one's opponent. Evidence has been cited which
indicates that the intensity of competition will change when the
contenders come to know one another intimately. For example, a
banker can foreclose a mortgage on an individual whom he does not
know with slight feelings of remorse or guilt. The foreclosure is
justified in the interests of good business. However, the situation
is quite different when the banker knows the individual intimately.
When he sees the person every day and knows the reason for the lack
of ability to pay and sees the results of the foreclosure it becomes
a much more difficult thing to do. It is the same with competitors
in business. One operator can drive the other "to the wall" so long
as the intimate details of his life are not known to him and so long
as he does not have to see him face to face each day, but when they
are "friends" it is usually a more difficult thing.

For the classroom teacher this means that if he can produce
an atmosphere of mutual respect and friendliness the undesirable
effects of competition are less likely to appear. It is further
substantiation of the fact that the classroom must foster dignity
and respect for all individuals.

7. Unfair competition. Competition which includes unwilling
contenders is unfair competition. Such contending can result in
damage to personalities rather than in strengthening. The teacher must see that the competition which is carried on is fair to all parties concerned.

8. Self-enhancement through the enhancement of others.

Students must be shown that all men are striving to become the best that they can. By helping others develop their potentialities the student can oftentimes enhance his own. This is a form of competing through cooperation, but it is a much higher form of competition than that which says that the competitor must destroy his opponent before he can feel that he has succeeded. Helping others is one of the most obvious methods of gaining the admiration and respect of one's fellows.

9. Changing the meaning of competition. The meaning of competition must be changed from a concept of "each against all" to the feeling that through a process of exploration and of measuring one's abilities against those of others, all members of our society will be able to find a suitable place where each can make a contribution for the good of the others.
CHAPTER X

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

I. SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was three-fold. First, an attempt was made to clarify and analyze the term competition philosophically. This was done by defining the term; analyzing the operation of competition in the present-day culture; studying the extent of competitiveness in the behavior of man; and determining the effectiveness of competition in motivation.

Second, the attitudes of educators toward competition were studied and were compared with those of business executives and wage earners. This was done by surveying the writings of certain educators to determine their attitude as revealed in the literature, and next by constructing a questionnaire on attitudes toward competition and administering it to educators, wage earners, and business executives. Responses of these three groups were compared.

Finally the information gathered from both these procedures was brought together and a role was proposed for competition in the public schools.

II. CONCLUSIONS

A summary of the conclusions which have been drawn follows:

1. Competition and cooperation are related terms. They do not exist in pure form and cannot be thought of other than in a social context.
2. Competitive behavior may be conscious or unconscious.

3. It is not possible to compete with oneself.

4. Competition can operate whether all competitors are present at the time or not. That is, a runner can run alone, or a woman can bake a pie alone and still be competing.

5. One does not compete merely for the sake of winning or to eliminate contenders, but for a place of status and respect among the members of society.

6. The economy of the United States is not competitive in the pure or idealistic sense, but competition remains a vital force in our system.

7. Man is motivated by self-interest and therefore has been unwilling to allow competition to operate freely when it meant that things would go badly for him. As a result many non-competitive elements have appeared in the economy.

8. Man is neither cooperative nor competitive by nature. However there are great individual differences in people and it is the nature of some to seek aggressive, competitive experiences more than others.

9. Competition is inherent in social living and it is not possible to eliminate it.

10. Competition operates best as motivation when tasks and goals are intrinsically related.

11. Competition which is unplanned and unregulated can result in harmful effects on the personalities of the individuals involved.
12. The writings of educators clearly reveal the importance of cooperation but the role of competition is not determined.

13. The attitudes of business executives strongly favor competition. Their responses to an attitude questionnaire on competition revealed that their attitudes differed significantly from those of educators and wage earners who did not tend to favor competition.

14. The attitudes of educators did not differ from one another in regard to competition.

15. Educators believed that man was natively somewhat competitive, but did not think competition was a good means of motivation and did not feel that the present day culture was competitive.

16. Business executives thought man was naturally competitive; that competition was a good means of motivation; and that the present day culture was competitive.

17. Wage earners thought that man was naturally competitive; were undecided about the effectiveness of competition in motivation; and did not feel that the present day culture was competitive.

18. Men favored competition more than did women.

19. Older people favored competition more than did younger people.

In light of the foregoing, the following suggestions are made to educators regarding the role of competition in the schools:
1. Competition is an effective means of motivation and should be utilized in the classroom, keeping in mind that tasks and goals should be intrinsically related; the contenders should be willing; and each contender should have a reasonable chance of winning.

2. Since competition is an inevitable part of social living, teachers must show students how to compete as well as cooperate.

3. It is the job of the schools to liberate intelligence and make the most of each individual. Helping students to recognize the operation of competition in the culture will help accomplish this job far better than ignoring the contribution of competition.

4. The unresolved struggle between individualism and socialism is a struggle between competition and cooperation in a sense. The problem should be approached through the method of intelligence and the school should be an example of the effective operation of both forces.

5. The meaning of competition should be reinterpreted from a concept of "each against all" to the feeling that through a process of exploration and of measuring one's abilities against those of others, all members of our society will be able to find a suitable place where each can make a contribution for the good of the others.

6. Marks and grades serve a useful purpose when they are given as a source of information concerning one's progress, abilities, and potentialities. In this way they help the individual as he seeks his place in society as stated in no. 5 above. However, they should
not be used as extrinsic rewards or punishments in motivation.

7. By creating a feeling that the contributions of all members of the class are worthwhile and deserving of status, the teacher can increase the amount of status available and thereby reduce the intensity of the competition for positions in the society of the classroom.

8. Contests of all kinds serve a useful purpose so long as the precautions cited in motivation are adhered to. In addition contests should be offered over a wide field so that all students have an opportunity to excell. Success in contests in whatever field should all offer equal status to the extent that that is possible.

9. It appears that some individuals are more aggressive and seek competitive experiences more than do others. Educators should attempt to discover the individuals who seek competition and those who dislike it and provide appropriate experiences.

10. Individuals tend not to practice competition which is harmful to their opponents when the opponents are known intimately. Educators should attempt to provide school experiences which will make the students well known and well accepted.

11. Since individuals will not willingly enter into competition unless there is a reasonable chance for success, educators should not force competition among students whose abilities differ markedly.
12. Educators must recognize that it is inherent in social living that men will act to place themselves in ever more advantageous positions. It must be shown that cooperative behavior is a satisfying and effective means of achieving this status.

13. Educators must create conditions which will lessen the possibility of students achieving superiority through taking unfair advantage of others.

14. Students must be shown that all men are striving to become the best person they can. By helping others develop their potentialities, the student oftentimes can enhance his own.
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QUESTIONNAIRE ON COMPETITION

Competition is a familiar word in our society. We hear it in every walk of life. Athletics, business, school, and play are all well sprinkled with one interpretation or another.

It is believed that the term competition means about the same thing to almost all the people in our country. Competition might be described in the following manner:

The behavior of a person, as he acts alone, or as a member of a group, attempting to place himself in a position which is superior to that of certain other persons.

It is also believed that some people favor competition and some people feel it has many shortcomings and wish to minimize or eliminate it from our culture. Following is a questionnaire which is designed to find out the various attitudes toward competition and determine whether there is agreement concerning its desirability for our society.

Please answer the following questions:

Are you a parent? _____ Race ______. Occupation ________

(specifically; e.g., Male or female? _____ Age ________.

English teacher, Lathe operator, elementary Religious Preference __________. principal, etc.)

Put a check-mark in the space which most clearly indicates how you feel about the item. Please answer every item. SA means strongly agree; A means agree; U means undecided; D means disagree; SD means strongly disagree.

SA  A  U  D  SD  1. All of us are born with a disposition to love and cooperate with our fellow man and we learn aggression and competition from our environment.

SA  A  U  D  SD  2. Human beings are such that competition is inevitable.

SA  A  U  D  SD  3. The fact that as infants we are so dependent upon the cooperation of others indicates that we are originally a cooperative animal.
4. Competition is natural with children and they would compete whether we encouraged them to do so or not.

5. Cooperation and love is the natural way with children and competitive behavior is learned later.

6. We are naturally competitive as is shown by the intense competition of young children as they try to be first, get the most, the best, etc.

7. It is human nature to struggle more for the success of the group than for personal success.

8. All of us are born with an aggressive, competitive disposition and we learn love and cooperation from our environment.

9. It is more natural to cooperatively seek and give help to others than to competitively struggle to make ourselves superior to others.


11. Rivalry, in a group, usually promotes good fellowship and friendly feelings.

12. Competition usually results in strife and contention among people.

13. People will tend to do more, and to do better, when competition is stressed than when cooperation is stressed.

14. People who lose in competition often become discouraged, lose confidence in themselves, and tend to avoid competition in the future.

15. People who lose in competition are usually motivated to try harder next time and resolve to do as well or better than the person who defeated them.
Competition makes many children so anxious and afraid that they cannot perform as well as they are capable of performing.

Even the people who lose in competition benefit just from having competed.

You can get more done in a group by getting the members to accept a common goal and help one another, than by promoting competition.

You can get more done in a group by promoting a little rivalry among the members than by promoting cooperation.

Failure in a competitive situation has caused many students to lose their self-confidence and has handicapped their progress and development.

Contests, honor rolls, prizes, etc., are in the true American spirit and should be fostered in our schools.

In our democracy teachers should stress the achievement of the group as a whole rather than the achievement of individuals.

Our schools should try to produce individuals for our democratic society who are competitive, "rugged individualists," rather than individuals who favor the cooperative group effort.

Democracy succeeds more because of cooperation than competition.

Because of the nature of our capitalistic, free enterprise, democratic way of life, it is essential that we stress competition more than cooperation in the schools.

In our democratic society students should be taught to help their fellows rather than encourage them to compete with one another.
Since life itself is so competitive, our schools must prepare students for life by stressing competition in the classroom.

The intense competition stressed in our society is a violation of true democracy, and cooperation should be stressed instead.

Life has, and always will be, a competitive struggle, therefore, children must be taught to try constantly to do better than others.

Forcing students to compete in the classrooms is not lifelike since in real life nobody is forced to compete in an occupation which he does not choose.
Dear Sir:

As you probably know, there are many criticisms being leveled against educators today - some of them rather serious. For example, some people are saying that educators are trying to eliminate competition in the classrooms and replace it with a socialistic type of cooperation.

The enclosed questionnaire is part of some research directed toward this problem. It attempts to measure the attitudes of respondents toward competition. Once we know what the attitudes are toward competition, we can then see if the attitudes of educators are any different than those of other people.

Would you please cooperate by checking your response to these items? A stamped, addressed envelope is enclosed and a speedy reply is requested.

Thank you,

(Signed)
Erven Brundage
Armory, Room 10
The Ohio State University
Columbus 10, Ohio

Enclosure
October 6, 1955

Mr. Erven Brundage
Armory, Room 10
The Ohio State University
Columbus 10, Ohio

Dear Sir:

We have your September 15 letter together with the Questionnaire on Competition. It would appear that you are attempting to arrive at a conclusion through what you believe to be a scientific process, although the terms you use as the basis for the questionnaire are not scientific in any sense of the word. Competition is a familiar word in our society, but as with many familiar words it has come to mean many things to many people. There are many collectivists who would describe competition as that factor which leads men to compete in the acquisition of wealth for its own sake, or in the use of power over one's fellows, or to gain special privileges which bars others from the goods of life. If one's objectives are to destroy the right of individual choice and to support a collectivist's society, then it is desirable to have such a description attached to competition.

One of the common measures of a high standard of living concerns the quantity and quality of goods available. Maximum efficient production of goods and services, therefore, produces a high standard of living. When each person is free to produce what he is most capable of producing, there will be competition as a natural and desirable result. This competition will automatically eliminate those who are unable to produce that particular product efficiently, because the customer will tend to buy it from the producer who has the lowest price. The customer will be better off because he is spending less for his purchase. In the meantime, the inefficient producer will go into another line of production where he is able to compete, and the entire population will profit because maximum efficient production has been achieved, but it is important to remember that competition can occur only when each and every person has the freedom of his own choice. Competition is only good; it cannot be bad in the sense used in the collectivist definition above.

The picture of competition which the collectivist would like to paint is one which is a result of the lack of or the restraint of competition. A socialistic society which you refer to as "a socialistic" type of cooperation" is a society in which competition does not exist if such definition of competition is tied in closely with the freedom
of choice of each individual. The socialistic cooperative you refer to is a monopoly of the worse kind inasmuch as the freedom of individual choice has been eliminated.

You use the word "cooperate" in your questionnaire to define the opposite of compete. These are not opposites. In like manner you also intimate that love somehow is not compatible with competition. Therefore, anyone who indicates a negative answer to a statement in favor of cooperation could be deemed as uncooperative; and anyone who indicates a negative answer to a statement in favor of love could be deemed as advocating hate. To say that cooperation is the opposite of competition is like saying that chickens are the opposite of cows, when, in fact, there is no basis of comparison or contrast. If your questionnaire were properly stated, the word cooperation and its fellow words would be removed in favor of one of the following phrases:

"The absence of competition"
"A collective society" or
"A society in which individuals have no freedom of choice but should be guided only by majority rule in all situations"

Why should you imply that cooperation is eliminated when competition exists? There is competition among the employees in our tile company, but there is also full cooperation among the employees with each other. There is competition of our tile company with other tile companies, but there is cooperation among all tile companies in regard to the tile industry and the promotion of the use of tile generally. Moreover, there is competition between the tile industry and other building-material industries for the use of our product as compared with their product. The result of all of this competition ends up in a better home for people to buy. If one were gifted with the eye of a superhuman being or if one were to attempt to judge the philosophical goal of mankind, it is quite likely that better homes would be a sought-for achievement. In that respect, all those who competed all along the line were cooperative toward the objective of the end goal - better homes.

Your survey could better achieve its basic purpose if you were to ask whether or not people believed in the right to make their own choices or whether individual choices are to be eliminated in favor of collective action. Evidence is great that the vast strides of human progress are a result of an atmosphere which contained a greater degree of latitude for individuals to make their own choices as compared with most of the previous periods through the history of mankind when individual choice was a scarce item.
In effect you ask, "Shall my child be taught the philosophy of individual choice (and its resulting progress), or shall he be taught the philosophy of collectivism (and stagnation)?" I don't want you to decide that for me. Whether you like it or not, I believe this is my choice, and as my son matures, the responsibility of this choice will be transferred from my shoulders to his. The responsibility should never lie with you.

Very truly yours,

(Signed)

J. C. Sparks

JCS:ca
Erven Brundage  
Armory, Room 10  
The Ohio State University  
Columbus 10, Ohio  

Dear Sirs:

Your survey appears to follow the concept that (1) each individual is or should be either strongly cooperative or strongly competitive, (2) cooperation is directly opposed to competition, and (3) the success or failure of our democratic society depends upon either our being cooperative or competitive. It is with this concept that I cannot agree. Also, your frequent reference to the term rivalry in place of competition may be misleading to many people. While you are technically correct in this substitution, there is a difference in the more common connotation of the two words.

While I realize that each person, each group, and each segment of society may present individual cases of exceptions, it is my belief that the competitive spirit has been primarily responsible for the progress which our country has made in all fields of endeavor which has enabled it to reach the level at which it is today. This does not mean that cooperation is unnecessary - it is essential. Now we arrive at the basic consideration. Within any kind of a group there must be cooperation to some degree, in order to attain the purpose of the group. At the same time, in most cases, and especially in business (companies) and athletic (teams) groups the purpose is to gain a competitive position among other similar groups. Again, cooperation within a family group is very desirable. Yet each man is basically competing with every other man within his level of society for recognition of accomplishment, social position, and monetary achievement.

Therefore I do not believe we can separate competition and cooperation and still maintain the type of society which we now have. I realize that my failure to complete the questionnaire will not assist you in your survey. However, I believe that a narrative description
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portrays my thinking on this subject more accurately than my answers to your questions would have done.

Very truly yours,

(Signed)

D. M. Garst
Vice President
Rajak Mfg. Co.
Mr. Erven Brundage
Room 10, Armony
Ohio State University
Columbus, 10, Ohio

Dear Mr. Brundage:

After spending considerable time attempting to answer your "questionnaire on Competition," I have decided that I cannot convey to you my attitude toward competition by answering the questionnaire. In the first place, the use of words, such as "many," and "often," in the questionnaire makes it difficult to convey an accurate meaning. For example, my answer to question No. 20, "Failure in a competitive situation has caused many students to lose their self-confidence and has handicapped their progress and development," would be a strong disagreement because I believe that relatively few have been so handicapped. However, if I indicate "Strong Disagreement" on the questionnaire, you might easily think that I thought that nobody would be handicapped by such failure.

Secondly, the questionnaire seems to assume that competition is necessarily the antithesis of cooperation and that to the extent that you have the one you do not have the other. Some examples of this implication are:

Question 9 "It is more natural to cooperatively seek and give help to others than to competitively struggle to make ourselves superior to others."

Question 18 "You can get more done in a group by getting the members to accept a common goal and help one another, than by promoting competition."

Question 28 "The intense competition stressed in our society is a violation of true democracy, and cooperation should be stressed instead."

My feeling is that both competition and cooperation frequently exist simultaneously and intensively in the same situation. In fact this very combination has made a substantial contribution to our present
high standard of living. The operation of a modern business corporation is a perfect example of such a condition. There is constant competition among the employees for the better jobs, but the keenest competitors will be found among those who cooperate best with their fellow employees. In fact, generally speaking, the better and more intelligently an employee cooperates, the more successfully he will compete. On the other hand, it is easy to imagine a society in which neither competition nor cooperation would exist and people would live alone and entirely unto themselves.

My own attitude toward competition is that children should be taught the proper use and application of both competition and cooperation. By removing competition from the classroom we may save the feelings of some of the slower students, but we shall also deprive the better students of the stimulus to extend themselves to the utmost. We thereby shall contribute to the ever-increasing tendency in our country to bring everybody into conformity with mediocrity. This may be the era of the common man, but he will not contribute materially to progress.

Cordially yours,

(Signed)

H. E. Young

HEY;jlb
Erven Brundage  
Room 10, Armory  
Ohio State University  
Columbus 10, Ohio

Your form letter, Mr. Brundage, dated September 15, 1966 together with the questionnaire was received by the writer October 7, 1966; it is returned as requested, answered, but without comment—we chose to make them in this fashion.

A similar, but by no means identical, questionnaire was received from a Purdue University Associate Professor. The writer refrained from answering the Purdue questionnaire because in many respects it was insulting. Your questionnaire is more propitious in the general area of socialism vs. private enterprise. The old adage of "figures do not lie, but..." is possibly pertinent here. We presumed in responding to your questionnaire that your efforts are earnest; but take question 25. tsk! Irrespective of the manner in which the five possible responses are marked (and cross checked with number 22) the writer, statistically, could make an initial release to the press proving socialism or free enterprise; in other words—who is looking over your shoulder?

The writer attempted to be consistant in his response. There was a temptation, however, to place two small checks instead of one large check for several of the answers.

The writer happens to have a philosophy of balance rather than all free enterprise or all socialism. To make my response in another fashion; Mr. Reuther despises automation, on the other hand, are we not bringing the level of the machine up to the higher and higher level of graduates of our educational system?

Sincerely,

(Signed)

G. T. Bradner
## COMPARISON OF THE RESPONSES OF EDUCATORS, WAGE EARNERS, AND BUSINESS EXECUTIVES ON ALL ITEMS IN "QUESTIONNAIRE ON COMPETITION"

*(See copy of questionnaire in appendix)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t t 1 and 2</th>
<th>t t 1 and 3</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t t 2 and 1</th>
<th>t t 2 and 3</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t t 3 and 1</th>
<th>t t 3 and 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>2.32*</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>2.32*</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>-2.82**</td>
<td>-2.04*</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-2.82**</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>3.85**</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>3.85**</td>
<td>5.59**</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-2.81**</td>
<td>-.81</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>-2.81**</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>4.57**</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>4.57**</td>
<td>-2.74**</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>-2.57**</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>-2.57**</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>3.25**</td>
<td>-1.58</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>3.25**</td>
<td>-2.98**</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>-1.93</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>-1.51</td>
<td>-1.93</td>
<td>-1.93</td>
<td>-1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>-1.55</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>-2.10*</td>
<td>-2.82**</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>-2.10*</td>
<td>-.74</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>-.73</td>
<td>-2.59**</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
<td>-1.28-</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>2.62**</td>
<td>-5.22*</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>2.62**</td>
<td>-5.88**</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>-3.40**</td>
<td>-3.64**</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>-3.40**</td>
<td>-5.84**</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>-1.98*</td>
<td>-3.18**</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>-1.98*</td>
<td>-.94</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>-5.27**</td>
<td>-3.70**</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>-5.27**</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-3.15**</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-2.95**</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>-1.40</td>
<td>-3.25**</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>-1.40</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>-02.84**</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>-2.75**</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>-.70</td>
<td>-3.28**</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>-.70</td>
<td>-1.29</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMPARISON OF THE RESPONSES OF EDUCATORS, WA(E) EARNERS AND BUSINESS EXECUTIVES ON ALL ITEMS IN "QUESTIONNAIRE ON COMPETITION"

(See copy of questionnaire in appendix) Mean \[ t \] Mean \[ t \] Mean \[ t \] Mean \[ t \] Mean \[ t \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 and 2</th>
<th>1 and 3</th>
<th>2 and 1</th>
<th>2 and 3</th>
<th>3 and 1</th>
<th>3 and 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-7.61**</td>
<td>-6.31**</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>-7.61**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>2.29*</td>
<td>-2.34*</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
<td>-5.12**</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-6.09**</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-5.51**</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-3.04**</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>-2.07*</td>
<td>-4.70**</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-.87</td>
<td>-3.56**</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>-4.24**</td>
<td>-5.27**</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>3.76**</td>
<td>-2.39*</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicates that the figure is significant at the .01 level.
*Indicates that the figure is significant at the .05 level.
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