

Ultimate Peace Summer Camp: A Step Towards Evaluation

Kylie Millbern

University of Massachusetts Boston

Author's note: This paper is in fulfillment of a Master's Project requirement for the Department of Conflict Resolution, Human Security and Global Governance at the University of Massachusetts.

Abstract

This project examines the use of sport, specifically Ultimate Frisbee, as a method for changing negative intergroup dynamics. Ultimate Peace, an organization using Ultimate Frisbee to bring together youth divided by conflict, invited the researcher to explore and evaluate this approach by attending their annual summer camp in Israel. First, the paper addresses the body of literature surrounding intractable conflicts, intergroup dynamics, and sport and peace education models. The paper describes the qualities of Ultimate, including spirit of the game, that make it a unique approach to deliver peace education. The researcher conducted a preliminary evaluation by administering surveys to participants and observing the camp atmosphere. The surveys investigated stereotype and social hierarchy beliefs. Although the results were not overwhelmingly strong, it provides a stepping-stone for future evaluations of Ultimate Peace and the use of Ultimate Frisbee as a method to deliver peace education.

Israeli-Palestinian Conflict

Conflicts in the Middle East are ongoing and ever changing. One of the various struggles in the area is that of the Israelis and Palestinians. The Israeli/Palestinian conflict, as it is known today, has continued for many years and is deeply rooted in the history and present reality of the area currently known as Israel and Palestine. The history is complicated and fiercely disputed making it difficult to understand and resolve.

The Israeli/Palestinian conflict stems from historical grievances branching out to include current protests surrounding politics, the economy, territorial claims, and religious persecution. The dilemma spans generations, regions, and religions. The conflict includes two major groups of people: Israelis and Palestinians. Religion further serves as a basis for division and complication, separating Jews, Muslims, and Christians. These groups live in separate worlds and have different views towards the conflict situation. Each group's historical narrative relays a distinct view of why and how it started and contributes to how they perceive present-day events.

The following is a condensed (and hopefully not overly simplistic) description of the conflict's beginning. The struggle between the groups surrounds the establishment of a homeland for the two national groups and unrestrained access to religious sites and holy lands for the three religions. The struggle dates back into the early 1900s when Britain came into control of the area. Contradictory promises of land from Britain for a Jewish homeland and the maintenance of a pre-established Palestinian land set the stage for instability in the area. During World

War II there was an influx of Jewish immigration to the Middle East. Struggles between the groups deepened as religious persecution during the Holocaust increased the movement of Jewish immigrants into the British-controlled Palestine. In response, Arabs banded together to assert themselves and maintain their land. At the present day there is still violence and instability in the area as the two groups search for power and fight over differences (Benin & Stein, 2006; Moran & Storm, 2008).

The crisis in the Middle East has far-reaching effects. The area is important to followers of a variety of religions, and therefore religion plays a role and influences actions in the conflict. Neighboring countries, like Jordan, Lebanon, Egypt, Iran, and Syria, feel the consequences of refugees and the push and pull of alliances with conflicting groups. With early influence in the Middle East after World War I, Russia, Britain, Germany, France, and the United States continue to play a role in the crisis with an interest in peace as well as self-interest in economics and geopolitical reasons. The conflict is an on-going, volatile struggle spanning over 100 years with modest, drawn-out movements towards peace. Despite many diplomatic attempts to transform the crisis and develop an inclusive resolution, efforts continue to fall short (Benin & Stein, 2006; Moran & Storm, 2008).

This paper seeks to explore the influence on participants of the methods used by Ultimate Peace. Ultimate Peace (UP) is a sports program that encourages friendship between Israelis and Palestinians by teaching respect, integrity, and leadership through the use of Ultimate Frisbee (Ultimate). In 2013, I attended UP Summer Camp with the objective of conducting a preliminary analysis of the

program. I gathered information firsthand by observing the program and engaging with participants. At the beginning and end of camp, I administered surveys to the participants. First, this paper explores the dynamics of intergroup relations and the factors influencing prejudice. Next, the paper discusses intractable conflicts and the effects this type of conflict has on the culture of involved groups. The reconciliation process for an intractable conflict requires groups to adapt a new culture framework – a culture of peace – to move forward.

Education and sport are methods that help develop this new framework in society. This paper looks at the requirements of these processes and argues that sports using cooperative methods are beneficial in building a culture of peace. Additionally, specific conditions of intergroup contact help advance a reconciliation process. Using the ideology set forth by UP, this paper identifies the unique qualities of Ultimate as a tool for reducing tensions between groups and fostering an inclusive community.

Intergroup Prejudice and Dynamics

Prejudice is a universal social phenomenon that individuals and groups experience regularly. Allport (1954) defines prejudice as an attitude, positive or negative, about another group or individual of a group based on an over generalized belief that satisfies a self-serving function for the person that holds the belief. Much research has been dedicated to the study of prejudice, and its origin is the result of many influences. According to an integrated approach by Duckitt (1992), prejudice is the product of four interactive processes: underlying psychological processes, intergroup dynamics, social transmission, and individual differences.

The first process consists of natural psychological responses of social categorization and minimal intergroup discrimination (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Social categorization is an automatic response that occurs to help an individual make sense of his social world and define his own social being or identity. Social groups are made up of individuals that perceive group members to share a common characteristic that differentiates their group from other units of individuals. These groupings are labeled as in-groups and out-groups. The in-group refers to the group the individual considers himself a member and identifies with on an emotional level. The out-group is the collection of individuals to which the individual does not perceive himself to belong. In-groups and out-groups may form over real perceived differences, like gender, or minimal and arbitrary differences, such as shirt color. One person may belong to multiple in-groups and the level of adherence may change over time or according to situation (Duckitt, 1992; Tajfel & Turner).

Regardless of the defining distinction, the mere presence of another group leads to in-group favoritism or ethnocentrism, which can lead to discrimination and competition between groups (Brewer, 1986). This bias comes from a major theory of intergroup behavior called the minimal intergroup paradigm, which states that random and insignificant differences can lead to in-group favoritism. Flippen et al (1996) identified the perception of interdependence as the important motivating element of group formation. Interdependence develops when two groups experience a shared threat. The threat acts to increase the salience of categorization to identify the two groups as being part of a common in-group. In other words, interdependence activates the importance of a particular group membership to

strengthen ties to that group category. Social categorization and bias towards the in-group are pervasive and universal psychological characteristics present in human nature that is heightened by the presence of interdependence (Duckitt, 1992; Tajfel & Turner, 1986).

Certain conditions create the tendency to discriminate against another group. The second determinant is based on intergroup dynamics highlighted by competition and group differences (Duckitt, 1992). Sherif, Harvey, White, Hood, & Sherif (1961) theorized that conflict between groups is the result of competition between two groups for limited resources. According to this theory, Realistic Conflict Theory, hostility and prejudice attitudes towards the other comes from competition over real or perceived items, like power, land, or food. Tajfel & Turner's (1986) Social Identity Theory offers an additional condition that influences intergroup bias. As a product of social categorization, social identity gives meaning to an individual's self-esteem based on shared group membership. Therefore the evaluation of an individual's self-esteem is based directly on the evaluation of his group affiliation. According to the Social Identity Theory, an individual strives to maintain a positive view of his group (and self) by making positive social comparisons to other groups. The act of distinguishing his group from an out-group on some dimension creates competition by identifying superiority or power over another group. Depending on the needs of the groups, these theories work in conjunction with the natural tendency to identify differences and similarities.

The third principle, transmission of intergroup understanding and attitudes, is shared in group values and social patterns. Members of a group learn about their

own group and group history from one another. Also, the group comes to understand and learn about its own group and other groups through socialization and contact experiences. The pressure to conform to social demands and normative groups patterns influences how an individual receives social values of prejudice. The final factor is the individual. Individual differences mediate the level of motivation and adherence to group bias and prejudice. According to this comprehensive theory, prejudice is a natural response reinforced by social and individual dynamics (Duckitt, 1992).

Intractable Conflicts

Pruitt and Kim (2004) identify conflict as irreconcilable interests and goals that are influenced by perceptions and beliefs. Conflict can often be an inconsequential part of everyday life happenings. On the other hand, it can be an unavoidably unfortunate and central aspect to one's existence. The latter is true for intractable conflicts like the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and the effects have a serious impact on the involved parties.

Conflicts considered intractable follow a few main features as described by Kriesberg (1998). First, the conflict is long lasting and usually persists for more than a generation. The conflict becomes part of society's socialization process and members are taught to understand the conflict issues in a way that benefits and is acceptable to one's group. In turn, this hardens the groups' views and prevents movement towards peace. Bar-Tal (2007) emphasizes this element by saying the conflict is central to the group as it is constantly in the forefront of their identity. The second dimension states the group views both of the competing groups'

interests and goals as non-compatible or contradictory. Bar-Tal (2007) expands on this dimension to say that the conflict is zero-sum or, in other words, that if one group satisfies their goal then the other group has lost. Each group perceives the goal of the other to be a direct threat to their purpose. The next characteristic of intractability is that both groups have powerful interests that keep them going in the conflict. Bar-Tal (2007) adds that the conflict is total or existential since the conflict encompasses needs, goals, and values that are essential to one's existence. Last, an intractable conflict involves the de-legitimization and dehumanization of the other, which leads to violent actions. The intensity and momentum of a conflict can fluctuate over time, but is still considered intractable if it falls into the aforementioned context.

Conflict Culture

The consequences of an intractable conflict have an immense impact on the affected groups and individuals. Involved groups are constantly exposed to stress, threats, trauma, fear, and exhaustion. As the conflict persists and the groups continue to encounter violence or other negative experiences, the group and individual adapt to these conditions by creating a conflict culture. The group develops this new socio-psychological infrastructure to deal with the negative experience of an intractable conflict. There are three elements of a socio-psychological infrastructure: collective memory, ethos of conflict, and collective emotional orientation. These components allow the group to construct beliefs, emotions, and attitudes that aid their group in understanding, dealing with, and continuing the conflict. A conflict culture framework will justify the conflict and

dominate the way the group thinks and feels towards the other. It becomes a major obstacle to peace and reconciliation (Bar-Tal, in press; Bar-Tal, 2009; Bar-Tal, 2007).

The opposite of a culture of peace is a culture of conflict that is expressed by a socio-psychological framework of collective memory, ethos of conflict, and collective emotional orientation. First, collective memory serves to tell the history of the conflict and group relations in a way that meets the needs of the group. It is usually biased and selective in the narrative it tells. The collective memory portrays the group in a positive light and depicts their group as the victim while the other group is distorted and delegitimized. Most importantly, it gives legitimacy to the group's actions and behavior throughout the conflict. The ethos of conflict is shared societal beliefs about the present and provides a point of reference for how the group understands the conflict. It outlines the group's beliefs about the goals, requirements, and behavior concerning the conflict.

The last component, collective emotional orientation, encompasses the group's emotional reaction to conflict events, similar to an individual's reaction but spread amongst the group as a whole. Two major emotional responses are fear and hope. Bar-Tal (2001) argues that groups involved in intractable conflicts are overcome by a collective emotional orientation of fear, because it is a contagious, automatic emotional response. Repeated exposure to violence makes an individual over-sensitive to this emotion. In turn, the group avoids the other group and spends cognitive energy focusing on the threat. The group comes to view the world and interpret experiences through fear. These narratives, beliefs, and emotions that

comprise the socio-psychological infrastructure of conflict culture interact and play off of each other to become a dominant outlook within society. It provides a lens to view and interpret the world around them. Unfortunately, the construction of this socio-psychological infrastructure complicates the road to peace (Bar-Tal, in press; Bar-Tal, 2001; Bar-Tal, 2007)

The elements of conflict culture serve a distinct purpose; they are easily accessible and reinforced by members involved in an intractable conflict to make living under threatening conditions easier. Conflict culture prepares group members for violence and provides tools to defend against the enemy by bringing the group together and motivating the group for action. It allows the group to view themselves as different and superior. Also, this foundation justifies the group's action and beliefs and provides a meaningful picture of the conflict (Bar-Tal, in press). These attitudes and emotions are shared and reinforced within the group and taught to the younger generation through social structures, such as family, media and education (Bar-Tal & Rosen, 2009). As the conflict continues, fear and brutality embed conflict in the culture and the socio-psychological infrastructure of the group making it readily available and resistant to change (Bar-Tal, in press). Violence and threatening situations become a reinforcing factor that strengthens the conflict culture creating a cycle of fear and violence that becomes an obstacle to peace. The collective memory, ethos of conflict, and collective emotional orientation play off of each other affecting an individual's social identity and influencing one's perceptions of new experiences and information (Bar-Tal, 2007).

Peace Culture and Reconciliation

To move away from the kind of conflict culture associated with intractable conflicts, a new culture - one of peace - is essential to pave the way for a reconciliation process. The groups need to create a new socio-psychological repertoire that promotes understanding and resolution. Together, the groups need to develop a new collective memory, ethos of the conflict, and change the collective emotional orientation to one regarding peace. This involves changing perceptions about the past, oneself and the other. It requires creating a new relationship and preparing for a new way of living. The groups must develop trust, recognition, sensitivity and positive attitudes towards the other (Bar-Tal & Rosen, 2009; Bar-Tal, Rosen, & Nets-Zehngut, 2009).

The groups need to create a shared interest and goal of peace. Specifically, there are five societal beliefs that support the ethos of conflict and collective memory that both groups need to change or adopt. The first belief is to see peace as the new goal, which will require the groups to leave past goals and create a common goal that is acceptable to both groups. Second, the groups need to adopt new ways to deal with conflicts that arise and resist violence. Both parties need to change their beliefs concerning the other and no longer see each other as the opponent, but as an equal. This change humanizes the other and legitimizes the other's struggles. A new view towards the other also requires the group to re-examine how they see themselves in the conflict. This new outlook about groups leads to the fourth belief revision. The party must take responsibility for their contribution to the conflict. Further, it encourages the groups to look for shared values and commonalities amongst their cultures. Lastly, the groups need to change societal beliefs about their

relationship and create a new, shared history for the conflict (Bar-Tal, in press; Bar-Tal, Rosen, & Nets-Zehngut, 2009).

It is important to change the collective emotional orientation to fully allow a culture of peace to evolve; however, it is a difficult process. A collective emotional orientation of fear is automatic and bypasses the thinking processes. This unconscious response allows an individual to react and adapt to perceived danger quickly. It breeds mistrust and violence. The emotional orientation of hope requires purposeful thinking and planning to resist the automatic emotions of fear. It requires flexibility and creativity to allow an individual to envision and accept a positive outlook for the future. To develop a hope orientation takes practice and commitment, but it can allow groups to move towards a culture of peace and reconciliation (Bar-Tal, 2001)

Bar-Tal, Rosen, & Nets-Zehngut (2009) define reconciliation as a process after a formal resolution that involves the establishment of peaceful relationships among conflicting groups. It requires movement towards a peace culture and changing the socio-psychological repertoire and societal beliefs. For reconciliation to be successful, it demands support from the majority of both groups to work towards a relationship based on mutual legitimacy, trust and security (Rouhana, 2004). Bar-Tal (in press) identifies multiple methods to spread peace culture. First, the idea may be disseminated via the mass media or messages originating from a non-governmental organization. Second, peace culture may be reinforced with truth and reconciliation commissions or by payment of reparations. Joint projects or cultural exchanges strengthen the new culture. Last, peace education introduces

the new culture to the young people across a generation in an effort to negate current conflict cultures. These methods may be used separately or in conjunction to create the most appropriate technique for circulating the new culture of peace.

Peace and Sport Education Models

Bar-Tal, Rosen & Nets-Zehngut(2009) suggest that peace education is an efficient socialization method for promoting reconciliation and constructing a culture of peace. Peace education readies children and adolescents for a new way of life defined by peace and reconciliation by developing beliefs, values and behaviors that facilitate a peace process (Bar-Tal, in press). There are two models of peace education: direct and indirect. The type of model used depends on educational and political-societal conditions. Educational conditions concern support from the highest department of education, and it's ability to mobilize staff. Also, there must be a detailed plan and sufficient resources for new textbooks. The ripeness of society and support from leaders and political parties add to the social-political conditions. It is helpful if there is already progress towards peace. The occurrences of these conditions dictate the model of peace education (Bar-Tal, Rosen & Nets-Zehngut, 2009).

When society supports peace is ready for change, the education system can implement a direct peace education model. The curriculum concentrates on conflict themes directly. The focus is to create a new worldview by creating a new collective memory and a new ethos of peace. In order to be effective, the education model discusses five themes. The first theme deals with conflict and peace by discussing the different types and the nature of conflict within the current conflict. The next

theme explores peace processes by analyzing different possible peace solutions for the conflict. Then, the next theme presents the rival. This step legitimizes the other and allows the other to become an equal. Each group is given the chance to reassess their view of the other and see individuals of a group. Another theme of the direct model creates an opportunity for society to create an unbiased, inclusive history. The last theme introduces a new collective affect and emotion characterized by hope and trust. Direct peace education aims to directly transform a young generation's worldview and behaviors when societal, educational and political conditions are suitable for change (Bar-Tal & Rosen, 2009; Bar-Tal, Rosen & Nets-Zehngut, 2009).

The indirect peace education model is used when conditions are not ripe or when society is not ready for direct discussion about the conflict. This type of model does not explicitly talk about conflict, but teaches general peace and conflict resolution themes, skills and behaviors. The indirect model does not challenge society's current culture or try to introduce a new ethos of conflict. Instead, the model suggests five themes that promote positive, alternative ideas and behaviors that can encourage a new way of seeing the conflict situation.

The first theme, reflective thinking, prompts individuals to entertain other ideas and move away from rigid thinking. This type of thinking teaches the students to be critical and evaluative. Tolerance is the second theme, which teaches students to reject prejudice and stereotypes. It leads youth to learn about and accept the other. Empathy and ethno-empathy are another important theme. This teaches perspective taking and the capability to understand the thoughts and feelings of the other. The fourth theme concerns human rights. It educates youth about dignity,

respect and fundamental freedoms of every person. Last, the fifth theme is conflict resolution. It discusses conflict and conflict resolution skills in general. Students are taught that conflict is natural and are given skills to negotiate and mediate. The skills emphasize collaborative problem solving. The five themes provide a focus and an outline of skills that should be discussed within an indirect model, but are not exclusive

Direct and indirect peace education is possible under a variety of conditions. The models are not limited to their specific types and should be modified and combined to meet society's level of readiness. The aim of both models is to change the mindset of the next generation to be more open and receptive to peace. The younger generation will become future leaders and contributing members of society, and their participation in peace education will allow society to move away from the conflict and establish a peace culture. For this to occur, peace education must be open-minded and relevant to current issues. Also, it must begin in early childhood education to cultivate these ideals and socialize youth during their formative years. Furthermore, it should be community-orientated to involve parents and include experiential learning so the experience is internalized and practiced. It is important that the education experience incorporates knowledge as well as skills and mechanisms. (Bar-Tal, in press; Bar-Tal & Rosen, 2009; Bar-Tal, Rosen & Nets-Zehngut, 2009).

The delivery method of peace education can take many forms: art expression in the shape of theater or photography, dialogue by means of singing or poetry, and physical activities like boating and camping. Sport education is one method of

delivering peace education and promoting development in a region of conflict. The use of sport to encourage goodwill dates back to 9th century BC Greece with the beginning of the longstanding Olympic tradition. Throughout periods of unrest, nations declared a temporary truce in the spirit of the games so that athletes and attendees may participate in the Olympics in peace and unharmed. Since then, there have been various advances concerning sport and the right to play. In 1978, the United Nations supported the declaration that sport is a human right. Following in 1979 and 1998, the right to play extended to specifically include women and children, respectively. In 2003, the UN Inter-Agency Task Force on Sport and Development recognized the use of sport as a tool for development and peace, and included it in the Millennium Development Goals. The intrinsic nature of sport provides support for variety of agendas like health, economic advancement, and peace and inclusion (United Nations, 2003).

Universally popular, sport has the ability to cross boundaries of language, social class and generations. Sport is unique in that it can reach a wide variety of people at the community and global level and create relationships over the game. With the popularity of sport and professional teams and athletes, sports can create a communication link between governments and as a tool to unify a nation. The core values of sport are very similar to those of peace education. It promotes respect, cooperation, and communication, while encouraging social contact and inclusion. For youth it is the beginning of a healthy physical and mental lifestyle and building positive character development and life skills (Finley, 2011; United Nations, 2003).

It is important to note that when used the wrong way, sport can lead to violence and conflict instead of reducing it. This is typically the result of competition. As a result, sport history is marked with tragic incidents like killing, human rights abuses, and terrorist attacks. Competition is traditionally seen as a central tenet of sport where others are characterized as opponents, and at the end there are only winners and losers. It creates a cycle of self-worth based on success and self-doubt from failure. Often, the individual assigns blame for their loss to the opponent – not the structure of the game. This can have an adverse effect on relationships. It can create aggression, negate trust building, and entrench the view of the other as an obstacle, (Kohn, 1990)

Kohn (1990) raises the idea that sport does not require competition, but rather sport requires cooperation. Cooperative interdependent learning allows youth to build self-esteem and create positive attitudes and friendship towards the other players (Aronson, 1975). Orlick (2006) modified traditional games to include cooperation rather than competition to introduce positive socialization to children. For example, during the game of musical chairs there is one less chair than participants, so when the music stops, the children compete to find a place to sit and one child is left standing (the loser). During the cooperative version of the game the children are encouraged to find a way to get all the children seated despite the lack of chairs. This challenges the children to work together to find alternative ways to reach the goal of the game. At the same time, it eliminates an ‘us vs. them’ mentality or winner/loser cycle. A publication from Sport for Development and Peace (2008) identifies “sport [as] a means to create positive new shared identities among

formerly opposing groups in order to build a solid foundation for a peaceful future.” Overall, games in a socially inclusive and culturally relevant setting based on fair play and cooperation build self-esteem and fellowship among the players (Finely, 2011; United Nations, 2003).

Conditions of Intergroup Contact

Minimal contact between two groups is not enough to support and reduce intergroup bias. According to Allport’s (1954) theory of intergroup contact, intergroup bias may be reduced if contact takes place under four specific conditions. First, the groups must be of equal status during the contact situation. Second, the groups must work interdependently on a cooperative activity. Similarly, a cooperative activity leads to the third condition, a common goal, like winning a game. Lastly, the contact between groups requires the endorsement of authority.

With the aforementioned conditions present, Pettigrew (1998) identified mediating processes that influence the attitude change of group members towards the other group. Intergroup contact can provoke negative emotion, like anxiety, which prevents constructive communication, causes mistrust, and increases attachment to stereotypes. However, contact under Allport’s conditions can provide an opportunity for groups to learn about the out-group, while at the same time learn about their own group. As the groups spend time together and learn more about one another, they form bonds of friendship and increase positive emotion and empathy towards one another (Dovidio, Gaertner, & Kawakami, 2003). The positive interaction and personalization of out-group members can contradict previously held stereotypes and may generalize to other intergroup interactions. Furthermore,

newfound knowledge of the out-group leads the in-group to reevaluate one's own group. This reassessment of one's own group or "deprovincialization" can lead to less nationalistic pride and cultivate contact with the out-group by devaluing time with in-group members. The four conditions and intervening processes of intergroup contact work in conjunction to reduce intergroup bias.

Pettigrew (1998) developed a reformulated intergroup contact theory or extended intergroup contact by adding a fifth condition to Allport's contact theory. The fifth condition proposed by Pettigrew is the potential for friendship. He believes that intergroup friendship, although time-consuming to develop and cultivate, is powerful. Friendship encourages individuals to divulge personal information, which allows acquaintances to foster a closer relationship. The four original conditions set forth by Allport and the mediating processes of Pettigrew set the stage for friendships to develop, and once cultivated, promotes repeated contact.

As discussed earlier, social categorization and social identity have a natural tendency to influence bias, but they provide insight into the generalization of contact theory. These two theories are based on sorting the world into groups and maintaining a positive evaluation towards the groups that matter to you. Based on this idea, Pettigrew formed a longitudinal model of his extended intergroup contact theory. The three stages (decategorization, salient categorization, and recategorization) progress in an overlapping sequence as contact and friendship occur over time. Since repeated contact is not guaranteed, results depend on the individuals' progression during initial contact and friendship-making process.

Further, it is possible for contact to end or stall at any point throughout the model (Pettigrew, 1998).

The extended intergroup contact model (Pettigrew, 1998) begins at first contact. At the start there is initial individual anxiety, but an optimal situation leads to decategorization. Decategorization begins with releasing the idea that group boundaries are rigid. It is the point where group members see the other as an individual rather than a stereotypic representation of the out-group (Dovidio, Gaertner & Kawakami, 2003). This stage of contact lowers intergroup anxiety and creates an affinity towards an individual of another group as the friendship develops, but the generated feelings do not extend to other members of the out-group.

The next stage, salient categorization, occurs during established contact. The interacting individuals must see the other as a representative of their group in order for out-group prejudice to extend to other individuals and settings (Hewstone & Brown, 1986). Decategorization and salient categorization seem contradictory, but when they occur in order, initial contact is made easier and increases the effects of generalization (Pettigrew, 1998).

The last stage, recategorization, is based on the common in-group identity model (Gaertner et al, 1994) and yields the maximum reduction of prejudice under ideal conditions. The common in-group identity model is the creation of one all-encompassing and unifying group. The groups do not relinquish their original group membership and identity, but expand the boundaries of their identity to

include the other. This final stage of recategorization is the best result of contact, but it takes time and can be difficult for different types of groups (Pettigrew, 1998).

Ultimate Frisbee and Spirit of the Game

Ultimate Frisbee, simply referred to as Ultimate, is a unique sport unlike many other competitive team sports. The single piece of equipment required, the disc, was first commercially produced by the company, Wham-O in 1951. According to Iacovella (n.d.) variations of the game first developed as an underground movement beginning in the 1950s and 1960s by students at colleges, like Dartmouth and Yale. However, the first officially recorded game occurred in Maplewood, New Jersey at Columbia High School in 1968. At the beginning the rules were loosely defined and the field requirements were vague. As teams developed at nearby high schools, so did the rules. Then, the high school players graduated and moved on to college bringing the game with them. By 1975 the game expanded to colleges throughout the United States and to other countries. In response to the popularity, a players' association, The Ultimate Players Association, was formed in 1979, and an international governing body, The World Flying Disc Association, formed in 1984. In 2015 Ultimate took a step toward becoming an Olympic sport. The International Olympic Committee recognized the World Flying Disc Federation acknowledging Ultimate's advanced competitive divisions and increased participation worldwide ("International Olympic Committee", 2015).

The game of ultimate is an athletic, non-contact sport that requires two teams, a disc and a large, rectangular field with end zones. There are seven players from each team on the field at a time. The disc is passed from player to player down

the field to a final catch completion in the end zone to score a point. The disc may be turned over for a variety of reasons to the defensive team, and then the defense becomes the offensive team passing the disc from player to player to reach the opposite end zone. No player may take more than three steps with the disc in hand requiring cooperative passing to move the disc. Like any other sport, there are rules to follow in order to play the game. However, one unique aspect of ultimate is that there are no referees or ruling officials. When a player commits a foul or infraction to the rules, the player or players involved in the play are in charge of dealing with the violation. A quick negotiation between the players resolves the matter, and the playing resumes. It is the responsibility of the player to play fairly and within the rules. Dan Roddick, an early supporter and champion player, coined this type of sportsmanship as Spirit of the Game or Spirit in the 7th Edition rules printed by Wham-O in 1978 (Leonardo & Zagarola, 2005).

Spirit is an underlying guiding philosophy of the sport. It promotes a mentality different from conventional sports that encourages the player to take responsibility for his or her actions (Mcleod, 2012). Players of other sports governed by referees get caught in a winner-takes-all mentality. It negatively influences the player to push the limits and do whatever is necessary to win until identified as a wrongdoing by the referee (Mcleod, 2012). Spirit as described in the 7th Edition rulebook highlights:

“Highly competitive play is encouraged but never at the expense of the bond of mutual respect between players or the basic joy of play. Protection of these vital elements eliminates some behavior from the ultimate field. Such actions as taunting of opposition players, dangerous aggression, intentional fouling or other ‘win at all costs’ behavior are fouls against the Spirit of the Game and

should be discouraged by all players.” (as cited in Leonardo & Zagarola, 2005, p. 40)

Spirit gives control to the players with the condition that they are held accountable to a higher standard of play. Players must know the rules, play fairly and in control and be respectful to others to play within the rules of spirit.

To an outsider or conventional sports player Spirit may seem unattainable or idealistic in a competitive setting. Although Spirit is in the rulebook, teams take it beyond the rules to embody it as a cultural element of Ultimate. Culture is a phenomenon of groups that comes from the product of experience (Avruch, 1998). Schein (1990) defines culture as a pattern of basic assumptions invented and developed by a group in an effort to deal with external and internal difficulties. These assumptions are taught to new members as the appropriate way to think and behave. The culture is developed and reinforced as the group learns to survive, adapt, and acquire new members. According to Schein, the strength and intensity with which the culture takes root is dependent on the length of group life, mechanisms for learning and teaching, and the ability of the leader to share the vision. Spirit is the fundamental piece of Ultimate culture.

The idea of spirit as a cultural aspect is evident in a variety of ways. It begins with the way players view the sport. Dan Roddick described Ultimate as an “alternative mentality” to sports that focuses on the joy of playing by “taking responsibility for their play and agreeing...to play to the rules that we had written down as opposed to taking every advantage they could” (McLeod, 2012). It demands playing on a moral level, which is kept in check by the other team and your teammates. If a player violates Spirit and prevents the flow of the game by playing

recklessly, taunting another player or excessively arguing a foul, teammates show disapproval by calling bad Spirit. This is usually done as a warning to the player to get back inline with Spirit, but repeated un-Spirited actions may be answered with removal from the field or team – often by your own teammates. Teams show Spirit by praising other teams or players for playing fairly, completing a difficult catch or showing good effort. Appreciation of good Spirit is often illustrated between teams with cheers, spirit circles, and invitations to play fun Spirit games after completing a game of Ultimate. These Spirit celebrations also help ease tensions after intense play or a close game. Spirit is a moral code of conduct that dictates how the game is played and influences the mentality of the Ultimate community (Robbins, 2004).

Spirit is an example of a peace culture adapted for sports. It introduces consideration for others, mutual respect, and positive attitudes. It encourages and teaches players how to resolve conflicts peacefully and how to accept that others may have a different view of reality (Bowman, 2010). Spirit changes the dynamic between two groups by building relationships and creating positive affect towards the other team instead of viewing them as enemies that need to be crushed.

Ultimate is a unique method of peace education using spirit as an introduction to peace culture.

Ultimate Peace: Program, Structure, and Mission

When the founders of Ultimate Peace (UP) went to Israel to promote Ultimate Frisbee, they noticed an uneven spread of players amongst the different groups that inhabit the area. Ultimate was not a new introduction to the Middle East as Israel has a national team; however, not all the groups present in the region

were familiar with the sport. An uneven awareness of and participation in Ultimate was the least of the problems in the Middle East, but for UP it appeared to be a starting point to bring different and conflicting groups together.

UP is a sports coexistence program that uses the sport of Ultimate to engage diverse groups of youth with one another despite conflict, violence and social and cultural barriers. Dr. David Barkan, Linda Sidorsky, and Dori Yaniv founded UP in 2008. Each of the founders live in a different part of the world, but they work together to use the sport of Ultimate Frisbee to promote peace in the Middle East, specifically in Israel and Palestinian lands.

UP hosts two different programs: a year-round clinic and a summer program. Both sections aim to connect Jewish Israeli, Arab Israeli, and Palestinian youth between the ages of 12 and 17 around the sport of ultimate. This paper focuses on the summer program of UP, which is made up of two weeklong overnight sessions: training camp and summer camp. The camps took place in the Arabic town of Akko, Israel. The first session, training camp, focuses on advanced players and past UP participants. Summer camp, the second session, tailors to participants still developing their Ultimate skills or those new to UP and the game. The youth are divided into mixed teams of varying skill and backgrounds led by a head coach and assistant coach. The coaches are Ultimate players from around the world that volunteer for one or both of the summer program sessions. The teams practice, eat meals and participate in evening activities together. Throughout the day, the participants have free time to interact with others and attend non-ultimate activities. With such a diverse population at camp, everything is translated into

English, Hebrew, and Arabic. This can be time-consuming, but allows for camp participants to practice language skills, ensures understanding and integrates camp diversity.

UP's mission aims to build friendship, cooperation and understanding among Middle East communities divided by conflict and distinct cultural backgrounds. Usually these groups live in segregated neighborhoods or villages with little to no contact. The summer camp offers a coach-in-training (CIT) option to participants that are aging out of the traditional summer program to learn about leadership and coaching. The CIT program is available to the Middle Eastern youth as well as youth from other parts of the world. The majority of the non-Middle Eastern CITs come from the United States. Using the unique sport and culture of Ultimate, UP hopes that the youth will build friendships across divides, and the experience will equip youth with the ability to become influential leaders in their community and lead positive changes in their communities.

UP focuses the teaching of spirit around five core values: mutual respect, integrity, friendship, non-violence, and fun. These principals are taught to the youth through short skits at the beginning of the program. As the youth are introduced to the game and spirit, the coaches and CITs act as the teachers and role models to reinforce the rules and culture of spirit at teachable moments during the summer program (D. Barkan, personal communication, March 4, 2013).

The UP program design brings together youth to have fun and learn Ultimate. As a result, friendships form across social and cultural divides. As the campers return to camp or continue to play Ultimate throughout the year, they adopt the

values and culture of Ultimate into their lifestyle. In the long-term UP aims to provide a space where friendships and lessons-learned through ultimate will foster leaders, who will be able to give back to their communities and break down the barriers between the conflicting groups.

Evaluation Design

The focus of this study is to identify differences between first-time participants and returning participants of the UP summer program. As mentioned earlier, there were two summer sessions. This evaluation focuses on the data acquired during the second session. There were three main areas of evaluation: social attitudes, understanding of Ultimate and conflict resolution skills. First, the evaluation examined participants' attitudes towards stereotypes and group dynamics using the Social Dominance Orientation (Pratto, Sidanius, & Levin, 2006) and the Stereotype Content Model (Cuddy, Fiske, Glick, & Xu, 2002). Also, the evaluation gathered information regarding previous experiences with the other to understand inter-group experiences prior to camp. The next section examined the participants' understanding and adoption of the sport and its culture of spirit. The last segment of the evaluation looked at the level of participants' problem-solving abilities.

The theory of Social Dominance Orientation (Pratto, Sidanius, & Levin, 2006) states that individuals have a tendency to categorize others according to a social hierarchy, which gives legitimacy to group-based inequality. These hierarchies vary depending on the society, but age and gender are two common influences on the hierarchy rankings. Deeper levels of classification, which can be more arbitrary, are

based on religion, class, or race. These hierarchy systems are derived from a variety of societal occurrences like intergroup experiences, traditions and institutions. Societal myths or ideologies reinforce the hierarchy levels. The Social Dominance Orientation scale assesses an individual's belief or attitude towards maintaining social hierarchies or group-based dominance. Usually higher status groups will have a higher social dominance orientation and are more likely to discriminate towards lower out-groups. Adherence to social dominance is a product of the societal structure and forecasts an individual's complacency to inequality and maintenance of the hierarchies. This scale was chosen to help identify if participants have a tendency to default to and reinforce classic hierarchy leading to discrimination of out-groups or perceptions of being part of a dominate in-group.

The Stereotype Content Model of Cuddy, Fiske, Glick, & Xu (2002) was used to assess social relations focusing on an individual's position towards stereotypes of their own and other groups. This scale identifies competency and warmth as the two main dimensions of social perception. A group's reported competency and warmth levels correlate to the group's perceived status and level of competition. Competency level relates to perceived status, so someone of low status is seen as having a low competence rating and vice versa. The warmth dimension corresponds to the amount of perceived competition. Allies or groups perceived as low competition are usually assigned high warmth. The opposite is true for rival groups. Combinations of high and low ratings along the two dimensions lead to different pairings, which corresponds to the root of 4 major emotions. The emotional responses are admiration (high competency and high warmth ratings),

contempt (low competency and low warmth ratings), envy (high competency and low warmth ratings), and pity (low competency and high warmth ratings). In theory the emotional responses predict an individual's reaction towards another. The scale will help assess how each group at camp perceives the other, as an ally or rival, or as having high or low position in society.

Methods

During the camp, the participants completed two surveys – one at the beginning of camp and one at the end of camp – to supply quantitative data (see Appendix 1 for the first survey and Appendix 2 for the second survey). Additionally, the researcher collected observational data during the entire camp. She participated in camp activities and joined one of the teams as a participant observer. All camp participants were aware of her role as a researcher.

Population

UP invited the researcher to attend the summer camp sessions, located in the Arabic town of Akko, Israel, for data collection and access to UP participants. Camp attendees were recruited by the organization itself. Many of the participants participate in the UP year-round program comprised of community practices, inter-community games, and tournaments. As a result, communities participating in year-round activities make up a large proportion of those at camp. Returning participants are common, and new recruits are often friends of returning participants.

All of the UP camp participants were asked to participate in an evaluation of the program. Parents signed a consent form prior to camp, and willing camp

participants signed an assent form at camp prior to the start (see Appendix C). A total of 102 participants took part in the first survey evaluation at the beginning of camp and a total of 104 that took part in the second survey at the end of camp. There were two participants that missed the first survey. The participants were males and females between the ages of 10 and 18. Participants were from various communities within Israel and Palestine. Please see Table 1 for a complete listing of demographics. Languages spoken at camp were English, Arabic, and Hebrew. Language abilities of the participants' varied, and not all participants spoke English. As needed, documents were translated into appropriate languages and then translated back into English to confirm the translations were correct.

For purposes of comparison the participants were grouped into two cohorts: new and returning camper cohorts. The new camper cohort consisted of participants that had never attended the UP summer camp in the past, but may have attended the UP year-round program. The returning camper cohort consisted of campers that had previously attended one or more summer camp sessions. Returning participants attended no more than four camp sessions in the past.

Statistical Procedures

Demographics. For both surveys participants were asked to answer questions about their demographic. Each participant reported his or her gender and age. Then, the participants selected between Israeli Jew, Israeli Arab, and Palestinian ethnicities. These ethnicity groups are complex, and how they are framed can be controversial. A further discussion of this breakdown can be found in the "Limitations and Challenges" section. Participants indicated if ultimate was a

novel sport or if they had prior experience with the game. Lastly, they identified if this was their first time at camp, or if not their first experience at camp, how many times they had been to camp previously. (Please see Table 1 for the first survey demographics and see Table 2 for the second survey demographics.)

Social Dominance Orientation. The Social Dominance Orientation construct questionnaire normally follows a 14- or 16-item scale. The version used in this study was a shortened 10-question adaptation of the original scale adapted by a University of Waterloo doctoral candidate (Schleien, 2007) for an evaluation of a peace education summer camp. The first survey used this format, and participants responded according to a 7-point scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. A high score on this measure refers to a high Social Dominance Orientation and a preference to maintain group dominance. Questions 5, 6, 7, and 8 were reverse-coded prior to analysis. Each question was analyzed individually and together as a composite score with a one-tailed independent t-tests comparing new and returning campers.

Stereotype Content Model. In the Survey, the Stereotype Content lists 4 traits (8 in total) for each of the two major dimensions, warmth and competency. The participants rate each group present at the camp, including their own, along a 5-point scale. The participants rate each characteristic twice, once according to society's view of the group and again according to their own personal view of the group. For analysis, the characteristics were placed into either the warmth or competency dimension, and each dimension was averaged. Then, each dimension

was analyzed with a one-way ANOVA comparing the new and returning participant cohort.

First Survey. There were a total of 102 responses for the first survey with 56 new camp participants and 46 returning participants. The first survey had three main parts: intergroup interactions in home community, Social Dominance Orientation, and Stereotype Content Model. The first part focused on questions to evaluate participants' previous levels of interactions with groups other than their own. Questions concerned community diversity, openness, and the accessibility of interacting with other groups in the community. Questions identified participants' view on the feasibility of making friends with other groups. Questions of this nature were based on either a 3-point or 4-point scale. Questions 17 and 20 were reversed coded prior to analysis. One-tailed independent t-tests were completed for each of the 12 questions. Questions were grouped based on similar scales, and then tested cumulatively. Many of the questions were created solely for the purpose of this evaluation, and some were taken or adapted from Margaret Bale's (2010) thesis concerning a monitoring plan for Ultimate Peace. The next part of the survey continues to address social relations with the Social Dominance Orientation. The survey ended with the Stereotype Content Model. (Please see Appendix A for the first survey.)

Second Survey. The second survey had a total of 104 responses with 54 new camp participants and 50 returning participants. The second survey had two main parts. The Stereotype Content Model was repeated using the same 8 characteristics on a 5-point scale to assess the participants' perception of stereotypes and group

categorization. The other part of the survey was broken into three parts with different scales. The scales follow a 4-point, 5-point, or agree-disagree scale. The three sections concern questions about understanding and adopting spirit, problem-solving abilities, and diversity of interactions with other groups at camp. Again, questions from these sections were developed from Margaret Bale's (2010) thesis or created specifically for this project. Regrettably the Social Dominance Orientation measurement was not included in the second survey. Camp administrators were worried about the length of the second survey, so the scale was removed.

The second parts of the survey were analyzed in groups depending on comparable scales. Each question was analyzed separately with a one-tailed independent t-test to compare new and returning participants. Questions concerning spirit were grouped together and analyzed as an average. (Please see Appendix B for the second survey.)

Observations. The researcher was on-site for the entirety of the two camp sessions. During the first camp session, researcher attended all events and observed multiple teams. During the second session, the researcher joined a female team and acted as a team assistant taking part in practices, games, and evening activities. The team participants were aware of the researcher's role at camp. First-hand observations and observations shared by the coaches were recorded by the researcher in a notebook.

Results

First Survey

The survey opened with statements concerning participant interaction with members of groups different from their own group. The statements in this section were separated into two groups based on scale similarities. (Please see Table 3 for results.)

The first group of questions, (8-12) asks participants about the extent to which the participants interact with members of other groups at home. These questions were combined, and returning participants reported significantly more interactions with members of other groups than the new participants ($t(91) = 3.806$, $p < .001$). When questions 8-12 were examined separately, three revealed significant results. For question 8, returning participants reported spending significantly more time with people whose ethnic backgrounds are different from their own more often than the new participants ($t(97) = 3.047$, $p = .002$). Question 10 was significant ($t(98) = 3.342$, $p = .001$) with returning participants reporting to choose more frequent interaction with people of different groups than new participants. Question 12 was significant ($t(95) = 2.48$, $p = .007$) with returning participants reporting their friends are more accepting of their choice to spend time with people from other groups than the new participants.

The next group of questions, (13-20) asks participants about their community's level of intergroup interactions and intergroup friendships. These questions were combined, and returning participants reported more significant responses than the new participants ($t(95) = 3.088$, $p = .002$). When questions 13-20 were examined separately, five revealed significant results.

Question 13 was significant ($t(96) = 1.868, p = .033$) with returning participants reporting their community consists of a variety of members more so than new participants. Question 15 was significant ($t(97) = 2.602, p = .006$) with returning participants reporting more opportunities to meet people of different backgrounds than new participants. Question 16 was significant ($t(90) = 3.870, p < .001$) with returning participants reported having more friends of different backgrounds than new participants. Question 17 was statistically significant ($t(99) = -1.659, p = .05$) with returning participants reporting a lower preference to be friends with only similar community members than new participants. Question 18 asked if people from different groups work together cooperatively at home. It yielded a significant result ($t(99) = 1.765, p = .041$) with returning participants agreeing more positively than new participants.

The following sections of the survey examined the social attitudes of new and returning participants using two different preexisting scales. The first scale focused on group relations and the second scale assessed stereotypes.

Social Dominance Orientation. An individuals' attitude towards group hierarchy was assessed using the Social Dominance Orientation scale. Participants answered 10 questions. As a single composite score, a one-tailed t-test did not yield a statistically significant result ($t(91) = -1.625, p = .053$) between the new participant and returning participant cohorts.

One-tailed t-test analysis of the individual questions showed significant differences between the two cohorts on three questions. There was a significant effect for the seventh statement "In an ideal world, all nations would be equal,"

($t(98) = -1.787, p = .039$) with returning participants agreeing more strongly than new participants. There was a significant effect for the eighth statement “All humans should be treated equally” ($t(97) = -1.730, p = .044$) with returning participants agreeing more strongly in favor of equality than new participants. Lastly, there was a significant effect for the statement “It would bother me if a person from the other side joined the same group that I belong to” ($t(98) = -2.032, p = .023$) with returning participants reporting it would likely bother them less where as it would be more bothersome to new participants. Overall returning participants scored lower on a portion of the Social Dominance Orientation scale. In other words, the returning participants showed a lower preference for social hierarchy and group-based dominance according to the three statements. (Please see Table 4.)

Stereotype Content Model. The second scale, the Stereotype Content Model, assessed participants’ view of stereotypes towards their own group and other groups present at the camp along two major dimensions of stereotypes (competency and warmth). New and returning cohorts were analyzed along ethnic categories by a one-way ANOVA.

Returning Israeli Jewish participants reported a more positive rating in response to the competency of Israeli Arabs than the new Israeli Jewish participants. The main effect of past experience at camp was significant for Israeli Jewish participants on the competency dimension towards Israeli Arabs ($F(1, 18) = 6.99, p = .016$).

Returning Israeli Jewish participants reported a more positive rating on the dimension of warmth towards Israeli Arabs and Palestinians than Israeli Jewish

participants for whom the camp was a novel experience. The main effect of past camp experience was significant for Israeli Jewish participants on the warmth dimension towards Israeli Arabs ($F(1, 17) = 6.02, p = .25$) and Palestinians ($F(1, 17) = 4.64, p = .46$).

Returning Israeli Arab participants reported a lower rating on the competency dimension towards Palestinians than the first time Israeli Arab participants. This effect was significant ($F(1, 47) = 4.16, p = .047$). This was not the expected outcome.

Returning Palestinian participants reported a more positive rating towards Israeli Arabs on both the competency and warmth dimensions than dimension ratings by new Israeli Arab participants. The effect was statistically significant for competency ($F(1, 12) = 12.20, p = .004$) and warmth ($F(1, 12) = 8.41, p = .012$). (Please see Table 5.)

Second Survey

The second survey began with questions regarding participant understanding of ultimate and spirit of the game after taking part in the program. Also, the survey asked questions concerning problem solving and friendship with teammates and other participants. In this section four questions yielded significant results after a one-tailed t-test. (Please see Table 6.)

Returning participants reported understanding the strategy of ultimate better than the new participants on question 2, yielding a significant result ($t(102) = 2.733, p = .004$). On question 9, returning participants reported an improved ability to solve a conflict than new participants with significance ($t(100) = 1.820, p = .036$).

Question 13 asked if participants viewed their teammates as equals. Unexpectedly, new participants reported more positively than returning participants with significance ($t(100) = -1.753, p = .042$). Question 15 asked participants if they made friends with people from different backgrounds while at camp. Returning participants answered more positively than the new participants resulting in a significance of ($t(100) = 1.750, p = .042$).

Stereotype Content Model. Mirroring the first survey, the Stereotype Content Model of the second survey assessed participants' view of stereotypes towards their own group and other groups present at the camp along two major categories of stereotypes (competency and warmth). Again, new and returning cohorts were analyzed along ethnic categories by a one-way ANOVA.

Returning Israeli Arab participants reported a lower rating towards Palestinians on the competency dimension than the Israeli Arab participants for whom the UP camp was a novel experience. The effect was statistically significant ($F(1, 47) = 5.38, p = .025$) however this was not the expected outcome. One would assume that returning participants after spending more time with others would assign a higher competency rating to the other groups than the new participants.

Also, returning Israeli Arab participants reported a lower rating towards their own group's competency level than the new participants. This effect was significant ($F(1, 47) = 5.38, p = .025$) but unexpected. (Please see Table 7.)

Discussion

There were a variety of limitations and challenges throughout the course of the project that should be taken into consideration when reading the results and

discussion of this evaluation. Please refer to the section labeled “Limitations and Challenges” for an in-depth look into the difficulties surrounding the project.

The focus of this study was to examine the role Ultimate plays in changing negative intergroup dynamics by identifying the differences between new and returning participants of the UP summer program according to their social attitudes towards other groups, understanding of Ultimate and its rules, and conflict resolution abilities. The first survey also evaluated the nature of inter-group experiences prior to camp, and the second survey focused on the understanding of the sport and conflict resolution skills.

First Survey

The first survey has three areas of concentration. The first section centered on intergroup contact outside of camp and in participant communities. The results showed that returning participants reported more intergroup contact than new participants. Since intergroup contact in Israel and Palestine is often infrequent, the experience in camp may have created a desire for returning participants to seek out and be more comfortable with intergroup contact thus reporting more contact with other groups outside of camp. Question 9, which asks about the ease of making friends with people of different backgrounds, did not yield a difference in responses between new and returning participants. This is a logical outcome for this population, as many communities are not integrated, making opportunities for interaction difficult and requiring individuals to seek out the experiences. Overall, the UP camp experience provides youth with the opportunity to interact with groups other than one’s own – for many it is a novel experience. Interactions

between groups at camp are informal and based around working together as a team. Relationships are built upon during team practices, games and free time.

The second section was the Social Dominance scale. Social Dominance Orientation is an individual's level of adherence towards group-based inequality beliefs. An individual with high social dominance orientation accepts social hierarchy ideologies and considers some groups to be higher than others. A low social dominance orientation rejects hierarchical group beliefs (Pratto, Sidanius, & Levin, 2006). The Social Dominance Orientation construct questionnaire normally follows a 14- or 16-item scale. The version used in this study was a shortened 10-question adaptation of the original scale created by a University of Waterloo doctoral candidate (Schleien, 2007) for an evaluation of a peace education summer camp.

A high score on this measure refers to a high Social Dominance Orientation and a preference to maintain group dominance. In contrast, a low score means the respondent has a low adherence to social group inequality beliefs. Although there were only three questions with significant responses, there was a strong trend showing that returning participants reported lower scores on nine out of ten questions. This suggests that returning participants may be less affected by societal myths of group inequality than the new participants and resist on some level. Pratto, Sidanius, & Levin (2006) reported that empathetic individuals who feel interdependent or communal with other groups tend to have a lower desire of group-based inequality (a low social dominance orientation).

During camp, members of different groups join together to create a team. They spend time working together during games, practice and extra-curricular activities. Participants depend on each other to move the Frisbee down the field and to score points. Team bonding happens throughout camp with team-created chants, team flag making, meal times and evening activities. The team is a component of a larger community of the whole camp, which engages a bigger communal aspect complete with a camp song, evening closing circles and spirit games and circles. During an interview with a 12 year-old Arabic participant, she shared her definition of spirit as a way “to accept the other side of the other person.” She goes on to recount a spirit circle after a game. “Even though we lost, we still had a spirit circle and we stood up – white girl, pink girl [teams alternate players and stand in a circle]. And we didn’t fight just because of a game. We were friends and we had fun together.” Spirit circles take place after each game to allow the players to decompress and congratulate each other’s skills. It takes the focus off of competition and creates an opportunity for opposing teams to build connections and become friends. UP camp and its teams invoke a shared, interdependent community, which may influence the low social dominance orientation responses. As suggested by Flippen et al (1996), the notion of perceived interdependence creates a unified group, which might contribute to the low social dominance orientation.

The Stereotype Content Model comprised the final section. The Stereotype Content Model of Cuddy, Fiske, Glick, & Xu, (2002) was used to assess social relations focusing on an individual’s view of other groups based on stereotypes. This scale

identifies competency and warmth as the two main dimensions of stereotypes. Combinations of high and low ratings along the two dimensions lead to four different major emotions: admiration (high competency and high warmth ratings), contempt (low competency and low warmth ratings), envy (high competency and low warmth ratings), and pity (low competency and high warmth ratings). On average, participant responses clustered in the high competency and high warmth range, but a closer look at the each group's responses along the two dimensions shows differences amongst the cohorts.

At the beginning of camp new and returning cohorts showed interesting differences across the outlined groups. Returning Israeli Jewish participants rated the Israeli Arab group higher on the competency dimension, and Israeli Arab and Palestinian groups higher on the warmth dimension than the new participants. This shows that returning Israeli Jewish participants viewed Israeli Arabs as having a higher status than did the new participants. This indicates that after the experience at the camp program in previous years, the returning participants are beginning to see the Israeli Arab group as equals. Also, returning Israeli Jewish participants gave Israeli Arab and Palestinians a higher rating on the warmth dimension. According to Cuddy, Fiske, Glick, & Xu, (2002) a high warmth rating may suggest that the returning Israeli Jewish participants felt little or less perceived competition towards Israeli Arabs and Palestinians. It may also mean that they are associating these groups as allies or friends and assigning a higher warmth quality towards those groups. Overall, it appears Israeli Jewish participants tend to have more positive views

towards the other groups, especially on the warmth dimension, after attending camp.

Returning Palestinians rated the Israeli Arab group higher on warmth and competency than did the new Palestinian participants. A higher warmth rating means returning Palestinian participants feel less competition towards Israeli Arabs and identify the group as an ally. The higher competency rating shows returning Palestinians view Israeli Arabs as maintaining a high status. Conversely, Israeli Arab returning participants rated the Palestinian group lower on the competency dimension than new participants highlighting a view that Palestinians hold a low status. Unfortunately, there is an unequal distribution of power amongst Israelis and Palestinians. Palestinians have fewer rights and less power than Israelis (Rouhana, 2004). Since this lower rating of Palestinians by Israeli Arab participants is not what was expected from participants having just completed the program, this finding is worth exploring in future studies.

These results are interesting in that the camp atmosphere may be contributing towards the breakdown of stereotypes amongst these groups, however the results tend to be one-directional. Many of the significant results of the Stereotype Content Model come from Israeli Jews towards the Arab population, and the other groups don't report the same positive feelings in return. The findings may be a result of the underlying structural power imbalances between Jewish and Arab populations in Israel/Palestine. Israeli Jews typically have more power in the relationship. This may have led to the higher rating of Israeli Arabs and Palestinians

because the Israeli Jewish participants do not feel threatened by them (Rouhana, 2004).

Second Survey

The second survey was taken after participating at camp. This may have an effect on the results bringing new and returning participants answers closer together. However, each experience at camp should further influence the participants thus resulting in differences between the two cohorts.

The second survey was broken into two main sections. The first section asked questions concerning an overall understanding of Ultimate and spirit of the game, problem solving and camp relationships. Average participant responses regarding Ultimate and spirit of the game were similar among new and returning participants. It is expected that after a week of learning and playing the game the participants should feel confident in their understanding of the game. New and returning participants differed in their responses on Question 2, which asks about strategy of the Ultimate. Returning participants reported a higher understanding of the strategy. As the participants play more and attend the program again, they gain a more sophisticated understanding and develop strategic playing skills. Like any sport, the more you play, the more confidence and ability you have in the game.

Due to the self-refereeing nature of Ultimate, it is expected that participants will feel better equipped to solve a conflict. Returning participants reported better ability to solve a conflict after attending the program than new participants. The original intent of the question was to gauge the general ability of participants' conflict solving abilities, however it is possible the participants misinterpreted the

question. Taking this into account, the result may be affected by the returning participants increased confidence in understanding the strategy of ultimate to manage an on-field issue. As a player better understands the game, they may feel more confident to stop the game to referee and call a foul or neutralize a conflict.

After camp it is expected that participants will have established friendships with people of different backgrounds and feel a level of equality amongst their teammates regardless of their group affiliation. Returning participants felt they created more friendships than the new participants. This may be due to having more opportunities for friendships from attending the program in previous years. Also, those friendships may branch out to the friends and acquaintances of the original friend. Contrary to the expected result, new participants reported more equality amongst teammates than returning participants. Although both groups responded to the question positively agreeing that teammates were equals regardless of nationality or ethnicity, new participants agreed more readily. For many of the participants, the first time at camp is the first opportunity they have for meeting and interacting with individuals from different groups. New participants may have been thriving off the new experience, which led to elevated the results.

The second section was the Stereotype Content Model questions. Again, the stereotype content model assesses an individuals view towards another group along two dimensions (warmth and competency). At the end of camp there were fewer differences between cohorts across the groups and dimensions. This was to be expected as all participants just completed the program.

Arab Israeli returning participants continued to rate Palestinians higher on competency than the new participants indicating they perceived Palestinians to maintain a high social status. This may show that the returning participants are beginning to reject the typical social hierarchy of Israel/Palestine. Interestingly, Arab Israeli returning participants rated themselves lower on the competency dimension than the new participant group. A possible reasoning for this response could be due to a perceived loss of power during the encounter. According to Maoz (2000) Arabs feel more competent and empowered when they can explicitly address the conflict during intergroup encounters. The UP camp program chooses to avoid dialogue components and does not outwardly discuss the conflict situation with participants. UP believes in providing camp participants with an opportunity to be free of conflict talk and solution finding, so they can become acquainted with the other side in a fun, positive atmosphere. They believe that this exchange is the first step towards a change in their perceptions and awareness of one another. However, returning participants, who feel ready to have discussions about the conflict, may feel frustrated and less empowered manifesting in the participants' feelings of low competency and status.

Limitations and Challenges

It is important to acknowledge the limitations of the present research. First, it is critical to note the complexity of the conflict. It is a complicated and multi-faceted dispute that has gone through multiple stages over many years. The roots of the conflict are hotly contested and the face of the conflict shifts as quickly as it progresses. Although this paper identifies three main groups, in reality group

memberships are much more complex. Using a grouping of Israeli Jews, Israeli Arabs and Palestinians is overly simplified: the groups can be broken further down to more accurately describe an individual's idea of identity. Israeli Jews may be Israeli born or immigrants. They may be Haredi Jews (Orthodox) or non-Haredi. Israeli Arabs and Palestinians may be Christian, Muslim, Bedouin or Druze. (There are more religious affiliations not mentioned.) As discovered during camp, the demographics portion of the survey offered limited ethnicity options making it difficult for some participants to give an answer. Further complicating the demographic question, many people prefer a two-group framework identifying as Israelis and Palestinians. For example, some Israeli Arabs strongly identify as Palestinian despite living within Israel. Future studies should identify this early on allowing the participants more options or asking additional questions about religion and place of residence to arrive at a more accurate answer.

Another important weakness is that of the researcher's background and knowledge of the conflict. The researcher lacked a comprehensive cultural understanding of the area and the participants. The researcher did not have experience with these cultures and age groups previous to the project, which may have affected her approach in survey development and implementation. A major hurdle in this area was the lack of Hebrew and Arabic language capabilities - written and spoken. Further, it prevented the researcher from grasping the subtle language nuances during the interactions and surveys translations. This prohibited a true connection between the researcher and participants.

Translation and language were an ever-present constraint of the study. As mentioned above it was difficult to communicate with the participants, but it was also a severe struggle with survey translation and delivery. Unfortunately, financial constraints of the project did not allow for a professional translator. UP staff and counselors-in-training provided much of the translations to the best of their abilities. Even so, it was difficult to translate the survey from English to Hebrew and Arabic in a few areas. First, there were issues translating particular words into the correct corresponding Hebrew or Arabic word and keeping it consistent across all the surveys and languages. This complicated the Stereotype Content Model translation. Many of the adjectives along each dimension were similar in meaning, and some did not have an exact translation in Hebrew or Arabic. Additionally, there were concerns that the participants, especially the younger participants, would not understand some of the words once translated into their native language. Although not possible for this project, a professional translator would have been helpful in many situations.

It is also important to consider that this was the researcher's first real-world experience in the measurement and evaluation field. In retrospect, the researcher could have prepared the surveys better. The survey questions could have been developed in a more cohesive manner to eliminate unnecessary and duplicate questions. Also, similar-aged adolescents in the U.S could have tested the survey to identify difficult or confusing questions. Future studies should reassess the survey structure and content.

Another area of limitation to explore comes from the methodology of the research. The participants that took part in the program were self-selected and did so under the approval of their parents. These participants may be pre-disposed to have positive feelings towards the other or live in a household that is more accepting of others than the other families in Israel/Palestine. The demographic spread of the sample size was also noteworthy. The numbers of new Palestinian participants and returning Israeli Jewish participants were low as compared to the consistently high numbers of new and returning Israeli Arab participants, which may not provide a reliable sample size. The original intent was to deliver the surveys in a way that each participant could be tracked individually. However, the structure of participant arrival and camp activities made it difficult to follow through with this arrangement. The timing, location and translator availability at the time of survey delivery added to the complication of identifying each individual.

There were further methodological complications concerning the survey that yielded additional limitations to this study. The data retrieved during this study relied on self-reported data, which can be unreliable. Considering some sections of the survey covered difficult topics, participants may have answered in a way they deemed to be favorable rather than their true feelings. Also, the participants took the survey in a room while sitting amongst friends. Although adults were available to answer questions and clarify directions, many participants engaged with friends instead. This may have led to discussions about the questions and shared answers amongst the friend groups. Also, some sections of the surveys were skipped over or left blank. This may be in response to the length of the survey or difficulty. The

directions and structure of the survey was another point of concern. It was possible that some parts of the directions were unclear or complicated to follow, or there were concerns that the participants felt rushed to complete the survey by friends.

Lastly, there were limitations on behalf of the organization and its underlying programmatic beliefs. An important organizational philosophy is to provide an atmosphere free from political discussion and solution finding. This prevented the researcher from asking certain questions during participant interactions and surveys. At the request of the organization language that was deemed to harsh or pointed was removed or replaced with more moderate substitutions in consideration for the participants. Unfortunately, some of these changes in the survey interfered with the integrity of the Stereotype Content Model and Social Dominance Orientation measure jeopardizing its validity. Future research should use the limitations identified in this study to create an appropriate and successful evaluation of Ultimate Peace or other youth sport and coexistence programs.

Conclusion

This paper explores the use of Ultimate in the on-going conflict of Israel and Palestine. It identifies the elements of an intractable conflict and the intergroup dynamics that results from an on-going conflict. This project pinpoints the components of peace education with a focus on the use of Ultimate and its unique culture of spirit. Ultimate Peace summer camp opened its doors to invite the researcher to observe its camp and interact with its campers providing valuable information for an evaluation on intergroup dynamics and the influence of Ultimate.

This project opened up an avenue for future studies on the use of Ultimate and UP. There is a need to better understand how participants understand and adopt the values of the spirit of the game. Due to the short timeframe of camp, a future study should examine the life span of a participant in a longitudinal format by assessing each individual at his or her inaugural camp and analyze the progression in subsequent camp attendances. It would be interesting to examine the change in attitudes overtime including when the participant leaves or ages out of the program. This would be especially interesting for Israeli participants who are required to join the Israeli Defense Forces at the age of eighteen. Studying the effects of conscription on former UP participants is important as their service could affect how they perceive group memberships, interdependence, and group allegiances.

Although there are many efforts to include sport and peace education in reconciliation endeavors, the use of Ultimate is not widespread. The unique aspects of Ultimate presented in this paper show that is a useful tool in repairing intergroup relations and building a culture of peace.

References

- Allport, G. W. (1954) *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Aronson, E. (1975, February). The jigsaw route to learning and liking: *Psychology Today*, 43-50.
- Avruch, K. (1998). *Culture and conflict resolution*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace.
- Bale, M. J. (2010). Monitoring and evaluating sport for peace interventions: Ultimate Peace for the Middle East (Master Thesis). Middlebury College, Vermont.
- Bar-Tal, D. (in press). Challenges for constructing peace culture and peace education. *The Israeli-Palestinian Conflict: Parallel Discourses*.
- Bar-Tal, D. (2007). Socio-psychological foundations of intractable conflicts. *American Behavior Scientist*, 50, 1430-1453.
- Bar-Tal, D. & Rosen, Y. (2009) Peace education in societies involved in intractable conflicts: Direct and indirect models. *Review of Educational Research*, 79 (2), 557-575.
- Bar-Tal, D., Rosen, Y., & Nets-Zehngut, R. (2009). Peace education in societies involved in intractable conflicts: Goals, conditions, and directions. In G. Salomon & E. Cairns (Ed.), *Handbook on Peace Education* (21-43). New York: Psychology Press.
- Benin, J. & Stein, R. (2006). *The struggle for sovereignty: Palestine and Israel 1993 – 2005*. California: Stanford University Press
- Bowman, E. (2010) *Teaching spirit of the game*. USA Ultimate Resource Guide, 63-67.
Retrieved from

- www.usa.ultimate.or/assets/1/page/usau_resources_guide_p4-teaching_sotg_08-09-10.pdf
- Brewer M. B. (1986). The role of ethnocentrism in intergroup conflict. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds). *Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Cuddy, A., Fiske, S., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 878-902.
- Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., & Kawakami, K. (2003). Intergroup contact: The past, present, and the future. *Group Processes & Intergroup Processes*, 6(1), 5-21.
- Duckitt, J. (1992). Psychology and prejudice: A historical analysis and integrative framework. *American Psychologist*, 4 (10), 1182-1193.
- Flippen, A. R., Hornstein, H. A., Siegal, W. W., & Weitzman, E. A. (1996). A comparison of similarity and interdependence as triggers for in-group formation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22(9), 882-893.
- Finley, L. L. (2011). *Building a Peaceful Society: Creative Integration of Peace Education*. Charlotte, NC, USA: IAP - Information Age Publishing, Inc.
Retrieved from <http://www.ebrary.com>
- Gaertner, S. L., Rust, M. C., Dovidio, J.F., Bachman, B. A., Anastasio, P. A. (1994). The contact hypothesis: The role of a common ingroup identity on reducing intergroup bias. *Small Group Research*, 25(2), 224-249
- Hewstone, M. & Brown, R. (1986) *Contact and conflict in intergroup encounters*. Cambridge: Basil Blackwell.

- International Olympic committee grants full recognition to the world flying disc federation (WFDF). (2015, August 2) Retrieved from <http://www.wfdf.org/news-media/news/press/2-official-communication/697-international-olympic-committee-grants-full-recognition-to-the-world-flying-disc-federation-wfdf>
- Iacovella, M. E. (n.d.). An abbreviated history of ultimate. Retrieved from <http://www.wfdf.org/history-stats/history-of-ultimate/167-an-abbreviated-history-of-ultimate-compiled-by-michael-e-iacovella>
- Kohn, A. (1993, July/August). Fun & fitness without competition. *Women's Sports and Fitness*. Retrieved from <http://www.alfiekohn.org/article/fun-fitness-without-competition/>
- Kriesberg, L. (1998). Intractable conflicts. In E. Weiner (Ed.), *The Handbook of Interethnic Coexistence* (332-342). New York: Continuum.
- Lee, A. (2010). About the spirit of the game. Retrieved from http://www.usultimate.org/about/ultimate/spirit_of_the_game.aspx
- Leonardo, P. A. & Zagarola, A. (2005). *Ultimate: The first four decades*. Joe Seidler.
- McLeod, R. (2012, November 27). Origins of spirit of the game – Dan “Stork” Roddick. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1W92QmBOb34>
- Moaz, I. (2000). Power relations in intergroup encounters: A case study of Jewish-Arab encounters in Israel. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 24(4), 259-277.

- Moran, P., & Storm, B. (Executive Producers). (2008, July 9). Crisis guide: The Israeli-Palestinian conflict. *CFR.org Crisis Guides*. Teaching module retrieved from www.cfr.org.
- Orlick, T. (2006). *Cooperative games and sports: Joyful activities for everyone*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- SDP IWG (2008). Sport and peace: Social inclusion, conflict prevention and peace-building. In *Harnessing the power of sport for development and peace: Recommendations to governments* (chapter 6). Retrieved from http://www.un.org/wcm/content/site/sport/home/unplayers/memberstates/sdpiwg_keydocs
- Sherif, M., Harvey, O. J., White, B. J., Hood, W. R., & Sherif, C. W. (1961). Intergroup cooperation and conflict: The robbers cave experiment. *Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Book Exchange*.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49, 65-85.
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., & Levin, S. (2006). Social dominance theory and the dynamics of intergroup relations: Taking stock and looking back. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 17, 271-320.
- Pruitt, D. & Kim, S. (2004). *Social conflict: Escalation, stalemate and settlement* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Robbins, B. (2004). "That's Cheap." the Rational Invocation of Norms, Practices, and an Ethos in Ultimate Frisbee. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 28(3), 314-337.

- Rouhana, N. (2004). Group identity and power asymmetry in reconciliation processes: The Israeli-Palestinian case. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 10(1), 33-52.
- Schleien, S. (2007). Confronting the intractable: An evaluation of the seed of peace experience (Doctoral Thesis). University of Waterloo: Ontario, Canada.
- Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of inter-group behavior. In S. Worchel and L. W. Austin (eds.), *Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- United Nations. Inter-Agency Task Force on Sport for Development, & Peace. (2003). *Sport for development and peace: towards achieving the millennium development goals*. United Nations Publications.

Table 1 Demographics for UP Summer Camp – First Survey			
	New Participants	Returning Participants	Row Total
N	56	46	102
Ethnicity			
Israeli Jew	19	5	24
Israeli Arab	29	23	52
Palestinian	5	17	22
Gender			
Male	31	27	58
Female	25	19	46
Age			
10-11	3	1	4
12-13	33	10	43
14-15	14	22	36
16-17	6	13	19
18+	0	0	0

Table 2 Demographics for UP Summer Camp – Second Survey			
	New Participants	Returning Participants	Row Total
N	54	50	104
Ethnicity			
Israeli Jew	17	6	23
Israeli Arab	30	23	53
Palestinian	3	19	22
Gender			
Male	28	29	57
Female	26	21	47
Age			
10-11	0	1	1
12-13	12	32	44
14-15	28	14	42
16-17	9	4	13
18+	0	1	1

Question	Year at Camp	Mean	SD
8. "At home, I spend time with people whose ethnic backgrounds are different from my own..."	New	1.86	1.227
	Returning	2.51	.910
10. "At home, when given the choice, people of different groups have..."	New	1.86	1.227
	Returning	2.46	.622
12. "At home, if I wanted to spend time with people from a different background, my friends would..."	New	2.51	.608
	Returning	2.78	.467
Question 8-12 Cumulative	New	2.07	.434
	Returning	2.39	.360
13. "My community consists of people from other groups, backgrounds, or cultures."	New	2.15	1.211
	Returning	2.59	1.066
15. "I have many opportunities to meet people from different backgrounds"	New	2.58	1.13
	Returning	3.09	.812
16. "I have friends of different backgrounds"	New	2.30	1.238
	Returning	3.09	.784
17. "I would rather be friends with people from my own community or background."	New	2.09	1.283
	Returning	1.67	1.236
18. "At home, people from different groups work together cooperatively"	New	2.60	1.099
	Returning	2.91	.661
Question 13 - 20 Cumulative	New	2.51	.573
	Returning	2.83	.437

Question	Year at Camp	N	Mean	SD
1. “Some groups are simply not the equals of other groups.”	New	55	2.85	2.02
	Returning	46	2.80	1.93
2. “This region would be better off if we cared less about how equal all people are.”	New	53	5.09	2.08
	Returning	45	4.69	2.16
3. “Some people are more deserving than others.”	New	55	2.65	2.03
	Returning	46	2.59	2.19
4. “Some people are inferior to others.”	New	55	2.47	1.99
	Returning	46	2.04	1.55
5. “Equality among people would benefit everyone.” ^	New	55	1.85	1.45
	Returning	46	1.59	1.39
6. “If people were treated equally, we would have fewer problems in this region.” ^	New	56	2.04	1.61
	Returning	45	1.96	1.58
7. “In an ideal world, all nations would be equal.” ^**	New	55	2.47	1.84
	Returning	45	1.87	1.55
8. “All humans should be treated equally.” ^**	New	56	2.61	2.11
	Returning	43	1.95	1.65
9. “I would feel self-conscious talking to a person from the other side in a public place.”	New	55	2.53	1.57
	Returning	44	2.66	2.19
10. “It would bother me if a person from the other side joined the same group that I belong to.” **	New	56	2.34	1.75
	Returning	44	1.70	1.37
Cumulative Social Dominance Rating	New	51	2.70	.87
	Returning	42	2.41	.83
** Indicates statement yielding significant differences ^ Indicates reverse-coded statements				

Ethnicity	Cohort	Competency Rating			Warmth Rating		
		Israeli Jew	Israeli Arab	Palestinian	Israeli Jew	Israeli Arab	Palestinian
Israeli Jew	New	15.72	13.67*	13.47	14.83	14.40*	12.60*
	Returning	16.80	17.40*	15.75	14.25	18.00*	17.25*
Israeli Arab	New	15.48	16.93	18.00*	15.22	17.96	18.54
	Returning	15.14	16.18	16.05*	15.05	16.52	17.35
Palestinian	New	12.00	11.75*	18.00	12.00	12.00*	17.75
	Returning	14.08	16.70*	18.14	13.09	15.75*	18.33

* Indicates significant difference between New and Returning cohorts

Question	Year at Camp	Mean	SD
2. Rate the importance of “Winning vs. Spirit of the Game”	New	2.39	.529
	Returning	2.66	.479
9. “After attending Camp UP, my ability to solve a conflict...”	New	2.26	.763
	Returning	2.51	.582
13. “All my teammates are equals regardless of their nationality or ethnicity.”	New	4.15	1.099
	Returning	3.76	1.182
14. After Camp UP, I can solve my problems better.”	New	4.43	.866
	Returning	4.67	.474

Ethnicity	Cohort	Competency Rating			Warmth Rating		
		Israeli Jew	Israeli Arab	Palestinian	Israeli Jew	Israeli Arab	Palestinian
Israeli Jew	New	16.31	15.20	15.20	16.06	16.67	15.40
	Returning	17.83	17.40	17.40	15.83	17.50	17.00
Israeli Arab	New	16.67	17.74*	17.74*	16.37	17.37	18.41
	Returning	16.26	16.00*	16.00*	15.90	16.95	17.77
Palestinian	New	16.33	17.33	17.33	16.00	14.67	17.67
	Returning	14.33	18.25	18.25	13.50	15.06	18.87

* Indicates significant difference between New and Returning cohorts

Appendix A

There are no right or wrong answers. Please attempt to answer each question; however, if you are uncomfortable answering any of the questions below, you may skip that item.

Please answer the following about yourself:

1. Are you a...? Camper CIT
2. What is your gender? Male Female
3. What is your age? _____
4. What is your ethnicity? Israeli Jew Arab Israeli Palestinian American
5. Is this your first year at camp? Yes No
If no, how many years have you been coming to camp? _____
6. Have you played Ultimate Frisbee before? Yes No
7. Do you use social media like Facebook or Twitter? Yes No

Please circle the number of the statement you think is the most accurate.

8. At home, I spend time with people whose ethnic backgrounds are different from my own _____.
 - 0 never
 - 1 rarely
 - 2 occasionally
 - 3 often
9. Making friends with people from different backgrounds is _____.
 - 0 impossible
 - 1 difficult
 - 2 neither difficult nor easy
 - 3 easy
10. At home, when given the choice, people of different groups have _____.
 - 0 no interaction
 - 1 little interaction
 - 2 occasional interaction
 - 3 frequent interaction
11. Adults and leaders in my community _____.
 - 0 strongly discourage people to make friends with people from different backgrounds
 - 1 do not discuss making friends with people from different backgrounds
 - 2 discuss making friends with people from different backgrounds
 - 3 strongly encourage people to make friends with people from different backgrounds
12. At home, if I wanted to spend time with people from a different background, my friends would _____.
 - 0 disown or shun me
 - 1 think badly of me
 - 2 would not care
 - 3 would think highly of me

Please check the box that best reflects your agreement with the statement.

#	Question	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
13.	My community consists of people from other groups, backgrounds, or cultures.					
14.	When I have a problem, I can think of many ways to solve it					
15.	I have many opportunities to meet people from different backgrounds					
16.	I have friends of different backgrounds					
17.	I would rather be friends with people from my own community or background.					
18.	At home, people from different groups work together cooperatively					
19.	People of different backgrounds, religions, or communities should be friends.					
20.	I have never met someone from a different background than me in my school or neighborhood					

Please rate your feelings about the following statements on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree), by circling your choice below.

1. Some groups are simply not the equals of other groups.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree			Neutral			Strongly agree

2. This region would be better off if we cared less about how equal all people are.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree			Neutral			Strongly agree

3. Some people are more deserving than others.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree			Neutral			Strongly agree

4. Some people are inferior to others.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree			Neutral			Strongly agree

5. Equality among people would benefit everyone.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree			Neutral			Strongly agree

6. If people were treated more equally, we would have fewer problems in this region.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree			Neutral			Strongly agree

7. In an ideal world, all nations would be equal.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree			Neutral			Strongly agree

8. All humans should be treated equally.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree			Neutral			Strongly agree

9. Question removed per request of Ultimate Peace

10. I would feel self-conscious talking to a person from the other side in a public place.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree			Neutral			Strongly agree

11. It would bother me if a person from the other side joined the same group that I belong to.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree			Neutral			Strongly agree

-Continue turn to the back side-

Please circle your rating of how you think the following groups are viewed by society according to the guideline below. Then, please fill in your rating of your own feelings about them using the scale.

1 2 3 4 5
 Strongly Neutral Strongly
 disagree agree

Americans		
Society Rating	Trait	Your Rating
1 2 3 4 5	Confident	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Friendly	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Knowledgeable	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Skillful	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Nice	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Creative	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Sincere	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Warm	1 2 3 4 5

Israeli Jews		
Society Rating	Trait	Your Rating
1 2 3 4 5	Confident	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Friendly	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Knowledgeable	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Skillful	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Nice	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Creative	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Sincere	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Warm	1 2 3 4 5

Arab Israelis		
Society Rating	Trait	Your Rating
1 2 3 4 5	Confident	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Friendly	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Knowledgeable	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Skillful	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Nice	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Creative	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Sincere	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Warm	1 2 3 4 5

Palestinians		
Society Rating	Trait	Your Rating
1 2 3 4 5	Confident	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Friendly	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Knowledgeable	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Skillful	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Nice	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Creative	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Sincere	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Warm	1 2 3 4 5

Appendix B

There are no right or wrong answers. Please attempt to answer each question; however, if you are uncomfortable answering any of the questions below, you may skip that item.

Please answer the following about yourself:

1. Are you a...? Camper CIT
2. What is your gender? Male Female
3. What is your age? _____
4. What is your ethnicity? Israeli Jew Arab Israeli Palestinian American
5. Is this your first year at camp? Yes No
If no, how many years have you been coming to camp? _____

Please circle the number of the statement you think is the most accurate.

1. Ultimate Frisbee
 - 0 I hate playing Ultimate Frisbee
 - 1 I dislike playing Ultimate Frisbee
 - 2 I like playing Ultimate Frisbee
 - 3 I love playing Ultimate Frisbee
2. Strategy of Ultimate
 - 0 I do not understand how to play Ultimate Frisbee at all
 - 1 I am confused on how to play Ultimate Frisbee
 - 2 I feel that I know enough to play Ultimate Frisbee
 - 3 I am very confident in the rules and strategy of Ultimate Frisbee
3. Spirit of the game
 - 0 I do not understand what Spirit of the Game is
 - 1 I am confused about what Spirit of the Game is
 - 2 I understand what Spirit of the Game is
 - 3 I understand SOTG well enough to use it in games of Ultimate
4. Winning vs. Spirit of the Game
 - 0 Winning the game is MUCH more important than spirit of the game
 - 1 It is okay to play with poor spirit only in order to win a game
 - 2 It is not okay to play with poor spirit in order to win a game
 - 3 It is important to ALWAYS play with good spirit of the game, even if that means losing the game
5. SOTG
 - 0 I don't play with good spirit
 - 1 I sometimes play with good spirit
 - 2 I often play with good spirit
 - 3 I always play with good spirit
6. It is important to always use SOTG
 - 0 Never
 - 1 Sometimes
 - 2 Often
 - 3 Always
7. At Camp UP, I spend time with people from different backgrounds _____.
 - 0 never

- 1 rarely
- 2 occasionally
- 3 often

8. At Camp UP, when given the choice, like during free time, people from different groups have _____.

- 0 no interaction
- 1 little interaction
- 2 occasional interaction
- 3 frequent interaction

9. After attending Camp UP, my ability to solve a conflict

- 0 became worse
- 1 did not change
- 2 became a little better
- 3 became much better

Please check the box that best reflects your agreement with the statement.

#	Question	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
10.	I trust all of my teammates.					
11.	In Ultimate, winning is the most important thing.					
12.	I respect my opponent during an Ultimate game.					
13.	All my teammates are equals regardless of their nationality or ethnicity.					
14.	After Camp UP, I can solve my problems better.					
15.	During Camp UP, I made friends with people of different backgrounds or from the other side					

Please circle if you agree or disagree with each statement.

- 16. I learned to better communicate with those who think or believe differently than me. Agree Disagree
- 17. At Camp UP, I learned how to build friendships with people who are different from me. Agree Disagree
- 18. I learned useful skills from Ultimate that I can use outside of sports. Agree Disagree
- 19. It will be difficult to keep in contact with friends from UP that are of a different background. Agree Disagree
- 20. Ultimate has helped me to deal with conflict more effectively. Agree Disagree

Please circle your rating of how you think the following groups are viewed by society according to the guideline below. Then, please fill in your rating of your own feelings about them using the scale. There are no right or wrong answers.

1
Strongly
disagree

3
Neutral

5
Strongly
agree

Americans		
Society Rating	Trait	Your Rating
1 2 3 4 5	Confident	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Friendly	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Knowledgeable	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Skillful	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Nice	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Creative	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Sincere	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Warm	1 2 3 4 5

Israeli Jews		
Society Rating	Trait	Your Rating
1 2 3 4 5	Confident	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Friendly	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Knowledgeable	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Skillful	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Nice	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Creative	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Sincere	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Warm	1 2 3 4 5

Arab Israelis		
Society Rating	Trait	Your Rating
1 2 3 4 5	Confident	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Friendly	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Knowledgeable	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Skillful	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Nice	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Creative	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Sincere	1 2 3 4 5

1 2 3 4 5	Warm	1 2 3 4 5
-----------	------	-----------

Palestinians		
Society Rating	Trait	Your Rating
1 2 3 4 5	Confident	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Friendly	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Knowledgeable	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Skillful	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Nice	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Creative	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Sincere	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Warm	1 2 3 4 5

Appendix C
**ADOLESCENT PARTICIPANT ASSENT FORM FOR ULTIMATE PEACE IN THE
MIDDLE EAST: AN IMPACT EVALUATION**

University of Massachusetts Boston
Department of Conflict Resolution, Human Security, and Global Governance
100 Morrissey Boulevard
Boston, MA. 02125-3393

Principal Investigator: Kylie Millbern

You are asked to help us in the project described below. Your parent or guardian has already given their okay, but you have the decision to participate or not. You may skip questions or end the study at any time by telling the investigator. Please feel free to ask questions at any point during the project. Your participation in camp will not be affected by this project.

Purpose of the Study

To evaluate the effect of the Ultimate Peace summer camp on the campers and staff.

Procedure

You will be asked to fill out a survey at the beginning of camp and at the end. There will be one person, Kylie, observing the camp. You may be asked to answer some questions in a private interview at the end of camp. The interview will be recorded and then written down. The tape recording will be destroyed at the end of the study. All three parts may take a total of 2 hours.

Kylie will be the only person who knows what you report or say unless a translator is needed. Potential risks are minimal to none. Kylie will do everything to make sure that you are safe during the process.

If you understand what is being asked of you and you agree to take part in the project, please sign your name below.

Signature of Participant

Date

Printed Name of Participant

Signature of Researcher

Date

