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Male youths ages 13-18 incarcerated at two minimum security detention facilities participated in a program to determine if Alfred Adler's concept of social interest could be developed through group interactions led by non-professionals.

The youths answered a self-report attitudinal scale, the Sulliman Scale of Social Interest and were rated by their classroom teachers on the Behavior Dimensions Rating Scale as pre-test measures. Volunteers from a liberal arts college sociology classes were randomly assigned to work in male-female pairs over a ten week period of time with the experimental population. These pairs led their constant group of incarcerated youths in ninety minute discussion sessions once per week for the duration of the program. Structured human relations exercises specifically designed to encourage elements of social interest; belonging, cooperation, and significance were assigned for each of the sessions. At the end of ten weeks, the youths in the experimental groups and the control population were tested again on the two scales.

The results of Pearson Product Moment Correlations Test indicated no relationship between attitude and behavior for either the experimental or control groups on the pre-test and the post-test.

A Mann Whitney U t-test indicated a highly significant increase in the social interest of the experimental group at the end of the program.
While the control group showed no change over the course of the ten
weeks, those who participated in the developmental groups increased their
scores on the Sulliman Scale of Social Interest by an average of 12 points.
Another Mann Whitney U t-test indicated that there was no difference
between the social interest of Caucasian and non-Caucasian youths.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The Individual Psychology of Alfred Adler is a telelogical, phenomenological, interpersonal psychology. Adler saw people as gaining identity and significance from within the context of their own subjective worlds. His two key concepts were that humans have a need to belong as well as possessing an innate capacity for "social interest" or "an interest in the interest of others" (Ansbacher, 1983, p. 85) which must be developed through interactions with others. He maintained that all of life's major problems require social interest and cooperation for their solution. Social interest involves the capacity to identify with others and the willingness to cooperate. Adler saw this as an innate characteristic which must be cultivated by the family, school or society. Ideally, this characteristic is developed within the family. However, in an imperfect world filled with people who seem to have no connection or interest in the good of society this does not always happen. This failure is what Adler termed maladjustment.

Juvenile delinquents, teenagers who have a history of criminal violations, are a population who, from an Adlerian perspective, have a distorted view of themselves and their relationships with others. Their "useless behavior" (i.e., shoplifting, burglary and vandalism) illustrate this distortion.
Many suggest that juvenile delinquents are guaranteed to remain on the "useless" side of life. This study proposes that social interest can be developed through positive interaction with others, even in juvenile delinquents. If cognitive dissonance is created through challenging assumptions, will their behavior change? Can social interest be developed in those who have not previously demonstrated it? And can it be increased among those who are somewhat complacent?

Definition of Terms

Individual Psychology is the holistic, interpersonal theory of psychology which is based on the ideas of Alfred Adler.

Social Interest is for the purposes of this study, defined as the participant's score on the Sulliman Scale of Social Interest.

Incarcerated youths are residents of the Pere Marquette Illinois Youth Corrections Center, Grafton, Illinois.

Control group members are residents of the Kankakee Illinois Youth Corrections Center, Manteno, Illinois.

College students are sociology students of Principia College, Elsah, Illinois who volunteered to participate in this project.

BDRS Raters are the classroom teachers assigned to Pere Marquette and Kankakee youths by those institutions.

Facilitation teams are made up of two students from Principia College sociology classes who have volunteered to work together in facilitating developmental groups with Pere Marquette youths for the duration of this study.
Outside Evaluators are two doctoral students of the Counselor Education program at the University of North Texas, who were chosen for their experience and training in individual psychology and with groups of high school and college students, which qualified them to be impartial consultants.

On-site Coordinator: Jane Summerfield, B. S. (English), M. A. (Education) was the on-site contact person who supervised the weekly developmental groups with the college students and incarcerated youths. As a sociology instructor for Principia College, her responsibilities included coordinating all off-campus service projects for the college. This project fell within that category. The on-site coordinator was responsible for transporting the students to Pere Marquette, helping with on-site problems and serving as liaison between the students and the researcher. Prior to the beginning of the project, she met with the researcher for approximately 10 hours to discuss the goals of the study. She studied background material on Individual Psychology and attended the training sessions conducted by the researcher. In addition, she had telephone contact with the researcher prior to each group as well as at the end of each group when she and two different students would telephone the researcher to discuss problems, questions and report on feedback received from group members.
Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study is to determine if social interest can be developed among incarcerated delinquent youth through a brief group counseling project.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of the study are (a) to develop greater social interest for incarcerated juvenile delinquents, (b) to develop ways to teach social interest to incarcerated individuals, and (c) to determine if groups led by nonprofessionals can increase social interest.

Hypotheses

The general hypothesis to be tested is that juvenile delinquent youths can develop social interest through participation in development groups led by nonprofessionals.

The specific hypotheses follow:

1. There will be a positive correlation between the results of the Sulliman Scale of Social Interest and the Behavior Dimensions Rating Scale on pretests.

2. There will be a positive correlation between the results of the Sulliman Scale of Social Interest and the Behavior Dimensions Rating Scales on posttests.

3. There will be an increase in the social interest of the experimental group (Pere Marquette) of incarcerated youths as a result of this program.

4. There will be no difference between the social interest of Caucasian and non-Caucasian youths on both the pretest and posttest.
scores of the Sulliman Scale of Social Interest and the Behavior Dimensions Rating Scale.

Significance of the Study

This study is an attempt to determine if change in juvenile delinquent attitudes and behaviors occur through short interactions of two disparate populations who would normally never encounter each other. Examining society and the individual's role within it through the eyes of another person can be a powerful experience. An effort was made to determine what happens when two sets of young people from vastly different backgrounds encounter thoughts, feelings, and values within an unfamiliar framework. Factors such as the rate of criminal activity, gang involvement and suicide among teenagers and young adults indicate a growing lack of social interest. This study attempts to determine if group counseling which is facilitated by nonprofessionals can lead to attitudinal and behavioral changes in terms of social interest for delinquent youth. The results of this study adds to the body of knowledge for therapists, teachers and detention institutions, and, therefore, seems relevant.

Limitations and Delimitations

This study was limited to male youths ages 14-18 who were incarcerated in the state of Illinois' Department of Corrections, Juvenile Division. The youths primarily came from two disparate regions in Illinois; urban Chicago and rural southern Illinois.
Basic Assumptions

This study assumed that the two institutions used were comparable, as both were established as the only minimum detention facilities in the state. They offer similar programs, services and rules. The study also assumed that the youths involved were representative of the Black and Caucasian populations detained in juvenile facilities. Further, it was assumed that the subjects responded honestly to the self-report instrument used. In addition, it was assumed that their teachers had good knowledge of the youths' behavior, and were therefore able to adequately and honestly complete the behavior rating scale. Finally, it was assumed that these instruments provided valid measures of the attitudes and behaviors for which they were used.

Review of Literature

The review of literature relevant to this study is presented in six sections: (a) group counseling, (b) social interest, (c) brief therapy, (d) research on incarcerated youths, (e) scales of social interest, and (f) behavior rating scales.

Group Counseling

Social embeddedness is a cardinal Individual Psychology concept. Individuals always exist within a social context, whether it be family, work or a social situation. For this reason, Adlerians often make use of the person’s milieu (Lowe, 1980) to help learn about social responsibility. This theory explains that social interest is best learned in a democratic context where individuals are provided opportunities to make choices, learn to judge the consequences of their choices, and assume responsibility for
Adlerian therapists attempt to make the group a representation of society with its own norms and culture. This *in vivo* experience manifests Adler’s statement that, “As soon as the patient can connect himself with his fellow men on an equal and cooperative footing, he is cured” (cited in Manaster & Corsini, 1982, p. 217). A group ideally promotes feelings of belonging, cooperation and responsibility toward society (Greever, 1971, p. 29). During the last 30 years, educators, therapists, business people, social organizations and politicians have developed a wide variety of help-oriented groups (Balgopal & Vassil, 1983; Berg & Landreth, 1980; Corey & Corey, 1987; Dinkmeyer & Muro, 1977; Glaser, 1980; Jacobs, Harvill, & Masson, 1988; Patterson, 1985; Phillips, Pederson, & Wood, 1979; Shaffer & Galinsky, 1974) which have been used in hospitals, schools, clinics, the workplace, prisons, private therapy practices and other institutions. The vast majority of these groups are based on the premise that personal growth is well facilitated in a peer context (Berg & Landreth, 1980, p. 11)

The most important outcome of the group counseling movement in the sixties and seventies is an understanding of the powerful influence a group can have in producing change in an individual’s attitudes or beliefs (Adair, 1979). Groups allow people to think, feel and experience their own being as well as their social embeddedness (Yalom, 1985).

Group counseling has both educational and remedial aims. The group involves an interpersonal process that stresses conscious thoughts, feelings and behavior. A growth orientation underlies activities which emphasize discovering inner resources and overcoming barriers. The process of the group provides a sample of reality as members receive feedback, practice new methods of communicating and behaving, and
experience the reenactment of everyday problems. The group experience may also provide an opportunity for self-examination, as groups often elicit feelings and behaviors mirroring those from one's family origin (Corey & Corey, 1987, p. 11).

"All people need recognition, a sense of doing something worthwhile, status and the deeper needs to give and receive from others" (Adair, 1979, p. 7). Groups can be a microcosm for experiencing these feelings which may have been previously unknown. One of the most important needs of the period of adolescence is to experience successes which lead to a sense of self-confidence and self-respect (Havighurst, 1953). Adolescents need to recognize and accept their wide range of feelings, and to learn how to communicate with others in a way that makes their wants, feelings, thoughts and beliefs known. Since a major element of adolescent experience is peer group pressure, the need for acceptance by one's peer group may become more essential than the need for self-respect. Group counseling can provide a forum in which teenagers express and experience conflicting feelings, discover that they are not alone in their struggles, question and perhaps modify their values, learn how to communicate with others and practice reciprocity in relationships (Corey & Corey, 1987, pp. 282-285). An example of the effectiveness of this form of counseling is found in a study by Smith and Farrell that compared an individual therapy wing of a psychiatric prison for boys 17-21 years of age with a group-oriented wing and found that "the individual therapy wing shows a lower degree of relatedness among the inmates and a larger number of isolates, i.e., people who do not feel about others and who do not have any feelings
directed towards them" (cited in West & Farrington, 1973). As illustrated by the example, the vast majority of group counseling with adolescents appears to take place in nonvoluntary settings (Jacobs et al., 1988, p. 288), yet with proper training leaders can overcome the resistant attitude of many youths (Corey & Corey, 1987, p. 288). Lowe (1980) stated that the main difference between involuntary and voluntary clients is that involuntary clients have been caught demonstrating their feelings of a lack of belonging. This fact may expedite the group process as participants are unable to avoid recognizing a similarity among group participants.

The use of non-professionals as effective group leaders has been well-documented (Corey & Corey, 1987; Jacobs et al., 1988; Shaffer & Galinsky, 1974). One of the most prevalent forms of non-professional group leadership is peer-counseling with adolescents (Kelley, 1980). A modification of this concept involves the practice of having young people who have successfully navigated one phase of adolescence work with those who are slightly behind them (i.e., college students with younger students) (Winston & Ender, 1988) or recovering addicts helping chemical dependency treatment patients (Pittman & Gerstein, 1984, p. 6). While careful training and supervision of peer counselors are requisite, these programs can offer assistance to young people in situations where professionals are not available (Corey & Corey, 1987, p. 296).

It appears that group counseling by nonprofessionals is often most effective when sessions are well structured. The use of action-oriented techniques such as communication exercises and role-playing are particularly appropriate for adolescents (Corey & Corey, 1987, p. 296). When these techniques are used in conjunction with the usual emphasis on
listening, immediacy, genuineness, and empathy (Berg & Landreth, 1980) the creation of a representative microcosm of society can lead to substantial personal growth for adolescents.

**Brief Therapy**

Traditionally, therapy has been considered a long process. Bateson, Jackson, Haley, and Weakland (1956), Ellis (1973), Haley (1963), and Rogers (1951) were among the first to suggest that time-limited therapy is also valid. Various practitioners have experimented with forms, styles and length of treatment. Therapeutic encounters ranging from weekend-long seminars to 12 weekly sessions are considered brief therapy (Corsini, 1984, p. 543).

The majority of brief therapy conducted in the fields of educational and human services is focused around a specific issue or solving a problem (Barrow, 1982; Conyne, 1985; Molnar & de Shazer, 1987). The time-limited, focused group therapy has been found especially helpful in populations with limited resources, rapid turnover, or for those in transition. Research on group brief therapy suggests its success with such diverse populations as families (Molnar & de Shazer, 1987, p. 349), depressed individuals (Barrera, 1979; Wierzbicki, 1987), schoolchildren (Kral, 1987), college students (Searight & Openlander, 1984), women (Killeen & Jacobs, 1976), and at-risk youth (Rowland, 1983).

The nature of this research project lends itself well to brief therapy as a solution-oriented therapy aimed at a population that is in transition and is experiencing quick turnover.
Adler saw social interest as the most important quality an individual could experience and express. He indicated that it lies at the root of all solutions to life's problems and is manifested in the way in which people meet life's problems. Although innate, social interest must be cultivated through guidance and training. The need for this cultivation is the basis for much of Adler's work in educational settings and guidance clinics (Mosak, 1984, p. 88). He pioneered a form of group psychotherapy with children in order to demonstrate the importance of teaching, developing and cultivating social interest for parents and teachers (Ansbacher & Ansbacher, 1956, p. 392).

One of the axioms of Individual Psychology is that people's problems are always social problems; therefore, the use of a group enhances the concepts of social embeddedness, belonging and social interest (Mosak, 1984, p. 87). Many Adlerian therapists today see education and counseling as inextricably intertwined. Teaching social interest is essential to the therapeutic process, in fact, some would say that therapy is teaching social interest (Lowe, 1981). The idea that social interest can be learned is central to this study.

Adler used the idea of social interest in many ways without a specific definition. This important concept has proven to be remarkably difficult to express. Many authors have suggested the difficulty lies in the translation of the German word *Gemeinschaftsgefühl* (Brennan, 1967). Ansbacher (1968) countered that the problem lies not in the translation, but rather with the complex nature of the concept itself. He defined it as "an interest in the interests of mankind" (p. 148). While Dreikurs (1953) viewed social interest as "having something in common with other people
and being one of them" (p. 5), Sweeney (1975) described it as a willingness to serve the greater good for the betterment of mankind. Brennan (1967) stated, "social interest is but the friend's attitude toward the befriended" (p. 44), while O'Connell (1965) suggested that a better label might be humanistic identification.

Cruce-Mast (1975) contended that social interest is an interrelationship of critical thinking, moral judgment and empathy. Adler (1958) emphasized the affective component when he pointed out the idea that "love in all its thousand variations is a feeling of belonging and hence ... is a social feeling" (p. 82). Another view of social interest is Ansbacher's (1983) contention that it is "a guiding cognitive structure by which decisions are made" (p. 136). A behavioral description, according to Dreikurs (1953), is that social interest entails giving of oneself without the thought of reward. O'Connell (1965) attempted to bring all of these aspects together in this definition: "the intellectual and affective, and behavioral aspects of the optimal relationship to others, namely understanding, empathizing with and acting in behalf of others" (p. 47).

Specifically, it has been stated that the expression of social interest comes about through a combination of the life tasks: work, love, friendship and self-significance (Friedland, 1972). Kaplan spoke of it in more global terms, as "a universal striving for significance so the individual is willing to cooperate with others for the common welfare" (cited in Wien, 1977, p. 4). Cruce-Mast (1975) believed that Adler envisioned social interest as the capacity to love and belong to the brotherhood of man, and to have a concern to help others for the present and the future.
The opposite of this connectedness is a lack of social interest which causes maladjustment.

Maladjustment is characterized by increased inferiority feelings, underdeveloped social interest, and an exaggerated, uncooperative goal of personal superiority. Accordingly, problems are solved in a self-centered "private sense" rather than a task centered "common sense" fashion. For the juvenile delinquent this leads to the experience of failure because the individual still accepts the social validity of personal actions as the ultimate criterion. (Adler, 1979, p. 2)

Behaviors which move an individual against or away from others indicate low social interest and are denoted as socially useless, self-defeating behaviors (Sweeney, 1975, p. 15). The clearest example of this is criminal behavior. Criminals are at odds with the world because they "cannot make friends with society at large, with ordinary people. They treat themselves as a body of exiles and do not understand how to feel at home with their fellow man" (Adler, 1958, p. 202). Adlerians prize activity above all personality traits except for social interest. Activity requires courage, which is the willingness to undertake risk-taking behavior. All people are innately capable of courageous activity; social interest gives one the willingness to act upon it. A behavioral definition of social interest is "to see with the eyes of another, to hear with the ears of another, to feel with the heart of another" (Adler, 1975, p. 42). Colonna (1977) pointed out that, for Adler, identification is always positively correlated with the degree of social interest. To identify is to understand and almost transpose oneself into the experience of another (p. 7).
Research on Juvenile Delinquency

The concept of juvenile delinquency is relatively new. It is a social product of the nineteenth century's progressive movement in which childhood became recognized as a distinct concept. Until 1899, juveniles were treated as adults by the legal system. At this time the first juvenile court was created in Cook County, Illinois, and promised special attention and consideration to children. The juvenile court advocated the protection and restriction of youth. Thus, the juvenile delinquent, a new category of social deviant, is attributable to enlightened ideas (Gibbons, 1981).

Juvenile delinquency is a social construct based on legal-judicial concepts and definitions. Self-report measures administered to random samples of juveniles indicate that 80-90% of the adolescent population engages in delinquent behaviors (Hindelang, Hirschi, & Weis, 1981). However, when court records are used as the criteria, delinquency appears in only 4% of the adolescent population (Griffin & Griffin, 1978, p. 52). Statistics from courts compiled by the National Center for Juvenile Justice indicate that adolescent crime is on the rise. In 1978 (the last year for which figures are available) the juvenile crime rate was 43.6 per 1,000. During that year, 1,355,000 juveniles were processed by the juvenile courts (National Center for Juvenile Justice, 1980). Recently, according to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), violent youth gang activity has moved from the nation's largest cities, so that drug and weapon-trafficking gangs are operating in more than 40 cities of the United States, primarily in the Midwest (Armstrong, 1988, p. 3). Arrest statistics indicate that although juveniles constitute only 15% of the population, they constitute 40% of those arrested for serious crimes. The
ratio of male to female arrests is 4 to 1 (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 1980). For a variety of reasons, in American society, delinquents are overwhelmingly from the lower rather than middle class, minorities rather than White, and male rather than female (Gibbons, 1981; Schur, 1973; West & Farrington, 1973).

Each year 4,000 juveniles are detained in state correction facilities where recidivism rates are often appallingly high (National Council on Crime and Delinquency [NCCD], 1988). In the late sixties, 40% of the adults in Massachusetts state prisons had graduated from large juvenile training schools. California, the state with the greatest number of juvenile lock-ups per capita, has an official rate of 45% recidivism for juveniles, but many experts believe the figure is much higher. An NCCD study stated that 85% of former California Youth Authority inmates are rearrested within three years. Many states are moving toward community-based programs in order to alleviate this problem, as state facilities are often seen as training grounds for a life of crime (National Center on Institutions and Alternatives [NCIA], 1988). Alternative programs are often viewed with dismay by the general population, but locking up juveniles has not proved to be a deterrent.

There are several ways to characterize the problems underlying the symptom of juvenile delinquency. The overwhelming majority of delinquents who come to the attention of the legal system exhibit behaviors consistent with a DSM III-R diagnosis of Conduct Disorder, which is defined as "a persistent pattern of conduct in which the basic rights of others and major age-appropriate norms are violated (Ateek, 1988). People who are weakly attached to conventional society and its institutions are relatively free to violate the law. Several theories of juvenile delinquency coincide with Adlerian understanding that belonging, cooperation, and accepting responsibility for one's actions are essential.
The lack of social interest leads to delinquency. Matza (1964) proposed that some adolescents are in a state of drift, a condition of limbo between a conventional lifestyle and a criminal lifestyle, with no attachment to either. This lack of belonging brings about an almost-accidental entry into crime—a drift into behaviors which are justified through "techniques of neutralization". (Conklin, 1989, p. 230)

These techniques allow youth to retain self-esteem as they justify their criminal behavior through (a) denial of responsibility, (b) denial of injury to anyone, (c) denial of the victim, (d) condemnation of the condemner, and (e) appeal to loyalties above the law.

The control theory of delinquency developed by Hirschi is based on the premise that youths who engage in delinquency have no intimate attachments, aspirations or moral beliefs which bind them to a law-abiding way of life (Conklin, 1989, p. 242). "Delinquency is not caused by beliefs that require delinquency but is rather made possible by the absence of (effective) beliefs that forbid delinquency" (Hirschi, 1969, p. 198).

Sutherland's differential association theory stated that a person becomes delinquent because of an excess of definitions favorable to the violation of the law over definitions unfavorable to violation of the law (Conklin, 1989, pp. 275-284). He theorized that, (a) criminal behavior is learned, (b) the learning occurs in face-to-face interaction, (c) learning includes techniques as well as the direction of motives, drives and attitudes, and (d) the law is determined to be "good" or "bad" and the direction of motives and drives are a direct result to this decision. In short, Adler's and Sutherland's theories of learning to belong run parallel to each other, with one accounting for useful behavior and one explaining useless acts.
Elkind (1984) has written that juvenile delinquents score higher on a concept he calls the "imaginary audience" scales than do normal teenagers. Their poor self-concepts cause them to lose sight of their own point of view and overemphasize that of a peer group (real or imagined). Behaving as though in front of an imaginary audience leads to (a) heightened self-consciousness, (b) extreme self-focus, (c) narcissism, (d) peer group allegiance, (e) need for privacy, and (f) feelings of shame. Adler (1979) called the same manifestations a lack of social interest. Elkind (1984) encouraged parents and professionals to intervene in the following ways: decrease self-focus by encouraging participation in meaningful activities, training in social perspective skills, early work experience, and encouraging the adolescent to validate social hypotheses.

**Scales of Social Interest**

In order to make the concept of social interest more applicable, throughout the last 20 years several researchers have attempted to develop instruments which make the concept of social interest explicit. The development and validation of an instrument, the Social Interest Index, measuring social interest was begun by Greever, Tseng, and Friedland (1973). The original work established validity and reliability for a small, community college population. More recently, researchers have correlated this instrument with other self-report instruments (Mozdzierz & Semyck, 1988).

Crandall developed the Social Interest Scale (SIS) in 1975. Since then he and his associates have conducted extensive research to establish
internal consistency, test-retest reliability and validity for this instrument (Crandall, 1977, 1980, 1981; Crandall & Harris, 1976; Crandell & Reimanis, 1976). Unfortunately, other Adlerian psychologists have not confirmed his findings. Leak (1982) found Crandall's SIS to have a high social desirability response set which could skew the results.

In 1988, the Sulliman Scale of Social Interest SSSI (Appendix A) received renewed attention (Sulliman, 1973). The original research was a pretest, posttest study of 452 Black and White male and female high school students (9th-12th graders). Mozdzierz, Greenblatt, and Murphy (1988) found the scale to correlate significantly with selected Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) scales; Ego Strength, Socio-Economic Status, Dominance, Social Responsibility, Emotional Maturity, and the Marlow Crown Social Desirability correlated positively. Significant negative correlations were found on the Maladjustment, Scale A, Dependency, Prejudice, Control, and the Manifest Anxiety scales. Interestingly enough, the correlation coefficients among the SSSI and the selected MMPI scales are of greater magnitude than the relationships reported with the traditional clinical scales (Mozdzierz, Greenblatt, & Murphy, 1986). In contrast, when Crandall's SIS was correlated with these MMPI scales, no significant relationships were derived.

The SSSI was also used in a study of 100 out-patient psychotherapy patients whose scores were correlated with five self-report instruments. Although the SSSI did not correlate positively with sex, socioeconomic status, years of education, or age, it did demonstrate moderately strong correlations between the various measures of adjustment and pathology for all the subjects in the sample (Fish & Mozdzierz, 1988, p. 312).
Although several assessment tools to measure social interest have been developed, the Sulliman Scale of Social Interest seems to have greatest validity and reliability (Mozdzierz, et al., 1988). Further use of this instrument with diverse populations can provide additional information as to whether or not a good instrument to measure social interest has indeed been developed.

**Behavior Rating Scales**

Behavior rating scales are psychometric instruments which provide a structured guide for assessing specific aspects of individual behaviors. These assessments are based on the rater's direct observations, perceptions, and interactions with the individual being rated (Guilford, 1954). Behavior rating scales require the rater to evaluate a series of social interactions in light of cultural and contextual norms (Cairns, 1979, pp. 209-226).

Within educational settings, behavior rating scales have been used primarily to assist in pre-intervention assessment, which includes the identification of specific behavioral characteristics of individual subjects (e.g., aggression, behavioral disturbance and hyperactivity) (Algozzine, 1980, pp. 223-233; Bullock & Wilson, 1986; Burke, 1977; Cassel, 1962; Cullinan, Schloss, & Epstein, 1987; Epstein, Cullinan & Rosemier, 1983; McCarney, Leigh & Cornbleet, 1983; Millman & Pancost, 1977; Pimm & McClure, 1969; Quay & Peterson, 1983; Walker, 1983). The literature reports their use as aids in developing individual intervention plans and in the tracking of behavioral change (Bullock & Wilson, 1986; Wilson, 1980). Researchers and program evaluators have also made use of behavior
rating scales (Achenback & Edelbrock, 1986; Lufkin, 1980; Quay & Peterson, 1983; Richey & Miller, 1987).

Behavior rating scales provide a systematic approach to behavioral assessment in which a standard set of relevant individual behaviors are considered. They facilitate data collection in that they require little time to complete (usually 5–10 minutes) and because they are completed by an observer, the rating scales can be an excellent adjunct to self-report instruments.

A selected review of six behavior rating scales by Bullock and Wilson (1988) (Appendix A) revealed that norming samples in four of the six scales included approximately equal distributions of subjects across school-aged grade levels. The other two were normed using elementary school-aged subjects (Appendix A). A review of the psychological and educational literature from 1977 to the present revealed only seven documented occurrences of the use of behavior rating scales with juvenile offenders. Youth placed in correctional facilities are not a representative sample of the youth found in regular educational settings. Not only have many experienced significant behavioral problems in regular school settings, but they represent a group which is disproportionately male, minority and those of lower socioeconomic level (Vinter, Necomb, & Kish, 1976).

Only two rating scales, the Behavior Dimensions Rating Scale (BDRS) (Appendix A) by Bullock and Wilson (in press) and the Behavior Evaluation Scale (McCarney, Leigh, & Cornbleet, 1983) were normed using a geographically representative national sample. Others were normed on data from clinical samples, urban centers, or geographically proximate
school districts. Of the two nationally normed scales, only the BDRS norming population approximates an ethnically representative sample or includes a comparison group of identified emotionally-disturbed, behaviorally-disordered subjects.

The BDRS has been shown to have an internal consistency reliability coefficient of .96, a test-retest coefficient of .87, and an interrater reliability coefficient of .68 (Appendix A). Content, criterion and construct validity are all represented in Appendix C (Campbell, Bullock, & Wilson, in press).
CHAPTER 2

DESIGN AND PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

Populations

This study involved subjects from three institutions in Illinois. A working relationship between two of these institutions (Pere Marquette and Principia College) has existed for a number of years. As part of a sociology major, students from the affluent, religiously-oriented liberal arts college became involved in volunteer work with incarcerated youths, many from inner-city Chicago. Each of the facilities is interested in determining the usefulness of the program for Pere Marquette residents.

Kankakee Illinois Youth Center is the only other minimum security detention facility for incarcerated youths in the State of Illinois. Therefore it was considered to be the most appropriate facility to serve as a control group. The programs are quite similar in plan and execution as well as in populations. Incarcerated youths included approximately 50 male residents at Pere Marquette Illinois Youth Center who ranged in age from 13 to 18. Approximately 55% are Black, 40% are Caucasian, and 5% are Hispanics. Principia College students were students, ages 18 to 25 of Caucasian ethnic background. Criteria for their inclusion was that the students from sociology classes volunteer to participate. Eleven males and 11 females for a total of 22 students chose to volunteer to participate in this program. They were randomly matched into teams by sex.
The control group included approximately 75 male residents at Kankakee Illinois Youth Center who were 13 to 18 years of age. Their ethnic backgrounds were approximately 55% Black, 40% Caucasian, and 5% Hispanic. All youth incarcerated at this facility who agreed to participate in this study were included.

Instrumentation

The instruments used in this study were the Sulliman Scale of Social Interest and the Behaviors Dimensions Rating Scale. No names were used. A request for noting ethnic background on the Sulliman Scale of Social Interest was made of the youths.

Sulliman Scale of Social Interest

The Sulliman Scale of Social Interest, a self-report questionnaire was completed by all subjects at Pere Marquette and Kankakee. This instrument is composed of 50 true or false items which measure the respondents' attitudes and reactions to their identity (significance) and relation to the world (belonging). The test was designed to measure concern for and trust in others as well as self-confidence and optimism in one's view of the world (Appendix A).

In order to assure the soundness of the instrument, Sulliman's original study utilized three methods of reliability. The Kuder-Richardson 20 formula provided a reliability coefficient of internal consistency of .91, while the test-retest showed a coefficient of stability of .93 after 5 weeks. The split-half method provided a reliability coefficient of .90.
Content validity was achieved through the participation of several experts, all of whom were clinical members of the American Society of Adlerian Psychology. All were well-versed in the concept of social interest. These experts worked independently to develop a key for the items, answering them as they deemed a person with very high social interest would. The independent keys were then compared, and items which produced disagreement of opinion were revised until all experts were in agreement.

Sulliman (1973) achieved concurrent validity by comparing teachers' subjective ratings with scores of students on the scale. His validity coefficients were .71 on both the Jaspen (1946) and Peters (1941) methods of validation.

Sulliman also developed sub-scales through the use of factor analysis. These sub-scales were termed "concern for and trust in others," and "confidence in oneself and optimism in one's view of the world" and were correlated with each other as well as with the entire instrument in order to arrive at a construct validity score. The correlation between the first sub-scale and the total test was .87, while the second sub-scale's correlation with the entire test was .90. The sub-scales had a correlation coefficient of .65 with each other (p. 71).

**Behavior Dimensions Rating Scale**

The Behavior Dimensions Rating Scale (BDRS) (Appendix A) has been nationally validated with juvenile offenders assigned to correctional education facilities. Its subscales can be used for populations in general educational and correctional education settings with the same
interpretation. The authors, Lyndal M. Bullock, Ed.D. and Michael J. Wilson, Ph.D., granted permission for the scale to be used in this study. The BDRS was developed and used to study the patterns of behaviors demonstrated by subjects with behavioral problems. Its characteristics have been influenced by numerous research studies (Bullock & Brown, 1970; Bullock, Wilson & Sarnacki, 1988; Bullock & Zagar, 1980; Bullock, Zagar, Donahue & Pelton, 1985; Sarnacki, 1987; Wilson, Moore & Bullock, 1987). The BDRS consists of 43 pairs of bipolar descriptors. Each descriptor is defined in the manual to avoid misinterpretation. Raters choose one of seven positions which best represent subjects' behavior on a continuum between the bipolar descriptors. The 43 items comprise four subscales: (a) aggressive-acting out, (b) irresponsible-inattentive, (c) socially withdrawn, and (d) fearful-anxious.

As previously mentioned, the BDRS was normed on a geographically representative sample of 641 subjects in kindergarten through grade 11 (Appendix A). The distribution of the sample was approximately equal across grade levels and included emotionally disturbed-behaviorally disordered and non-handicapped male and female subjects (Bullock & Wilson, in press).

As with the initial validation study for the BDRS, the standardization sample was drawn from each of the four geographic regions (i.e., Midwest, Northeast, South and West). The majority of the students were 15 to 18 years old (Appendix G) and were predominantly Black or Caucasian (Appendix H). Participants in the validation study were selected from the American Correctional Association Directory (1986) on the basis of their
(a) willingness to participate and (b) ability to identify subjects meeting the desired characteristics of the standardization sample.

Subjects included in the correctional education standardization sample were (a) male, (b) not identified as handicapped as defined by the Education for Childrens Act of 1975 (P.L. 94-142) (20 USC 1401), (c) observed by their teacher for a minimum of two weeks, and (d) resided in a state-operated juvenile correctional facility.

Comparison of the variance-covariance matrices using the Goodness of Fit Index yielded a result of .876 and an Incremental Fit Index (IFI) of .962. Bentler and Bonett (1980) suggest that an IFI level of .90 is an indication of a relatively good fit between the data and the model estimates. Continued analysis of the data was not required since the matrices could be considered essentially the same and common measurement characteristics could be determined from a pooled variance-covariance matrix (Joreskob & Sorbom, 1986).

The finding that the BDRS is factorially equivalent for subjects in general educational settings and for juvenile offenders in correctional educational settings is important for the current study as the BDRS has been established as valid for use with juvenile offenders in correctional facilities and with invariant variance-covariance matrices, the instrument may be used in either setting with the same interpretation.

The BDRS was completed for each of the subjects by their classroom teacher. Upon admission to the institution, Pere Marquette and Kankakee youths are assigned to a specific classroom teacher for the duration of their sentence.
Procedures

Approval of the following procedures for the use of human subjects was obtained. Based on the fact that the results of this study were completely confidential, with the youths only being identified by a number assigned by the researcher, the Illinois' Department of Corrections granted permission for the youths to participate in the program. Youths within the Juvenile Division, Department of Corrections are under custody of the state. Ronald Davis, Superintendent of Pere Marquette and Dennis Cooper, Superintendent of Kankakee gave permission for their charges to participate. The youths were presented with the letter of explanation on the first night of the program. It was carefully explained that anyone was able to choose not to participate at any time. Throughout the ten weeks, five youths chose to withdraw.

Treatment Strategy

Training

Principia college students enrolled in all sociology classes during the 1989 winter quarter were asked to participate in this project at Pere Marquette. Those who volunteered were randomly divided into teams. These teams met with the researcher and the coordinator for volunteer activities at Principia, for three one-hour training sessions during the first week of winter quarter. These sessions consisted of brief lectures on group counseling principles (Appendix E). Each of the lectures was followed by a discussion period. The first session dealt with communication skills such as active listening and open-ended questions. The second session focused on the stages of a group. The final training
session considered the ethics and limits of leading a group. A question and answer period was conducted before each of the training sessions ended.

The researcher accompanied the teams to the first session with the Pere Marquette youths, and then conducted a debriefing group with the college students immediately after the initial meeting to examine their experiences in relation to the Adlerian concepts previously learned.

Each week the college students and coordinator for volunteer activities met in order to observe a one half-hour video tape which explained the following evening's exercise at Pere Marquette. In each video tape an in-depth explanation and rationale for the exercises was given, as outlined in the appendices. The video tape presented a step-by-step outline of each week's exercises, including goals, time allotted for each exercise, the procedure to be observed and the specific objectives, and the expectations as to what participants had learned, felt, thought or experienced as a result of the interaction.

**Development Groups**

The facilitation teams led on-going discussion groups with the Pere Marquette experimental groups. The groups of six inmates and a college team met for 90 minutes each week. These were constant groups—the same members except for normal attrition of the delinquent population—no new members were added. Groups which declined below three Pere Marquette youths were collapsed and joined together for the remainder of the program. This happened to four groups. The youths at Kankakee also filled out the SSSI and were rated by their teachers.
The project lasted for 10 weeks, the length of a college quarter. At the end of the quarter, the delinquent population was given the self-report forms of the SSSI. The Pere Marquette teachers filled out the Behavior Dimension Rating Scale on each of the students for the second time. Ten weeks after taking the SSSI and the BDRS the Kankakee youths and teachers completed posttest evaluations.

As the college students were inexperienced in leading developmental groups, an exercise for each weekly meeting was selected by a team of doctoral students to implement the development of social interest. Exercises were chosen from 10 handbooks of structural experiences for human relations training. Exercises requiring reading or writing were discarded because the educational abilities of many juvenile delinquents are low.

Thirty-seven exercises were submitted to two outside evaluators who had experience in training in Individual Psychology and group counseling. In order to efficiently utilize the 90-minute group sessions between the Principia and Pere Marquette groups, the evaluators chose 13 exercises which they felt coordinated effectively to achieve the purposes of this study. The researcher requested that the evaluation team reach a consensus upon the choice of exercises. They chose the exercises based on criteria of (a) age-appropriateness, (b) likely interests, (c) feasibility for mixed groups, (d) personal successful experience, and (e) possibility of enhancing social interest (Appendix F). The researcher and evaluation team agreed to begin with exercises containing relatively low interpersonal risks and high rewards for belonging. Each week the exercises became more personally involved, and possibly more interesting.
or threatening. Creating a group where each person feels significance and belonging, and hence cultivating social interest, was the goal for each of the following activities:

Week 1. Two ice-breaking exercises were used. The goals for the first were to: (a) involve each person, (b) break down barriers between people who do not know each other by engaging in a common activity, and (c) alleviate tension through physical activity, as first encounters between groups are often uncomfortable.

Fruit Basket Upset is a physically-involving game which forces people to move around and takes 20 minutes (Ayers, 1973) (Appendix F). At the end of this activity the subjects were assigned to permanent groups. This task takes about 10 minutes. Once the groups were formed, an exercise called Best Friend was introduced. Its goals were to (a) afford participants the opportunity to introduce themselves in a non-threatening manner, and (b) develop a climate for group interaction by sharing personal information. The amount of time required was approximately 45 minutes (Pfeiffer & Jones, 1977, p. 3) (Appendix F).

Week 2. Learning how to listen was the focus of this session. Mixed Messages: A Communication Experiment was introduced. Its goals were (a) to explore the dynamics of receiving verbal and nonverbal communication cues that were in conflict with one another, (b) to examine how nonverbal cues can convey listener attitudes that can affect the communication process, and (c) to develop an understanding of the importance and impact of being direct and congruent in all forms of
interpersonal communication. The amount of time required was approximately 45 minutes (Appendix F).

The leaders used their discretion to determine when to go on to the next exercise, which was Team Building. Its goals were to (a) provide a forum in which each member can experience being listened to, and (b) provide a condensed experience in team building. Time required was approximately 45 minutes (Mill, 1972, p. 16) (Appendix F).

Week 3. A values clarification exercise which usually provokes controversy was the topic for this session. *Alligator River* is a story which participants analyze from each of the characters' viewpoint and then talk about their personal likes, dislikes and identification with the characters. The goals were to (a) have the subjects become emotionally involved in a fictional situation, (b) have the subjects identify and reveal some of their values, (c) go through the process of recognizing that others may hold differing values, and (d) negotiate for compromise or agree to disagree on values. The time required was approximately one hour. Next, 15 to 20 minutes was spent on having the groups explain their rankings of the characters' behavior to the other groups. Goals were to increase team feeling and increase perception of differing values (Simon, Howe & Kirschenbaum, 1978, pp. 290-294) (Appendix F).

Week 4. This discussion centered around the issue of trust. Affirmation of Trust: A feedback activity had the following goals: (a) to increase understanding of physical, intellectual and emotional trust, (b) to explore how the trust level existing in the group affects the openness of discussion, and (c) to provide an opportunity for group members to give
each other feedback on trust. The time required was 45 minutes (Pfeiffer & Jones, 1977, pp. 110-113) (Appendix F).

The exercise In my Neighborhood utilized incomplete sentences which all began: "In my neighborhood . . ." and was used to guide the last half of the discussion on appropriate trust. Goals were to (a) establish that everyone is both a student and a teacher, (b) allow Pere Marquette youths to become the "experts" in a discussion, and (c) explore the issue of trust. Sample sentences were: "In my neighborhood, we never . . .," "In my neighborhood, you know something's going on when . . .," "In my neighborhood people always . . .," etc. Time required was 45 minutes (Dinkmeyer & Dinkmeyer, 1986; Sullivan, 1988, p. 29) (Appendix F).

Week 5. Family of Origin consisted of role-playing which was implemented for the first time. Each member of the group chose and played a part about an incident wherein they found out a little boy in their family had been buying drugs from a neighborhood dealer. The researcher carefully explained how the facilitators can generate ideas for family roles; father, brother, grandparents, other children, etc. The leaders were prepared for the fact that this could be an uncomfortable situation at first and that few of the youths would be willing to assume female parts. However, with guidance, most students can be successful at recreating family feelings, at least for a while. Everyone was encouraged to join the exercise but not forced to participate. If participation was a problem the leaders could process the interactions which occurred during this 90 minute period. Goals were (a) to involve each person in a dramatic recreation which impacted their family of origin, (b) for each person to have a chance to experience another's feelings for a few moments, and
(c) to explore similarities and differences in regards to families. Time required was approximately one and one-half hours (Appendix F).

Week 6. Another night of role-playing, this exercise, Pregnancy, was designed to stretch the youths' abilities to understand another's situation. In this exercise, a crisis has occurred when a family discovers that the teenage daughter or sister is pregnant. Again, the group decided the family composition and how the roles were assigned. One person could choose to be the boyfriend and prospective father. Goals were to (a) explore the emotions involved in a situation which many of the youths had experienced, (b) begin to explore sexual ethics in a mixed setting, and (c) clarify values. Time required was 45 minutes (Appendix F). The next activity was to make up a Sexual Values Work Sheet. The goal was to continue to clarify values in the context of sexual-romantic relationships. Time required was 45 minutes (Pfeiffer & Jones, 1979, p. 27) (Appendix F).

Week 7. This was a follow-up to the previous week's activity. Sex-role attitudes: Personal feedback was an exercise which facilitated further discussion of sexual ethics and expectations. Goals were to (a) discuss attitudes and prejudices about the sexes in a non-threatening environment, and (b) increase awareness of and provide feedback on personal attitudes, beliefs and behaviors in regard to sex differences. Time required was one and one-half hours (Pfeiffer & Jones, 1979, pp. 85-90) (See Appendix F).

Week 8. A role-playing exercise with a wider focus was the assignment for the session. World View involved the group in an exercise of global affairs. The group was given the opportunity to develop a solution to nuclear war. Goals were to (a) increase participants' sense of
belonging to the world, (b) create an opportunity for creative thinking and cooperation, and (c) develop a sense of significance or self-efficacy as a problem-solver. Time required was one and one-half hours (Appendix F).

Week 9. This week was left open for input from either the administration or the residents of Pere Marquette or the college students. Sometimes pertinent issues arose which required attention. College students were asked for suggestions which they had thought of or were conveying from Pere Marquette. The students discussed the ideas in a round-table discussion with the researcher via a conference telephone call.

Week 10. The final session required paper and colored pencils for the Coat of Arms exercise. Each group member drew their own "coat of arms" which explained each individual's strengths, values and place in the group. Goals were to (a) affirm each group member's uniqueness and importance, (b) allow an expression of creativity, and (c) have a symbolic ending to the group with each person defining himself as he felt at that moment. Time required was one hour (See Appendix F).
CHAPTER 3
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Analysis of Data

The Sulliman Scale of Social Interest (SSSI) and Behavior Dimensions Rating Scale (BDRS) were scored by the computer center in the College of Education at the University of North Texas. The pretest and posttest scores of the experimental and control groups of incarcerated youths on both the SSSI and the BDRS were compared. As these are non-normal samples, it was assumed that there would be a skewness of the distribution (Huck, Cormier & Bounds, 1974). In addition, the small sample size disallowed the assumption of a normal distribution or homogenity of variances. For these reasons, all the data for the study were analyzed by means of nonparametric statistics which work with all levels of measurement; nominal, ordinal, interval, and ratio.

A Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used to address Hypothesis 1 and 2.

Hypothesis 3, addressed whether there had been an increase of social interest. Comparing pretest and posttest scores on the SSSI for the experimental and control groups yielded this result. The Mann Whitney U is a $U$-test which is analogous to the parametric $t$-test for independent samples. It was used to compare the experimental group at Pere Marquette to the control group at Kankakee in order to determine whether or not the difference is statistically significant.
Hypothesis 4 required comparison of the scores of Caucasians to non-Caucasians. The correlations used in the first two hypotheses were divided according to race in order to test this hypothesis. Again the Mann Whitney U test was utilized to test significance because it accounts for the differences in the sample sizes of the races.

The major purpose of the study was to determine if a program of developmental groups led by non-professionals could increase the social interest of adjudicated youths as measured by two instruments. Based on the review of literature, it was anticipated that there would be a relationship between attitudes and behavior. A pre-posttest experimental design was employed.

Ninety male youths in two juvenile institutions were first scored on a scale of social interest and a behavior rating scale initially. The experimental group contained 43 youths, the control group contained 47. Next, the experimental group participated in a program of weekly developmental groups, led by non-professionals. These groups were centered around topics related to social interest. At the end of 10 weeks the participants were retested. Due to institutional attrition the posttest groups were considerably smaller: experimental 31, control 21.

Two of the four hypotheses were supported. The social interest scale did not correlate with the behavioral rating scale on the pretest or the posttest scores. A comparison of the pretest and posttest scores of the experimental group showed a significant increase in social interest. The null hypothesis regarding race was supported; there was no difference between the social interest of the Caucasian and non-Caucasian youths on either scale.
Results of Testing the Hypothesis

The first hypothesis stated that a positive correlation would occur between the pretest results of the SSSI and the BDRS. This hypothesis was not supported. A low, but not significant correlation between the two tests was found on the pretests. In a possible range of scores from 0 to 100, the mean for the SSSI was 58.12, with a standard deviation of 18.17. This places the mean in the middle range of scores. The possible score range on the BDRS was from 0 to 301. The mean was 182.58, with a standard deviation of 39.96. This also is a mid-range score. A very low positive correlation was found between the scores, .003. Table 1 contains data related to this hypothesis.

The second hypothesis stated that a positive correlation would occur between the posttest results of the SSSI and the BDRS. This hypothesis was not supported. Another low, non-significant correlation was found on the posttests. The mean for the SSSI test was 65.69 with a standard deviation of 15.69. The BDRS had a mean of 181.75 with a standard deviation of 37.47. The correlation was .001. Table 2 contains the results related to Hypothesis 2.

The third hypothesis stated that there would be a significant increase in the social interest of the experimental group (Pere Marquette) of incarcerated youths as a result of this program. This hypothesis was supported. Difference between means were analyzed using a test for correlated samples. The mean for the adjusted pretest scores was 50.38, the standard deviation was 5.53. The posttest mean was 65.16, the standard deviation was 17.05 ($\overline{x} = 8.86$, $df = 30$). The gain was significant. The increase surpasses significance at the .0001 level. Table 3
summarizes the results of the pretest and posttest scores for the experimental group.

Table 1  
**Correlation of Pretest Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sulliman</td>
<td>58.12</td>
<td>18.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDRS</td>
<td>182.58</td>
<td>39.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = 90  Note. Correlation = .003*

Table 2  
**Correlation of Posttest Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sulliman</td>
<td>65.69</td>
<td>15.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDRS</td>
<td>181.75</td>
<td>37.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = 51  Note. Correlation = .001*
Table 3

t-Test Results for Pretest and Posttest scores for the Sulliman Scale of Social Interest of the Experimental Group (Pere Marquette)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error of Difference of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>50.39</td>
<td>15.53</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>62.90</td>
<td>17.05</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*\( p < .0001 \)

In order to ensure that the results were not attributable to the passage of time, the effect of being incarcerated or any other unknown factor, the results of the control group’s pretest and posttest SSSI were examined. The mean for the adjusted pretest scores was 69.95, standard deviation 13.76. The posttest mean was 68.29 with a standard deviation of 14.50 (\( t = -1.00, df = 20 \)). The results of a two-tail probability test was .328, a non-significant change between pretest and posttest scores. This group made no gain in the scores on their social interest test. As the control group was highly comparable to the experimental group on pretest score, it would appear that the increase on the social interest scores for the experimental group were due to the treatment.
Table 4

Results of Pretest-Posttest Scores of Sulliman Scale for Control Group
(n = 21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error of the Mean</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>69.95</td>
<td>13.76</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>68.29</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two Tailed Probability = .328

The fourth hypothesis, stating that there would be no difference between the social interest of Caucasian and non-Caucasian youths on both the pretest and posttest, was supported by the scores of the SSSI and the BDRS. The statistical analysis of the Mann Whitney U test necessitates converting scores into rank order to perform the function of analysis. For that reason the scores in this section are represented as rank scores and therefore differ considerably from those previously reported. On the experimental SSSI pretests, the mean for White youths was 43.45 and 46.48 for Black youths ($z = .51$). For the BDRS pretest the mean for Whites was 45.45, and 45.52 for Blacks, ($z = .0130$). The posttest SSSI scores were Whites 30.91, and for Blacks 23.00. Although the $z$ score was -1.87, the difference was not significant. The BDRS posttest scores were
26.87 for Whites and 25.29 for Blacks which yielded a z score of -.38. The null hypothesis was accepted. The two races scored as though they were the same population. Table 5 summarizes the data.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results of the Two Scales Pretest and Posttest Divided by Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulliman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDRS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results Not Expressed in Hypotheses

One result which was not expressed in the previous hypotheses seems worthy of mention. The researcher added five questions to the SSSI in order to gain a feedback from the experimental participants about their assessment of the project. An accurate analysis of a five-question instrument is admittedly difficult, but the results may be useful. The 31 youths participating in the posttest reported that their attitudes had changed as a result of the developmental groups. Table 6 summarizes the results.
Table 6
Items Added to the SSSI by the Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions Added</th>
<th>Number Who Agreed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51. This program between Pere Marquette and Principia helped me learn things about myself.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. I am glad I participated in this program</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. I feel different about my relationships with girls as a result of this program.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. I feel different about my relationships with other people as a result of this program.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. I think this program would be helpful to other Pere Marquette students.</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion
This study explored the Adlerian construct of social interest. Social interest is one of the fundamental concepts of Adlerian psychology and was defined earlier as interest in the interest of others. The primary purpose of the study was to determine if social interest could be developed
among incarcerated youths through groups led by non-professionals. An attempt was made to utilize a relatively unexplored scale, the SSSI, on a new population: that of delinquent youths. A secondary purpose was to investigate the relationship between attitudes and behavior by pairing this instrument with the BDRS, a measure whose construct validity is established with this population. The results failed to support a relationship between social interest and behavior. The hypothesis that treatment would lead to an increase in social interest was supported. The final hypothesis that there would be no difference between Caucasian and non-Caucasian youths, was also supported. The following section provides rationale for the results.

Participants

An incarcerated juvenile population is rarely stable. This study was conducted over 10 weeks. Those who participated had to continue to be involved or they were dropped. Five youths chose to discontinue participation. During the same period 11 other youths were discharged from Pere Marquette. Thus, the relatively small original sample of 47 was reduced to 31 for the final results. The small sample size is one reason to view the results with caution. The highly significant increase in social interest could be attributed to a skewedness based on the small number of subjects.

Instruments

As stated previously, the SSSI has recently been rediscovered. It has been used with outpatient psychotherapy patients and hospitalized alcoholics as well as being correlated with Minnesota Multiphasic
Personality Inventory (MMPI) scales. It was normed on male and female high school students. There were no adjudicated youths in the norming process. The results of this study indicate that this instrument may be relevant to delinquent populations. Further studies utilizing this instrument with a variety of subjects appears to be warranted.

Procedures

A 10-week program is considered fairly brief. Although the scores on the social interest scale, a self-report instrument of attitudes, showed an increase as a result of the treatment, the teacher-scored behavior scale showed no increase. This finding violates a basic Adlerian assumption that behavioral change necessarily accompanies attitudinal change. Perhaps 10 weeks is not an adequate time span to demonstrate behavioral change.

Another possibility is that the focus of the developmental groups concerned only attitudes and not behaviors. Although role-playing was utilized, the groups did not directly contribute to behavioral implementation of the ideas discussed.

It is also feasible that the norms of a facility based on a shared history of criminal behavior works against the process of making behavioral changes. Outcome research of incarcerated populations who have participated in rehabilitation programs show dismal results (Lipton, Matinson, & Wilks, 1975; Schrest, White, & Brown, 1979).

A final point is that for incarcerated youths the presence of the other sex may contribute to the social desirability of a program. The groups were led by co-ed teams, a college male and female student coordinated each discussion. This factor could account for the interest of the youths in
volunteering for the groups and their participation. It is conceivable that similar groups led by non-professional males would have different results.

Summary

One purpose of this study was to determine if social interest could be developed among incarcerated youths through discussion groups led by non-professionals. A second purpose was to establish the existence of a relationship between the attitudes and behavior of this population.

Subjects participating in the first stage of the study included 90 male youths in two juvenile delinquency facilities. The number of subjects who completed the program totaled 52. Of the 31 in the experimental group at Pere Marquette, 18 were Black and 13 were White. The control group at Kankakee was composed of 21--15 Black and 6 White. The posttest population was slightly skewed in terms of racial composition due to chance. More of the subjects who were discharged happened to be White.

Volunteers from a liberal arts college were solicited in sociology classes to lead groups among the youths at Pere Marquette. Eleven male and eleven female students were randomly assigned to work in pairs for the 10-week period of time. Each facilitation team attended three one-hour training sessions prior to the beginning of the project. These training sessions were conducted by the researcher and the on-site supervisor using materials especially adapted for the sessions. The training sessions included discussion of and practice in communication skills, expectations concerning stages of groups and the ethics and limits of group leadership.
The researcher and on-site supervisor accompanied the facilitation teams to the first session with the experimental groups. The college students and youths were given letters of explanation and questions were answered about the project, the Sulliman Scale of Social Interest (SSSI) and the Behavior Dimensions Rating Scale (BDRS). All of the young people--college students and youths alike--were then given the SSSI. Each item was read aloud and the participants marked their answers privately. When the tests were collected, subjects were randomly assigned to groups. These groups remained constant throughout the 10-week period except for attrition. Four of the groups were collapsed and joined when the number of participants dropped too low. During the same week, each classroom teacher rated the participants on the BDRS.

Each week the group leaders discussed the assignment provided by the researcher prior to the group session. They then led the activity and were debriefed by the on-site supervisor at the end of the evening. Every week a different team telephoned the researcher to discuss the results of the debriefing. At the end of the 10 week period the researcher retested the group and teachers rated their students on the BDRS.

During this same period of time, the control group at Kankakee was tested. The SSSI test was given during regular classtime. Teachers rated their students on the BDRS. Ten weeks later the process was repeated for those who had remained in the institution.

Hypotheses 1 and 2 were tested using the Pearson product moment correlation. Hypothesis 3 was analyzed through the use of a $F$-test and a Mann Whitney U test was used for Hypothesis 4. The .05 level of significance was used to test the hypotheses. The instruments used in
pretesting and posttesting were hand scored and computer analyzed for statistical purposes.

It was predicted in Hypothesis 1 that the pretest scores of the SSSI and the BDRS would have a positive correlation. The correlation did not reach the .05 level of significance; therefore, Hypothesis 1 was rejected.

It was predicted in Hypothesis 2 that the posttest scores of the SSSI and the BDRS would correlate positively. The correlation did not reach the .05 level of significance; therefore, Hypothesis 2 was rejected.

Hypothesis 3 predicted that the youths participating in the developmental groups would show a significant increase in their scores on the SSSI. The $f$ value surpassed the .0005 level of significance; therefore, Hypothesis 3 was supported.

It was predicted in Hypothesis 4 that there would be no difference between Caucasian and non-Caucasian youths on the pretest and posttest scores of both the SSSI and BDRS. The $z$ scores were less than the .05 level of significance, thus Hypothesis 4 was supported.

Findings

The following is a summary of the findings of the study.

1. There was no correlation between social interest and socially desirable behavior.

2. Youths who participated in the developmental groups showed a marked increase in social interest.

3. Racial background was not a factor in the presence or absence of social interest.
4. The SSSI scale may be a valid instrument even for this non-normal population.

Conclusions
Youths incarcerated in correctional facilities can develop social interest. Participation in groups, even those led by non-professionals, focusing on the development of useful, other-directed attitudes appear to merit further investigation.

Recommendations
Based on this study, the researcher believes the following recommendations could be helpful to the field of counseling.

1. A program utilizing non-professionals as group leaders should be employed at a number of juvenile correctional facilities in order to explore the general validity of the procedure for this special population.

2. The specific development of social interest should be included as a part of counseling and education programs for juvenile delinquents.

3. Counselors, teachers and volunteers should look for specific ways to connect attitudes to behaviors. Behaviors which demonstrate social interest should be specified, discussed, practiced and examined for their practicality as well as intrinsic and extrinsic rewards.
APPENDIX A

SCALES
Sulliman Scale of Social Interest

1. People are all of equal worth, regardless of what country they live in.

2. If it were not for all the bad breaks which I have had, I could really have amounted to something.

3. I often feel like I am completely alone in the world.

4. I think that most people are friendly.

5. I get angry when people do not do what I want them to do.

6. Members of my family have great concern for me.

7. I wish that everyone would leave me alone.

8. I like to watch movies where the bad guy wins.

9. If people make things difficult for me then I will try to make things even more difficult for them.

10. It seems like nothing ever changes for me.

11. A person must watch out for himself because no one else will help him.

12. Most people only appear to be honest but do many dishonest things.

13. I don’t let anyone tell me what to do.

14. I would like to make the world a perfect place in which to live because I would be seen by others as the most important person alive.

15. The world is a great place in which to live.

16. I like animals more than I like people.

17. I like to make new friends.

18. Some people do not deserve to live.
18. Some people do not deserve to live.

19. It seems like people are always doing bad things to me.

20. Most people have little respect for others.

21. It seems like everything I do turns out wrong.

22. There are some individuals whom I hate.

23. No one really cares about me.

24. Things usually work out for the best.

25. I would rather complete a "perfect crime" and not be caught than to complete a work of art such as a painting.

26. Most people are concerned only with themselves.

27. Sometimes I like to hurt people.

28. I wish that I could run away and leave everyone in the world behind me.

29. I am an important person in the lives of some other people.

30. I would like to help every person in the world.

31. Most people treat me more like a little kid than an adult.

32. Most people would take advantage of me if they could.

33. I am a happy person.

34. I care about people that I know but not about total strangers.

35. I sometimes like to hurt animals for no reason at all.

36. No one tries to understand me and my feelings.
37. I wish that I could destroy the world and build it back up the way that I would like it to be.

38. People cooperate with me most of the time.

39. If something goes wrong for me, I become extremely angry.

40. There aren't very many things that I care about.

41. I hope that I get the chance to get back at some people for the bad way in which they have treated me.

42. People can't be trusted.

43. This is a great time to be alive.

44. People are not very friendly

45. I have confidence in other people.

46. To get ahead in this world, you have to step on people along the way.

47. I hate to listen to other people's problems.

48. People are basically good.

49. There are several people whom I hate.

50. If I had control over people, I would make them do what I wanted them to do.

51. This program between Pere Marquette and Principia helped me learn things about myself.

52. I am glad I participated in this program.

53. I feel different about my relationships with girls as a result of this program.

54. I feel different about my relationships with other people as a result of this program.
55. I think this program would be helpful to other Pere Marquette students.
Student Behavior Ratings

Part I: Data Tracking Information

Teacher’s Name__________________________________________ School District/Agency__________________________________________

School Phone # (_______)____________________________________ Student’s initials__________________________________________

Part II: Individual Student Information

A. Date of birth

B. Today's date

C. Grade placement of this child? (Check one)

1. Preschool (3-5 years)
2. Kdg - 3rd grade
3. 4th - 5th grades
4. 6th - 8th grades
5. 9th - 11th grades

D. Ethnic origin (Check one)

1. American Indian
2. Asian/Pacific
3. Black (not Hispanic)
4. Caucasian (not Hispanic)
5. Hispanic
6. Other (specify)

E. Is this child eligible for a free lunch program? (Check one)

1. Yes 2. No

F. Sex (Check one)

1. M 2. F

G. Best description of academic setting (Check one)

1. Regular preschool
2. Preschool designed to serve students with special needs
3. Self-contained special class in public school
4. Special education resource room in public school
5. Special center in public school
6. Psychiatric hospital
7. Regular education
8. Other (specify)

H. If this child is receiving special education services, please check all that apply

1. Behavioral disorder
2. Cognitive disorder
3. Motoric disorder
4. Sensory disorder
5. Other (specify)
### Part III: Student Behavior Ratings

**Directions:** The following pairs of adjectives and behaviors refer to ways children act. The two terms of each pair represent a continuum of behavior, such as from aggressive to passive. Please indicate how the child usually behaves by circling one of the seven points along the continuum. For example, the child who is always hitting and threatening other children would receive a circle next to the aggressive end of the aggressive-passive continuum.

**Example:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggressive</th>
<th>Passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>praises others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long attention span</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disruptive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>withdrawn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quiet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sociable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dislikes classmates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>breaks rules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feel free to use any one of the seven points to represent the child's usual behavior by circling a point there. Please complete all 44 items for each child.

| 1. | hurts others | praises others |
| 2. | self-conscious | confident |
| 3. | short attention span | long attention span |
| 4. | non-disruptive | disruptive |
| 5. | outgoing | withdrawn |
| 6. | possessive | sharing |
| 7. | talkative | quiet |
| 8. | shy | sociable |
| 9. | likes classmates | dislikes classmates |
| 10. | observes rules | breaks rules |
| 11. | distractable | stays on task |
| 12. | tense | tranquil |
| 13. | bold | timid |
| 14. | leads | follows |
| 15. | responsible | irresponsible |
| 16. | dislikes school | enjoys school |
| 17. | passive | active |
| 18. | destructive | constructive |
| 19. | fearful | self-confident |
| 20. | cooperates | fights |
| 21. | poor social relationships | adequate social relationships |
| 22. | calm | anxious |
| 23. | respects authority figures | defies authority figures |
| 24. | reluctant | eager |
| 25. | follows directions | does not follow directions |
| 26. | quarrelsome | adequate social relationships |
| 27. | works independently | anxious |
| 28. | plays with group | defies authority figures |
| 29. | stays on task | follows |
| 30. | inattentive | irresponsible |
| 31. | unmotivated | does not follow directions |
| 32. | easily frustrated | adequate social relationships |
| 33. | expresses feelings | anxious |
| 34. | poorly organized | defies authority figures |
| 35. | sad expression | follows |
| 36. | self stimulates | irresponsible |
| 37. | receptive to new ideas | does not follow directions |
| 38. | abuses self | adequate social relationships |
| 39. | sure | anxious |
| 40. | trusts others | defies authority figures |
| 41. | no learning difficulties | follows |
| 42. | abuses others | irresponsible |
| 43. | understands environment | does not follow directions |
| 44. | doesn't complain about physical problems | adequate social relationships |

---

Note: The table above contains a mix of adjectives and behaviors, with some cells left blank for formatting purposes. The actual table would have consistent formatting and alignment.
APPENDIX B
ADDITIONAL TABLES
Table 7

Selected Characteristics of Six Behavior Rating Scales Based on Manual Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th># Items</th>
<th>Age/Grade Level</th>
<th>Forms</th>
<th>Interpretative Profile</th>
<th>Response Format</th>
<th>Unique Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BORS</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Grades: K-11</td>
<td>Single Form</td>
<td>4 subscales</td>
<td>Uses a 7-point Likert scale to indicate which bipolar descriptor best represents individual's behavior</td>
<td>Consists of bipolar behavioral descriptors Manual provides definitions for all bipolar descriptors Uses NCR paper to facilitate score transfer National validation on ED &amp; nonhandicapped National validation on juvenile offenders Canadian sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acting out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Irresponsible/inattentive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Socially withdrawn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fearful/anxious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normative Sample: Males ED &amp; non-handicapped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female ED &amp; non-handicapped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larger # Females in non-handicapped group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approximately equal # males across grade levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race/Ethnic (approx.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White: 67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black: 19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic: 11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other: 3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separate national normative data (N 1942)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National validation on ED &amp; non-handedicapped</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on youth in correctional facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geographic Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NES</th>
<th>52</th>
<th>Grades: K-12</th>
<th>Single Form</th>
<th>5 subscales</th>
<th>Uses 7-point Likert scale to relate items to federal definition of emotionally disturbed</th>
<th>Summary sheet relates items to federal definition of emotionally disturbed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning problems</td>
<td>Interpersonal difficulties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate behavior</td>
<td>Unhappiness/depression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Physical symptoms/fears</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normative Sample: Males ED &amp; non-handicapped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approximately equal distribution among Grades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approximately equal distribution between M-F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race/Ethnic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White: 60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black: 02%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other: 02%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geographic Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>Race/Ethnic</td>
<td>Socialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBCL-TRF</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>Ages 6-16</td>
<td>Various forms</td>
<td>Various forms</td>
<td>Various forms</td>
<td>Various forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESP</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Grades K-6</td>
<td>Various forms</td>
<td>Various forms</td>
<td>Various forms</td>
<td>Various forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSPC</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Grades K-6</td>
<td>Various forms</td>
<td>Various forms</td>
<td>Various forms</td>
<td>Various forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPSIC</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Grades K-6</td>
<td>Various forms</td>
<td>Various forms</td>
<td>Various forms</td>
<td>Various forms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

Reliability Estimation of Six Rating Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Consistency</th>
<th>Test-Retest</th>
<th>Interrater</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(ALPHA) (Split 1/2)</td>
<td>Subscale Rng</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low to High</td>
<td>Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDRS</td>
<td>.90 .95 .96</td>
<td>.82 .89 .87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BES</td>
<td>.73 .91 .96</td>
<td>.97 .97 .97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBCL-TRF</td>
<td>--- --- ---</td>
<td>.26 .99 .89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESB</td>
<td>--- --- ---</td>
<td>.71 .91 ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBPC</td>
<td>.90 .95 ---</td>
<td>.49 .83 ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPBIC</td>
<td>--- --- .98</td>
<td>.43 .88 .80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9
Validation as Reported in Behavioral Rating Scales Manuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Criterion-Related</th>
<th>Construct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BORS Expert review &amp; confirm validity of the subscale content.</td>
<td>Discriminant function analysis predicting BO and non BO students results: significant p&lt;.001 74% to 76% correct group placement by subscale. significant (p&lt;.001).</td>
<td>a. Confirmatory factor analysis established adequate fit of hypotheses structure b. Multitrait Multimethod Validation result: Aggression/Acting Out &amp; irresponsible/inattentive subscales good convergent validity, other subscales not conclusive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BES Reports that content is valid due to experts part in instrument development</td>
<td>Correlated with Behavior Rating Profile results: significant correlations of subscales &amp; r = .64 for overall</td>
<td>a. T-test between BO and normal students (p. (p&lt;.01). b. Subscale intercorrelations r = .50 to .68. c. Subscale correlations r=.58 to .65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBCL-TRF Report of feedback during the item development process and statistical differentiation based on classification of students.</td>
<td>a. Regression of age, referral status, race and SES on CBCL-TRF scores resulting multiple significant and nonsignificant amounts of variance accounted for. b. Discriminant analysis between referred and non-referred, approximately 78% correctly identified.</td>
<td>a. Correlation of IS CBCL-TRF subscales with 4 subscales of Conner's Revised Teacher Rating Scale (1999); correlations between .12 and .39. b. Significant differentiation between students with and without attentional deficit disorder. c. Significant differences between students with and without learning disabilities. d. Significant correlations with direct observation of teachers. e. Factor analysis of items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESB Suggestion of content review and approval</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPIC Reports that content is valid because of a careful item selection process which made teachers and experts part of the process.</td>
<td>The following were predicted with subscales scores a. BD identification (p&lt;.001) b. child withdrawal (p&lt;.01) c. achievement (p&lt;.001) d. classroom observations (p&lt;.001) e. parent ratings of on deviant and nondeviant boys (no s.d.)</td>
<td>a. Exploratory factor analysis interpretations supported instrument theoretical basis. b. Inter-item correlations, r=.00 to .63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBPC None</td>
<td>Discriminant function analysis predicting BO &amp; non BO students results: significant p&lt;.01 85% correct identification for overall scale</td>
<td>a. Conceptual comparison with BSRI-II yielded good match. b. T-test between BO and normal students (p&lt;.05) c. Subscale correlations with peer ratings on aggression, withdrawal and likeability; 7/21 of the correlations were significant d. Correlation of subscale scores with achievement and aptitude tests (p&lt;.001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10

Behavior Dimensions Rating Scale: Distribution of the Standardized Sample by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11

**Behavior Dimensions Rating Scale: Distribution of the Standardized Sample by Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percent of Standardized Sample (N = 560*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 - 12</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 16</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 - 18</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 - 20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 22</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * This data not provided on 81 subjects

Note. ** Less than 1% of the sample size
Table 12

Behavior Dimensions Rating Scale: Distribution of the Standardized Sample by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnic Origin</th>
<th>Percent of Standardized Sample (N = 605*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian Pacific</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * These data were not provided for 36 subjects
APPENDIX C

LETTER TO STUDENT
Dear Student,

I would like to include you in a research project I am conducting with Principia students and the youths at Pere Marquette IYC. As a doctoral student in counseling, I am interested in learning how to help teenagers in trouble with the law. Several years ago, I was responsible for the Soc. 50 program with Pere Marquette. Now I want to see if this program is being helpful to the Pere Marquette and Principia students involved.

I would like to have you answer a 50-item survey about your attitudes toward the world. This questionnaire, The Sulliman Scale of Social Interest, has no right or wrong answers and would take about 15 minutes to complete at the beginning of winter quarter and again the last week of the quarter. At the same time your teacher will also be completing a Behavior Rating Scale, in order to gain another perspective on your interactions with others. There are no risks. The results will be totally confidential--no names will be used, so you will not be identified. Of course, participation is voluntary, and you may withdraw at any time.

Hopefully, this study will help counselors know how to help teenagers in trouble with the law. If you have any questions, please feel free to make an appointment to talk to me while I am on campus, or write or call me at the address listed below. Thank you for your participation.

Connie Eldridge
425 Bernard #204
Denton, TX 76201
(503) 668-5202
Outside Evaluators

A. Here are 37 group exercises which could build on the principles of social interest, cooperation, belonging and striving for significance.

B. Based on your knowledge, training and experience in group counseling and individual psychology, decide which of the exercises would work most effectively in groups of college students and juvenile delinquents.

C. Following are the criterion upon which to base your selection of 14 exercises to be used.

1. Age-appropriateness
2. Likely interests
3. Feasibility for mixed groups
4. Possibility of enhancing social interests
5. Successful personal experience with exercises
6. At the end of this sheet in the section described as Rationale, list the reasons for your choices.

RATIONALE:

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.
APPENDIX E
GROUP TRAINING LECTURES
Group Training Lectures

Session One

The researcher/trainer will give a brief lecture outlining the following active communication concepts:

A. Paraphrasing  
B. Reflection of feeling  
C. Immediacy  
D. Self-disclosure  
E. Confrontation  
F. Open vs. closed ended questions  

The students will be given an opportunity to become familiar with each of the above concepts through practicing them in the dyads of their randomly selected facilitation teams (Berg & Landreth, 1980, pp. 31-46).

Session Two

The trainer will ask the students to meet with their assigned co-leader to discuss the following concepts:

A. Initial Stage
   1. Division of Responsibility
   2. Setting up ground rules
   3. Helping members understand goals

B. Transition Stage
   1. Dealing with anxiety
   2. The struggle for control
   3. Problems behaviors and difficult group members

C. Working Stage
   1. Cohesion and universality
   2. Hope
   3. Willingness to risk
D. Ending Stage

1. Dealing with feelings of separation
2. Reviewing the group experience

Session Three

I. The trainer will outline some limitations for a peer counseling group:

   A. Boundaries
   B. In case of trouble
   C. Personal limits

II. The trainer will lead the group in a discussion of the above topics as well as:

   A. Attendance
   B. Dress
   C. Contact outside of group
   D. Personal feelings about group members.
Fruit Basket Upset

Goals:

A. Involve each person.
B. Break down barriers between people who don't know each other.
C. Alleviate tension through physical activity.

Time: 20 minutes

Process:

1. The researcher/trainer will introduce the idea of a game and ask all the participants to help move the tables and chairs so that the middle of the room is open.

2. She will then request the group to make a large circle with the chairs, one for each person.

3. The trainer will stand in the middle of the circle and divide the participants into groups of six or eight. The division will be in name only as everyone is to remain seated in the circle, but now each group has a "fruit name." The trainer will say, "You are now apples. Remember that you will remain apples for the rest of the game." She will then divide and name each grouping of six to eight people until the entire group has been put into categories.

4. The trainer then explains, "In this game everyone has a chair except me. I am going to call out the names of two or three fruits. If I call your fruit, stand up and trade seats with someone else who is standing. I am going to try to get someone's chair away from them. That means that when everyone has finished scrambling for chairs someone else will be left standing and I will be sitting down."
This will happen each time. The person in the middle will call out the name of two or three fruits or they could say, "Fruit basket upset!" which means that everyone has to move. If your fruit name is called you have to move. So be aware of that and remind your fellow group members or they will end up in the middle.

This game moves quickly so just remember that no matter where you sit you'll always be the same fruit name you are now."

5. The trainer will then answer questions.

6. The trainer will have the group do a trial run to help everyone understand how the game is played. If there are more questions time will be allowed.

Time: About 20 minutes

The objectives for this activity are:

1. To create new groupings so that the division between the Principia and Pere Marquette groups is erased, however briefly.

2. To have dissimilar people share similar labels for a few moments.

3. To have everyone participate in a new activity together, i.e., to put the participants on an equal footing.

4. To have everyone move out of his or her chair at least three times.

5. To have participants become so involved in an activity that they forget about impressing anyone else.

6. For the participants to experience having fun together.
Expected outcome:

The hope is that this activity will result in an awareness that people are all remarkably similar in terms of silly, playing, or competitive behaviors. It is anticipated that the participants will have fun with people they are meeting for the first time.
Best Friend: A Getting-Acquainted Activity

Goals:

A. To afford participants the opportunity to introduce themselves in a non-threatening manner.

B. To develop a climate for group interaction by sharing personal information.

Time: Approximately 45 minutes.

Physical setting:

Group of 6 to 8 with chairs arranged in a circle.

Process:

1. The facilitator briefly discusses the goals of the experience.

2. The facilitator explains to "identify in your own mind the one person outside this group who you think knows you better than anyone else—it may be your mother, father, girlfriend, brother, sister or a close friend. We will call this person your best friend. Now please introduce yourself to the group as you think your best friend would introduce you to us. You might include items like "I am the kind of person who...", "I really like...", "Someday I would like to..."

3. The facilitator leads a discussion of the experience, including relevant questions, comments, and feedback to the participants. The group members then discuss what they learned about themselves, and then about each other as a result of the experience.
The objectives for this activity are:

1. That the participants will each think about how he is perceived by a loved one. Perhaps they will recognize that another's view may be as valid as their own.
2. For each person to participate.
3. For each person to speak about himself in a positive manner.
4. For the group members to think about how people represent or express individuality.
5. For the participants to recognize similarities among their new group.
6. For people to begin to feel comfortable with each other.
7. For the individuals to begin to form a group.

Expected outcome:

As a result of this activity group members should know each others names, as well as having learned some information about each person in the group. A group identity will have begun to form as a result of self-disclosure.
Mixed Messages

Goals:

A. Explore dynamics of receiving verbal and nonverbal communication cues that are in conflict with one another.
B. Examine how nonverbal cues can convey listener attitudes that affect the communication.
C. Develop understanding of importance and impact of being direct and congruent in all forms of interpersonal communication.

Time: 45 minutes

Process:

1. The group leaders will divide their group (including themselves) into triads, then have group members move their chairs so that the triads have some privacy. The leaders will ask them to talk about whatever they wish for a few minutes.

2. After five minutes the leaders will interrupt the conversation by asking each triad to designate a communicator, a listener and an observer.

3. The communicators will meet briefly with one of the leaders who will instruct them to "carry on the conversation with your listener that you have already started. Try your best to communicate your message to your partner. It is your responsibility to keep the conversation going. Do not discuss these instructions at this time."

4. One of the leaders will meet with each of the observers and inform them, "Your task is simply to collect data on what the communicator and listener are doing during their conversation. Do not concern yourself with what they are saying, but rather how they
communicate. Pay attention to what each of them do (eye contact, gestures, body positions and other non-verbal behavior). Describe what you observe as accurately as possible without judging. You will be asked later to give feedback to the communicator and listener. Do not discuss these instructions at this time.”

5. One of the leaders will meet with the listener and tell them that this exercise is called “Anything you can do, I can do better.”

“You and your communicator are to continue the conversation that your triad started a few minutes ago. You are to appear attentive and to listen carefully to your partner, but you are to challenge everything your partner says. You may interrupt while he or she is talking, anticipate what would have been said next, and disagree or present your own point of view. You may point your finger, lean forward as if about to pounce, and engage in other non-verbal behaviors that accent your verbal behavior. You are the critic. After you have made your criticism or statement, wait and allow your partner to begin the conversation again. Your task is not to try to take over the conversation but merely to interrupt, disagree, or challenge whatever is said. If your partner hesitates, remain silent until he or she begins to talk again, and then resume your role. Do not discuss these instructions at this time.”

6. The group is instructed to begin the activity.

7. After five minutes the leader stops the activity and instructs the members to share their role instructions. Observers are asked to report their observations--to give feedback to communicators and listeners. The communicator and listener each explain their assignment and his/her experiences while playing this role.
8. The groups are then instructed to switch roles. The leaders tell the new listener that this exercise is called "who gives a damn?"

"You and your communicator are to continue the conversation that your triad started a few minutes ago. You are to listen carefully to what your partner is saying, but are to send your partner non-verbal signals that indicate your boredom (i.e. look away, slump in your chair, twist and fidget, clean your fingernails, fiddle with your clothing, or such). If your partner accuses you of being uninterested, insist that you are interested--you may even review what has been said--but continue to send non-verbal signals of boredom. Do not discuss or share these instructions at this time."

9. The groups begin the activity.

10. The leader interrupts after five minutes and asks them to perform the same kind of debriefing that they had done for the first exercise. Each shares role, experience and reactions.

11. The triads switch roles again. The new listener is told that this exercise is called "how sweet it is."

"You and your communicator are to continue the conversation that your triad started a few minutes ago. You are to appear attentive, listen carefully, and agree with everything your partner says, regardless of your opinions on the subject. When your real opinion is opposite of what your partner is saying, smile as you indicate agreement. You may make comments such as "That's a great way of putting that." "That's very insightful of you." "Oh, wow," and so on. Resist any invitation from your partner to share your ideas ("Oh, I agree with you"), or to criticize or
evaluate the ideas being communicated. Do not discuss these ideas at this time.” The triads conduct this activity for five minutes.

12. The leader interrupts and asks them to perform the same kind of debriefing that they had done for the other two exercises. Each shares role, experience and reactions.

13. The leaders will have the group reassemble for a discussion of the effects the different listener roles had on the feelings and perceptions of the communicator. The leaders will facilitate this discussion by asking:

(a) How it felt to play the different listener roles.
(b) How it felt to try to communicate with the different types of listeners (including frustrations and satisfactions).
(c) The level of communication achieved by each triad and each type of listener.
(d) Can you think of other examples when you have had trouble communicating or being listened to? Let’s talk about some of those situations and the feelings they generate.
(e) What kind of listeners are your friends? Your teachers, your family, yourself?

The objectives for this activity are:

1. To have group members talk with each other.
2. To create an awareness of verbal and non-verbal messages.
3. For group members to experience different roles.
4. To facilitate awareness of feelings—for group members to be asked to express how it felt to be listened to or not.
5. To stimulate thinking about communication skills.
6. To create interactions among group members.
Expected outcome:

As a result of this activity, all the group members will have experienced playing a role, speaking, listening and observing. Exploring feelings will have begun. The participants will have begun to think about their ability to communicate.
Team Building

Goals:

A. Provide forum in which each member can experience being listened to.

B. Provide a condensed experience in team building.

Time: 45 minutes.

Process:

Each group will form a circle. The leaders will introduce this exercise by saying, "Now we are going to have an experience with team building. I will give you some topics to talk about. Each topic will be in the form of an incomplete sentence. You can use the sentence as a jumping off point. You will have four or five minutes for each of these topics. The first topic is "When I first enter a new group, I feel . . . ." The leaders will both participate and facilitate.

At five minute intervals, the leaders will introduce the following incomplete sentences:

1. My greatest strength is . . . (brag about yourself).

2. I usually try to make people think I am . . . (facade).

3. The hardest kind of person for me to get along with is . . .

4. What I am afraid is going to happen is . . . (use any time reference).

When these topics have been discussed, the group will be given the assignment of coming up with a statement which everyone agrees upon. The statement begins, "To us, trust is . . . We think it's important because . . . ."
In five to ten minutes, when all the groups have reached a consensual statement, each group will designate a spokesperson to read or state their statement to the entire assemblage of Pere Marquette and Principia group.

The objectives for this activity are:

1. To help the group draw together through self-disclosure.
2. To create an open forum discussion.
3. To have group members begin to make statements about themselves (significance) and their relation to the world (belonging).
4. For the group to cooperatively arrive at a value statement.
5. For each group to experience their identity as a group (a feeling of "us-ness") within the larger group.

Expected outcome:

As a result of this activity the members will have examined and expressed their own identities. The group will have negotiated a statement of themselves as a team. All of the teams will have made public statements of "This is what we believe."
Alligator River

Goals:

A. Have subjects become emotionally involved in a fictional situation.
B. Have subjects identify and reveal some of their values.
C. Go through the process of recognizing that others may have differing values.
D. Negotiate for compromise or agree to disagree on values.

Time: One hour

Process:

One of the Principia students will tell the following story to the entire group:

Once upon a time there was a woman named Abigail who was in love with a man named Gregory. Gregory lived on the shore of a river. Abigail lived on the opposite shore of the river. There was a huge storm which blocked out communication between the two sides of the river. Abigail wanted to cross the river to be with Gregory. Unfortunately, the bridge had also been wiped out in the storm. She went to ask Sinbad, a riverboat captain, to take her across. He said he would be glad to do so if she would agree to go to be with him before the voyage. She promptly refused and went to a friend named Ivan to explain her plight. Ivan did not want to become involved in the situation. Abigail felt her only alternative was to accept Sinbad's terms. Sinbad fulfilled his promise to Abigail and delivered her into the arms of Gregory.
When she told Gregory about how she had gotten across the river, Gregory cast her aside with disdain. Heartsick and dejected, Abigail turned to Slug with her tale of woe. Slug, feeling compassion for Abigail, sought out Gregory and beat him brutally.

After the story has been told, each group will discuss it. These questions will be used by the leaders to guide the discussion:

1. Who did you like the most? Why?
2. Who are you the most like?
3. Who did you dislike the most? Why?
4. What would you have done if you had been Abigail?
5. What would you have done if you had been Gregory?
6. What do you consider the most important things in a relationship?

When these questions have been discussed, the group leaders will ask their group to decide on the best person and the worst person in the story.

At the end of the hour, each group will designate a spokesperson (not one of the leaders) to announce their group's decision about the best and worst characters and the reasons for these choices.

The objectives for this activity are:

1. For each group to discuss an emotionally involving story.
2. For group members to experience identification with another person even though it is a fictional character.
3. To have people speak up for their values.
4. For people with differing values to communicate.
5. Creating a forum in which to discuss love, relationships, trust, honesty and belonging.

6. For the group to cooperatively arrive at a statement about the story and state it to the larger group.

Expected outcome:

As a result of this activity the participants will have been stimulated to think about and feel for someone else. They will have compared other people's values to their own. In addition, the group will again have made a team decision and statement about values.
Affirmation of Trust

Goals:

A. Increase understanding of physical, intellectual and emotional trust.

B. To explore how the trust level existing in the group affects openness of discussion.

C. Provide opportunity for members to give feedback on trust.

Time: One hour

Process:

1. Each group forms a circle with their chairs.

2. The leaders then facilitate and participate in a discussion of the following questions:
   - What kind of situations cause you to be afraid?
   - What kind of life situation do you hope to have at some time in the future?
   - What makes you happy?
   - What do you do best?

3. Twenty minutes will be spent on this discussion.

4. The leaders will explain that they will read a series of statements about trust. "As there are many kinds of trust, there are many of these statements. We hope that within these groups we are building trust. As I read these sentences, if you hear anything which applies to someone in the group please speak up. Each of us will have different feelings about trust and other group members. What we want to do is create an opportunity to think about what is important to each of us individually in terms of trust."
(a) I would trust you to share your happiness with me.
(b) I would trust you to hold my money.
(c) I would trust you to care for my children.
(d) I would hope that you would tell me how others perceive me.
(e) I would trust you to help me if I were incapacitated in some way.
(f) I would hope that you would give me help if I needed it.
(g) I would trust you to keep an appointment with me.
(h) I would hope that you would tell me if I sounded phony.
(i) I would trust you to be honest with me.
(j) I would trust you not to talk about me behind my back.
(k) I would trust you to keep a secret I shared with you.
(l) I would trust you enough to tell you about those I love.
(m) I would trust that you would be a good traveling companion on a trip.
(n) I would trust you to drive my car.
(o) I would trust you to pay back any money I might loan you.
(p) I would trust you to live in my apartment or house.
(q) I would trust you to complete any job I might give you.
(r) I would hope that you would give me a place to sleep if I needed it.
(s) I would trust you to be my friend.
(t) I would hope that you would offer me emotional support when I need it.
(u) I would trust your advice.
(v) I would hope that you would share some of your free time with me.
(w) I would trust you with my life.
(x) I would trust your views about political matters.
(y) I would trust you to fix me up with a blind date.

5. As the leaders read these statements they will have to model sharing their own feelings. Caution needs to be given in two areas:

(a) Leaders need to be honest—they should not tell someone they trust them if this is not the case. Giving double messages is not helpful.
(b) If a group member is being ignored the leaders need to determine whether or not to address this problem. In some cases discussing why others do not trust him could be helpful. In other cases, if a group member is seen by peers as a bully or
scapegoat discussing it may prove counterproductive. The leaders need to be sensitive to the group dynamics.

The objectives of this activity are:

1. To explore the issue of trust.
2. Examine the different ways in which trust can be expressed.
3. Create a forum for feedback among group members.
4. Increase positive feelings among group members.

Expected outcome:

As a result of this activity the participants will have expressed their feelings of trust for group members. Hopefully, some of them will have experienced feeling trusted.
In my Neighborhood

Goals:
A. Establish everyone as both student and teacher.
B. For Pere Marquette boys to become "experts" in discussion.
C. Address the issue of trust.

Time: 45 minutes

Physical Setting:
Chairs to be arranged in a circle.

Process:
1. The leaders will explain that everyone grows up in environments which determine their perceptions of how things are supposed to be. Our families and neighborhoods are the norms we know as children—hence the ways we understand ourselves and the world are shaped by that with which we are familiar.

2. Obviously, everyone grows up in a different kind of neighborhood. Some are in the city; some people live in suburbs and some so far out in the country that they have no neighbors. In many areas, everyone owns a car, while in others, no one does.

3. There are other deeper expectations which often go unsaid and are possibly not even acknowledged in thought. For example, in some areas, kids play out in the street, in others no one knows anyone else's name, or everyone goes to the same church, etc.

4. Have every group member spend a few moments thinking about their own neighborhood. Each person will then describe their
neighborhood, including what it looks like, what it feels like, what they like and dislike about it.

5. The leader will then ask everyone to finish the following incomplete sentences:
   - In my neighborhood we never ...
   - In my neighborhood you know something's going on when ...
   - In my neighborhood people always ...
   - In my neighborhood people would say ... about me.
   - The biggest thing that ever happened in my neighborhood was ...
   - One of the great things about my neighborhood is ...
   - One of the bad things about my neighborhood is ...

6. While everyone should be encouraged to answer each question, the intention is to establish a conversation of sharing and learning.

7. Leaders will end the activity by asking the members to debrief what they learned about themselves and others.

The objectives for this activity are:

1. For group members to begin to examine their assumptions about the physical and social aspects of their lives.

2. For everyone to have something to share or explain to others about their own private world.

3. To establish that certain aspects of life are the same no matter where one lives.

4. To increase knowledge about each other through self-disclosure.
Expected outcome:

The expected result of this activity is that learning about the lives of other young people's worlds will occur. It is further anticipated that connections will be formed between group members.
Role-Playing

Goals:

A. Involve each person in dramatic re-creation which impacts their family of origin.
B. For each person to have a chance to experience someone else's feelings for a few moments.
C. Explore people's similarities and differences regarding their families.

Time: One and one-half hours

Process:

1. The group leaders will introduce the exercise by talking about role-playing, i.e., that it's embarrassing and awkward for everyone at first, but can be both fun and informative.

2. The leaders will outline the assignment as follows: "We are supposed to imagine that we are a family. It can be any kind of a family we decide upon as long as everyone has a role. The only restriction is that there has to be an 8-year old boy who has been discovered to be buying crack from a neighborhood dealer.

   Let's set up a family. Do we want to have a mother and a father? Grandparents? Aunt and uncle? Who will be the dad, etc.?

   Okay, do you want to talk about your roles or just start by being them? We have to act out how this would feel and what we decide to do to deal with this situation."

3. Remain in role-play for at least 30 minutes.
4. Move into debriefing. Discuss what it felt like to be 8 years old and in trouble; to be the brother of a kid who is going to get messed up, etc.

5. Examine how it feels to "be" somebody else.

6. Who did you feel angry with? What would you have liked to do differently?

7. Talk about similar situations the group members may have experienced in their own families.

The objectives for this activity are:

1. For group members to remember what it was like to be a small child.

2. For each person to "try on" the identity of someone else.

3. To experience the feelings of being part of a family where interdependent behaviors affect oneself as well as others.

4. To create a situation where one's depest feelings of belonging are elicited.

5. To establish a situation which requires cooperation on the part of the group.

The expected outcome is:

As a result of this activity it is expected that everyone will have thought about their family of origin. Each person will have experienced being someone else for a brief period of time. The differences and similarities between families will have been discussed.
Pregnancy

Goals:

A. Explore emotions involved in situations which many of the youths may experience.

B. Begin to explore sexual ethics in male and female settings.

C. Clarify sexual values.

Time: 45 minutes.

Physical setting:

Chaires to be arranged to form a circle.

Process:

1. The leaders remind the group about the role-playing which was done the previous week.

2. This assignment is to be explained as follows: "Tonight, we are to form a family again. This is another family crisis. Again, it can be made up of any one we choose as long as everyone is involved. The only restriction is that there has to be a 15-year old girl who has just discovered she is pregnant.

   Let's set up the family. Do we want to have both parents? A boyfriend? Who else? Who wants to be the girl? Shall we begin by talking about the situation and the roles or just jump into it? Our task is to act out how this would feel and to decide what to do in order to deal with this situation."

3. Remain in role-play for about 30 minutes.

4. Move into debriefing. Discuss the feelings of being faced with fatherhood, motherhood, an abortion, etc.
5. Examine how it feels to "be" somebody else.

6. Who did you agree with? Who did you want to listen to you? What would you have liked to do differently?

7. Talk about similar situations that you may have experienced in your own family.

The objectives for this activity are:

1. For group members to consider the ramifications of teenage pregnancy from several viewpoints.

2. For each person to "try on" the identity of someone else.

3. To experience the feelings of being part of a family where interdependent behaviors affect oneself as well as others.

4. To create a forum to talk about relationships, sexual values and consequences.

5. To establish a situation which requires cooperation on the part of a group.

6. To address potentially-emotional issues in the context of the group.

The expected outcome is:

The anticipated results of this activity are that the group will have dealt with a controversial subject through experiencing other people's thoughts and feelings.
Sexual Values Worksheet

Goals:

A. To identify one's own values about a romantic/sexual relationship.

B. To become aware of the sexual values of others—especially members of the other sex.

C. To increase awareness of the many components of romantic/sexual relationships.

Time: 45 minutes

Physical setting:

Group of chairs arranged in a circle. A blackboard or flip chart with the sexual values list printed on it is needed for each group.

Process:

1. The leaders briefly discuss the goals of the exercise.

2. The leaders explain that they are going to read the list out loud and briefly explain each item. Then they will read it more slowly and ask each group member (including themselves) to signify the three items which are most important to them in a relationship.

3. The leaders will write down each group member's name with a (+) next to those items he designates.

4. The members will then be asked to signify the three items which are least important to them in relationships.

5. The leaders will write the members' names with (-) next to those items.
6. The leaders will lead a non-judgmental discussion about these values. The following questions should be used to guide the discussion.

(a) Why are these values important to you?
(b) How are these values similar to or different from your parents' relationship or the relationships of other people close to you?
(c) Do we really think about these values when becoming interested in a new person?
(d) Why or why not?
(e) Are any of your values different than they were two or three years ago? Why?
(f) How easy is it to establish relationships with your values?
(g) How did you respond to discovering that other group members have radically different values?

The objectives for this activity are:

1. For each person to have an opportunity to think about values they hold for relationships.
2. For group members to hear the values their peers possess.
3. That a discussion of the similarities and differences between group members will stimulate thought.
4. For group members to possibly re-evaluate their beliefs.

Expected outcome:

As a result of this activity group members will have engaged in a forum discussion about values in relationships with peers, at least one of whom is a member of the other sex. Similarities and differences of values will have been explored.
Sexual Values Worksheet

1. Age
2. Attraction
3. Commitment
4. Companionship
5. Consideration
6. Contraceptive protection
7. Dependence
8. Equality
9. Expectations
10. Feeling at ease
11. Honesty
12. Interdependence
13. Jealousy
14. Love
15. Openness
16. Possessiveness
17. Race or ethnicity
18. Mutuality
19. Religion
20. Respect
21. Security
22. Ability to get along with other person's family
23. Trust
24. Experimentation
25. Pressure
26. Dominance
27. Communication
28. Variety
29. Similar interests
Sex-Role Attitudes

Goals:
   A. Discuss attitudes and prejudices about the sexes in a non-threatening environment.
   B. Increase awareness of a provable feedback on one's own attitudes, beliefs and behavior.

Time: One and one-half hour

Physical setting:
   Chairs are arranged in a circle. A blackboard or flip chart with the following list written (and hopefully illustrated) is in each group.

Process:
   1. The leaders will explain that everyone holds certain beliefs about the feelings and attitudes of the sexes. Examining those beliefs can lead to understanding how we each set up expectations of ourselves and others.
   2. They will read each list over quickly and tell the members that each person will be given a chance to talk briefly about their own agreement or disagreement with several statements.
   3. The leaders will then read one statement and ask a specific group member to express his opinion about the statement. In this manner, all of the statements and all the group members (including the leaders) will be covered. Obviously, each member will be given opportunities to express an opinion.
   4. The leaders will encourage an open discussion. If other members express opinions about a certain item, this should be encouraged. The idea is to have a lively discussion with these ideas as jumping-off points.
The objectives for this activity are:

1. To expose stereotyped beliefs about the sexes to the group members' scrutiny.
2. To have group members react to and against these stereotypes.
3. To encounter differences of opinions and thus to recognize someone else's viewpoint.
4. To stimulate thought and emotions regarding stereotyping.

Expected outcome:

As a result of this activity, group members will have discussed sex-roles with peers, at least one of whom is a member of the other sex. A discussion of one's gender identity and that of others will have been examined in a thoughtful, emotional discussion.
Sex-Role Stereotyped Statements

Male:
1. Men are logical
2. Men are untidy
3. Men are brave
4. Men are egotistical
5. Men are mechanically inclined
6. Men are cynical
7. Men are strong
8. Men like to gamble
9. Men are aggressive
10. Men are sexually driven
11. Men are competitive
12. Men are happier when they are not married
13. Men want to be the breadwinners
14. Men want women to be submissive
15. Men are not good losers
16. Men do not know how to cook
17. Men are smarter than women
18. Men need women to take care of them
19. Men do not appreciate delicate things
World View

Goals:

A. To increase people’s sense of belonging to the world.
B. To create an opportunity for creative thinking and cooperation.
C. To develop a sense of significance or self-efficacy as a problem solver.

Physical setting:

Chairs are arranged in a circle. A pad of paper and a pencil will be provided.

Process:

1. The leaders will explain that this evening’s activity will be a "flight of fantasy." The group has the opportunity to devise a plan for completely changing the world. They are going to explain the situation and ask the group to arrive at a plan to rectify the problem. No holds are barred—any idea which the group agrees to is acceptable, regardless of whether it is currently feasible. The only restriction is that the solution must be a positive one.

2. The United States and Russia are engaged in a nuclear war. Within one hour, if something doesn’t happen, final missiles will be fired. These missiles guarantee the death of all life on earth: human, animal and plant. Some buildings will remain but no one will survive.

3. The group has been selected to come up with a solution to this horrible dilemma. As scientists, business people, educators, politicians and family members, etc., their opinions are regarded as representative of the best thinking in the world today.
4. They are requested to come up with the solution to this problem. The leaders may suggest any of the following options for consideration if the discussion falters, but allow plenty of time for the group to generate their own ideas.

(a) An agreement between the two countries for a cease-fire could be reached with a well-developed plan for resolving differences like a year-long exchange program for all 15-year-olds in both countries or some other idea.
(b) The space program could send people to another planet and start a new world.
(c) The citizens of the other countries in the world could band together to somehow stop the two super-powers.

5. Discuss all ideas thoroughly and have one person record the group's plan.

6. Completely cover the options and rationale for each.

7. At the end of the hour, a spokesman from each group will explain their plan to the entire group.

The objectives for this activity are:

1. For the groups to cooperate on a plan.
2. To have the group members see themselves as problem-solvers rather than problem-makers.
3. To broaden their thinking beyond the normal sphere of their own activity—to create a world vision and a sense of themselves as citizens of the world.
4. For the groups to have shared their own unique solution with other like-minded "world citizens."
Expected outcome:

As a result of this activity it is expected that the group members will have explored some new avenues of creative thinking. A sense of self-efficacy will have been experienced for a brief period of time. A heightened sense of belonging to the world will have increased social interest.
Coat of Arms

Goals:

A. Affirm each group member's uniqueness and importance.
B. Allow an expression of creativity.
C. Have symbolic ending to group with each person defining himself.

Time: One hour

Physical setting:

The chairs are arranged around a table for the first part of the exercise. Each group member is given several pieces of blank paper. Pencils of various colors are placed in the center of each table.

Process:

1. The leaders will explain that a "coat of arms" or a banner was used by ancient tribes in Europe and Africa to represent a group's identity.

2. This activity will consist of each person drawing their own personal coat of arms and explaining it to the group.

3. Each person, including the leaders, will be asked to divide their paper into six cells. It will be emphasized that drawing doesn't matter, the ideas behind the pictures are the focus.

4. In the cells, everyone will draw:

(a) The possession you love most.
(b) Your favorite place in the world.
(c) Your greatest personal achievement.
(d) Your greatest personal failure.
(e) A picture of how you think of the world.
(f) Something you are striving to be or what you hope your future will hold.
5. When everyone has finished their drawings, the group will move away from the table and form a circle with their chairs.

6. Each person will show their "coat of arms" to the group, explaining what each picture represents.

The objectives of this activity are:

1. For group members to have an opportunity to think about and represent their own significance.

2. For each person to have a tangible product to keep, if they choose, as a momento of the group.

3. For a sense of belonging to the group to be expressed through sharing their identity.

4. For the group to end on a positive note.

Expected outcome:

As a result of this activity it is expected that everyone will think about themselves in a new way. Engaging in this light-hearted activity will be fun. A positive self-identity within the context of the group will have been expressed.
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