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This study compares the impact of group counseling with that of outdoor group experience upon institutionalized adolescents. Limited to subjects between twelve and sixteen years old, the study evaluates behavior, self-esteem, social and personal adjustment, and sociometric choosing. The object of these evaluations is to test the effectiveness of these two approaches to treating disturbed adolescents who had failed to function in a community setting and who might otherwise have lapsed into delinquency.

Group counseling sessions followed a format of fifteen ninety-minute periods over a five-week span. The outdoor group experience included five weekly meetings lasting approximately seven hours each. The group-counseling approach as described by leaders was client-centered, while the outdoor group experience followed a structured time schedule climaxed with the group's cooperative effort in preparing a meal.
The results of this study do not support the prediction that group counseling sessions lead to scores on the **Self-Esteem Inventory** significantly higher than scores obtained following a control period. Data also fail to indicate that outdoor group experience effects significantly higher self-esteem than a group counseling period and a control period.

**Behavior Rating Form** scores fail to show significantly higher self-esteem following group counseling sessions than after a control period. Neither does self-esteem appear significantly higher following outdoor group experience than after group counseling and a control period. Data from the **California Test of Personality** show no significant change in personal and social adjustment following group counseling or following outdoor group experience.

Sociometric choosing does not differ significantly from measures taken following group counseling and following a control period. Nor do subjects score significantly higher in number of sociometric choices following outdoor group experience than following a control period or group counseling.

Group counseling subjects received a larger number of behavior points than those tested following a control period. However, the change is in favor of the group counseling subjects instead of the outdoor-group-experience subjects, as had been predicted.
Significant change following group counseling and following outdoor group experience as measured by accrual of points for behavior suggests that both approaches are effective, with group counseling having the greater impact. Also, younger subjects appear to profit more from both group counseling and outdoor group experience.

The absence of significant change reflected by standardized instruments creates two questions. Are available instruments normed on basically normal groups appropriate for use with such a unique group of subjects as those in this study? Also, does the intense resistance these subjects demonstrated toward all pencil-and-paper activities negatively affect the accuracy of results from these standardized instruments?
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Group counseling experience in recent years has been an increasingly acceptable approach for improving the quality of individual interpersonal adjustment. Group counseling experience has been found to yield benefits such as reduced tensions, increased interpersonal participation and improved social functioning (11). Other benefits have resulted in clearly defining the adequacy of the group member's relationships with other people, thus providing a variety of value systems for consideration by the member (14). According to Gordon (13) group counseling increases intellectual maturity, self understanding, acceptance of others, self confidence, respect for oneself, and awareness of one's needs and limitations. Group counseling also reduces defensiveness and need to direct others.

Various authorities (1, 10, 19, 31, 32) in the counseling field have maintained that group counseling promotes increased levels of self understanding, acceptance of the client, and counseling efficiency. Some of the same
descriptions of mental health as defined by Gazda (10) correspond to the variables above (increased level of self understanding, increased acceptance of others).

Children and adolescents who are institutionalized often lack the qualities listed as benefits accrued from group counseling. Their problems have been described as arising "...from their violent, and sometimes unnecessarily intense reactions to essential controls and frustrations" (26, p. 288). Inability to conform to restrictions created by family and by school has been found repeatedly to be a reason for placing children in institutions (28). Even placement, itself, while attempting to help the child, often has added to his problems.

Resentment is general, diffuse, and universal. This is unavoidable, for removal from one's family and social group inevitably spells rejection and deprivation of the pleasures and comparatively secure relations in the normal setting of life (25, p. 209).

Recently more attention has been focused upon setting and activity as aspects of the therapeutic process meriting research (26). The use of the outdoors as an alternative to the traditional counseling room has been explored by the Dallas Salesmanship Club for adolescent boys who were experiencing multiple adjustment problems in school and at home. Triggs, (31) former director of this organization's outdoor program reported improved self-control and increased success in school among participants completing several
months of such an outdoor experience. He also suggested that the same positive changes might occur among institutionalized youngsters who followed a similar program.

Based upon reports of positive change resulting from short-term activity group experiences, a series of one-day outdoor experiences was selected for comparison with the generally effective treatment, group counseling. These one-day outdoor group activities serving in the present study with group counseling formed the two components of a nucleus in which both approaches were examined as to influence upon separate groups of subjects. Slavson described the positive impact of an activity-oriented treatment as follows:

For all children the ultimate outcome of such an experience within a group (activity group) is that their frustration tolerance is greatly enhanced, which is the essence of maturity (26, p. 288).

The students who participated in this study were observed to exhibit two traits which seemed to make them good candidates for an outdoor therapeutic experience. "Acting-out" behavior was more common than verbalizing frustration. They, as a group, had higher scores on the performance subtests of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children than on the Verbal subtests. The other characteristic was low frustration tolerance, which was thought to be related to the high frequency of motor behavior in situations of anxiety or stress.
A search of related literature yielded three findings relevant to the present study. Little organized research has been conducted to study the therapeutic effects upon children and adolescents of outdoor group experience. No evidence was found that a comparison has been made between the effects of the two treatments of group counseling and outdoor group experience. No experimental studies were located which dealt with exploring institutionalized youngsters and their reactions to group counseling as compared to other institutionalized youngsters and their responses to outdoor group experience in terms of change in multiple criterion variables related to personality.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to determine whether group counseling or a specific outdoor activity sequence produced greater positive change in behavior, emotional stability, and social maturity of two treatment groups of students in an institutional setting of maladjusted children.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine changes in personality, self-esteem, sociometric choosing, and behavior occurring as a result of two forms of group experience.
Hypotheses

1. Subjects will score significantly higher in self-esteem as measured by the Self-Esteem Inventory following participation in group counseling sessions than following a control period.

2. Subjects will score significantly higher in self-esteem as measured by the Self-Esteem Inventory following participation in outdoor group experience than following a control period and than subjects in group counseling.

3. Subjects will score significantly higher in self-esteem as measured by the Behavior Rating Form following participation in group counseling sessions than following a control period.

4. Subjects will score significantly higher in self-esteem as measured by the Behavior Rating Form following participation in outdoor group experience than following a control period and than subjects in group counseling.

5. Subjects will score significantly higher in social and personal adjustment as measured by the California Test of Personality following participation in group counseling sessions than following a control period.

6. Subjects will score significantly higher in social and personal adjustment as measured by the California Test
of Personality following participation in outdoor group experience than following a control period and than subjects in group counseling.

7. Subjects will score significantly higher in number of sociometric choices following participation in group counseling sessions than following a control period.

8. Subjects will score significantly higher in number of sociometric choices following participation in outdoor group experience than following a control period and than subjects in group counseling.

9. Subjects will score significantly higher in number of points issued by school staff for positive behavior following participation in group counseling sessions than following a control period.

10. Subjects will score significantly higher in number of points issued by school staff for positive behavior following participation in outdoor group experience than following a control period and than subjects in group counseling.

Background and Significance

Youngsters who are institutionalized and are characterized as having "acting-out" behavior often have behavioral traits in common with adolescents who have been adjudicated delinquent. The majority of subjects in the present study exhibited both acting out behavior and strong
resentment toward authority figures. Research studies involving delinquents thus are considered to be a direct source of input as to the nature of the subjects of this research endeavor.

It has been reported that juvenile delinquents need the self-respect and confidence necessary to change their negative attitude toward themselves and society. The following statement documents their plight.

There is no other group of children in American Society who represents so complete failure as the institutionalized delinquent. He has failed himself, his family, his school, and his community. In fact, he has even failed at crimes. . . .his home is broken; he is chronically unemployed; his diet is grossly insufficient. Frequently illiterate, he is always undereducated; and living amidst squalor, he commits crime against society for which he and society must pay (4, p. 20).

The school has had a significant role in the development of personalities of these young persons. Glasser (12) has made a number of observations as to this impact. He noted, after working with delinquent girls, that problems seemed to begin after they perceived that they were not wanted by the staff in the elementary school. Glasser further suggested that public school was "much rougher" than the school for delinquent girls, adding that without exception each delinquent child brought before him had been failing in that public school. He explained that
people who feel they are failures have a failure identity and they behave as failures. They follow failure pathways that solidify their failure identity. Their behavior is antisocial, and it can be serious or it can be mild" (12, p. 12). Glasser defined antisocial behavior as one of two options, "delinquency" or "withdrawal", and explained that effective or "responsible" involvement with other persons was the opposite circumstance. Cautioning readers not to become concerned with bad home situations while ignoring bad school environments, Glasser reemphasized that "...involvement is the basis of motivation. In this world, we do things because we care for others and we care for ourselves in relationship to these others" (12, p. 14).

Another view of delinquent behavior and its causes as well as a suggestion for treatment has been offered by Didato.

The delinquent may be seen as a product of the group experience, not as a causative determinant in its formation. ... Since the delinquent shows greater responsiveness and sensitivity to group processes it is hypothesized by many that he may best be treated in a group setting (5, p. 211).

Didato's position that adolescents with antisocial tendencies may find help through involvement in groups has been supported by the work of a number of authorities. His rationale for the value of groups was that
Man as a social being is primarily motivated by a strong desire to belong. Only within the group can he fulfill the potentialities which he possesses (5, p. 199).

The effectiveness of group counseling in meeting needs of delinquents often resistant to change was stated thus: "...to the extent that juvenile delinquency may be interpreted as a consequence of the failure of social controls, the group setting provides for realistic retraining and controlled experience in interpersonal relations (18, p. 409).

Lifton (17) listed assumptions which contributed to the development of a group counseling rationale. He based these points upon an approach both humanistic and existential wherein a member helped another because of a dependence upon other members and because in so doing he helped himself. Specifically, he noted the following:

Individuals and groups when freed of threat, strive toward healthier, more adaptive kinds of behavior. ... Each individual lives in a world of his own, bound by the uniqueness of his perceptions and past experiences (17, p. 233).

The core of Lifton's conceptualization of groups lies in his statement listing the necessary elements for change.

It [the group] offers support, feedback of perceived behavior, information about alternatives which could be considered, reinforcement of positive behavior and rejection of unacceptable behavior, and new experiences designed to broaden the repertoire of experiences and skills needed to cope with society (the group) (17, p. 233).
Dreikurs (6) reported helpful attributes of counseling groups relevant to vanity and status anxiety, explaining that new social values are supplemented through an educational process. The participant thus finds a place of his own in the group, a value especially important to the individual who has never had this experience in his family.

Other features of therapeutic groups relate to stress, sensitivity, and hostility, significant components in the lives of delinquents and socially maladjusted adolescents. Essentially the impact is one of lightening their load and teaching them more effective means of handling their burdens (27).

Both institutionalized boys and girls have profited from experience in group counseling. Gains for girls have included developing new sex roles as related to male figures, working through the anxieties related to sexual thoughts, and learning to live with a more passive self definition while avoiding feelings of helplessness. Improved adjustment to body changes, better relations with adults and peers, and more accurate social perceptions also have been experienced by girls (15).

Group therapy has reportedly been found to be superior to individual therapy with delinquent boys in an industrial
school. Participants were described as having felt less anxious, defensive and lonely than in the individual setting (16).

Foster children and delinquents have characteristics such as behavior problems setting them apart from the mainstream of youth. They are subject to the positive impact of group counseling which effects change, "the defensive, deprived, shy, dependent, and school behavior problem" (8, p. 281).

These youngsters are particularly susceptible to the whims and demands placed upon them by peers. Gazda (8) termed group counseling as having "unique value" for the adolescent experiencing pressure to identify with his peer group.

An adolescent foster child who participates in group counseling can expect to profit in several ways such as improved self-confidence.

Through the groups many adolescent foster children are now able to handle some of their unresolved feelings concerning their natural parents and, as a result have better relations with their foster parents (3, p. 27).

The following list of therapeutic goals was designed to meet needs of delinquents in group therapy.

(1) To increase capacity to experience powerful affects (positive or negative) without acting them out.
(2) To increase capacity for empathy.
(3) To strengthen identification with the therapist.
(4) To encourage new behavioral patterns in helping the group resolve intragroup conflict through nonphysical verbal means (5, pp. 207-208).

The effectiveness of group counseling in meeting needs of delinquents often resistant to change was stated thusly, "...to the extent that juvenile delinquency may be interpreted as a consequence of the failure of social controls, the group setting provides for realistic retraining and controlled experience in interpersonal relations" (18, p. 409).

Studies relating directly or indirectly to therapeutic outdoor group experience are quite few in number. However, relatively informal observation reports (2) have proposed that rather startling positive change in both behavior and attitude can follow specific outdoor activity group experiences. These changes evolve through a maturing process based upon making effective decisions and the "give and take" necessary for successfully working with others toward a common goal. Further, learning about reality appears to be a prerequisite to success within the "real" setting. The outdoor group as herein defined is, itself, an experience in reality. If these statements are true, then further investigation as to the therapeutic potential of outdoor activity group experience is a mandate. While there is face validity to the idea that a planned outdoor experience is beneficial, little organized research in
support of this contention can be found. A typical assessment is that "the activity group experience provided significant positive results in most behavioral areas" (2, p. 63). Such generalizations illustrate the looseness with which terms have been defined and studies have been organized.

Despite the absence of the kind of research foundation enjoyed by group counseling, an outdoor activity approach appears particularly well suited to institutionalized foster children and delinquents for several reasons. As a group they tend to mistrust adults who represent authority and are therefore often uncomfortable in a structured setting managed by an adult. However, the most obvious reason for pursuing an activity approach is the tendency for institutionalized youngsters to act-out instead of talk-out their feelings. Frustration and anxieties appear to be of such a magnitude as to require the most effective means of tension reduction; this has been overt behavior. Blakeman (2) reported that "The activity approach does not emphasize 'treatment' as such and is observed therefore to be less threatening. . ." (2, p. 71).

Problem areas have been listed wherein the activity approach reportedly exceeds traditional group counseling in terms of effectiveness. There is an unusually close parallel between this list and behaviors observed among
institutionalized youngsters. Examples include behavior problems such as inadequate social skills, difficulty at verbalization, and lack of trust in authority (2).

Outdoor group experience in particular has been shown to promote positive behavior among institutionalized youngsters. Those who have gained most are "primary behavior disorders, . . . character disorders, particularly those involving constriction and restriction or faulty identification and a distorted self-image and low self-esteem, children with neurotic traits and mild psycho-neuroses" (26, pp. 285-290).

Probably the most significant offering of the outdoor activity approach has been its ability to focus upon two need areas. Blakeman (2) described these as "pre-verbal" problems and the need to establish contact with reality. Activity and reality are so closely related that the former can effect behavior change even in the more difficult cases where the individual is not yet able to verbalize his frustrations.

Both group counseling and outdoor group experience have each been acclaimed as beneficial for various lists of needs. However, despite the wide variety and large number of the descriptive and experimental studies, needs for additional research have been cited. Gazda reported that "research
has not clearly demonstrated ideal combinations of members for maximum growth through group counseling" (8, p. 275).

At present the obvious conclusion is that the research in group counseling has been inconclusive. Specifically, "there is much variation in group size, length and duration or intensity of treatment, type and quality of treatment, sophistication of research designed, instruments of evaluation, and test statistics" (9, p. 64). The present study was designed to yield pertinent data regarding some of these criticisms by containing a detailed description of procedures, by utilizing only well qualified leaders, by employment of a complex statistical design capable of extracting the maximum amount of data, and by the use of proven psychometric devices.

Recommendations for improving the status quo in research have been offered so as to produce clearer findings by concentrating efforts in areas of greatest need. Rogers reported that "If the individual's view of himself and reality is so important. . .then a great deal of research is needed in this area" (23, p. 186). On group counseling research Duncan wrote that ". . .it is apparent that we do not know enough about them[children] or how to work with them effectively. Therefore, we will need to continue to explore all possibilities. . . ." (7, p. 16).
Rogers wrote of the need for research on delinquency.

A field in which the need for new knowledge is so great does not have to justify the importance of fundamental research into the nature of delinquency and the examination of existing techniques and the development of new ones. In few places could investigation of this sort be carried out better than in schools for delinquents (24, p. 164).

The significance of exploring a means by which positive growth occurs among youth who have defied rehabilitation would appear to require little support beyond an awareness of the magnitude of the problem of delinquency and the foster child coupled with a cognizance of the therapeutic impact of groups. Comparing two approaches, both praised for their positive influence upon a segment of youth which has resisted change, seems to be a promising undertaking.

Such an evaluation of the relative effects of group counseling and outdoor group experience upon institutionalized youngsters serves two purposes. A seemingly effective but objectively untested approach, outdoor group experience, is assessed by comparison with the more adequately proven positive impact of group counseling. Outdoor group experience superficially appears to offer the institutionalized youngster some of the same advantages as does group counseling. The outdoor group approach has even been described as having assets not found in group counseling (2). Well organized investigations into outdoor groups might be undertaken as a result of a finding in the
present study that these experiences, lead to measurable positive change in institutionalized youngsters.

Further, a second goal of this evaluation is to add a measure of specificity of conditions under which group counseling data is gathered. All too frequently such vague phrases are encountered as "experience in interpersonal relations," and "more adaptive kinds of behavior" or "skills needed to cope with society" (18, p. 409) (17, p. 233). Such ill-defined statements cloud the perceptions of the uninitiated as to the actual positive impact of group counseling.

Little doubt exists that, under certain circumstances, group counseling offers a broad range of opportunity for greater utilization of personal and social potential. Group counseling, therefore, offers an excellent criterion measure with which outdoor group experience, a superior approach according to some, may be compared (2).

Research reported in Chapter Two relates to variables and subjects presently utilized in the comparison of group counseling with outdoor group experience. The range of studies is quite broad in terms of design controls, results obtained, and evaluations of results. While findings reflect more frequently than not that positive change occurs following group counseling, inconsistency appears to be the common denominator.
Studies are arranged in groups; included among topic headings are "self-esteem," "achievement," "the subject," "rationale," and "background" of an approach. Following each such grouping is a summary statement drawing the connection between the literature and the present study.

Limitation to the Study

The study was conducted by a member of the board of directors of the school at which the subjects resided. Observations and judgments herein reported were thus subject to possible bias precipitated by the holding of this position. However, the holding of this position resulted in no direct contact with the institution program or children.

Each of the fourteen board members was appointed upon the purchase of one or more shares of corporation stock. The principal functions of this group were to appoint an administrator and to provide advice as to program development and implementation. School policy was determined by the administrator.

Definition of Terms

1. **Group Counseling**: Indoor group counseling was a two-fold activity involving "statement of problem" and "elaboration of problem" by various members. The counselor attempted to create an atmosphere promoting exploration of
"subsequent themes toward a deeper expression of concern"
(21, p. 303).

The counselor tries to help the pupil to identify and clarify problems which disturb him, to improve his understanding of himself and of his situation, to define, examine, and test alternative solutions for his problems, and to select an alternative on which he acts. . . . (The counselor) must observe how each speaker's comments affect other members, and help each to participate in the discussion. . . . From the counselor, the members learn to accept one another and to help each talk about his problems. . . each member is given an opportunity to test his tentative solutions in an accepting group of peers and to obtain from them multiple reactions simultaneously, prior to translating his verbalizations into overt behavior (20, pp. 24-25).

2. Outdoor Group Experience: Outdoor group experience was defined as activities in each of five trips to a wooded or lake area by a group of youth wherein a trained group leader would utilize a planned schedule of activities to involve the youngsters in problem solving and discovery of environment. Problem-solving tasks included gathering and loading food and supplies, deciding from among alternatives where the group would go, what should be the responsibilities each had in food preparation, and what would be the activity following the noon meal. Decisions also were required for returning equipment to the bus prior to leaving for school. Slavson has written, "It is our position that people can become responsible only by carrying out responsibilities. The road to maturity lies in responsibility and self-direction" (28, p. 173).
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CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The plan for surveying related literature included a review of two major topics, Group Counseling and Outdoor Group Experience. Under the heading of Group Counseling, research and other published materials related to the background and antecedents of this therapeutic approach were investigated. Philosophical questions and the various rationales upon which group approaches were founded were reported and are followed by a discussion of positive and negative traits of group counseling.

A study of the technical features related to group counseling served as an additional subtopic, followed by a survey of a number of different variables measured by experimental research. Included were school achievement, self-esteem or self-concept, effect of group counseling upon various groups or types of subjects such as delinquents, Negroes, underachievers, and others, and the measurable impact of group counseling.
This aspect of the review is followed by a look at group counseling in conjunction with or as opposed to other approaches dealing with a variety of forms of behavior and attitudinal change. The segment concerning group counseling is concluded with a brief look at recommendations for research in group counseling.

Using a similar sequence of reviewing topics, outdoor group experience is explored. Because of the paucity of studies relating to this topic, activity group counseling and outdoor camping studies are also reported if a relationship to the present study was established.

Paralleling the group counseling review, studies exploring the rationale for using outdoor group experience as well as considerations such as size for group and nature of activity, add to the review of this topic. The value of outdoor experience, both negative and positive, was explored as well as the various purposes for which this approach had been used.

Experiments and other published materials were examined in order to provide a review of such variables as grade point average, self-esteem, and juvenile delinquency. Finally, suggestions as to the form which future research should take were cited when a relationship existed with the present study.
Background of Group Counseling

The term, group counseling, was first noted in print in 1931. An article titled "A Group Guidance Curriculum in the Senior High School" was written by Dr. Richard D. Allen, who is thought to have been the first person to use the term (29, p. 3).

Even before 1931, however, the roots of group counseling have been traced to events which occurred early in this century. Social and political changes have had their impact upon the development of group counseling and its forerunning techniques as they have moved from infancy to an enviable position within the behavioral sciences. A rather succinct sketch of this metamorphosis is offered by Gazda.

... group methods as we know them today are essentially the product of the twentieth century. The advent of group therapy and group counseling parallels man's advance through political freedom and social democracy. It had its beginnings in Europe at the turn of the century and reached its peak during the decades following World War I. ... Group counseling and group therapy are democratic procedures and do not flourish in an autocratic atmosphere. ... Since group methods thrive only in a free social and political environment, it is not extraordinary that group techniques developed rapidly in the United States. They had their beginning in private practice by psychiatrists and were later adapted to the field of education. ... A Viennese psychiatrist, Alfred Adler appears to have been one of the first to use group methods deliberately and systematically in his child guidance clinics. While group therapy, like a barometer, was rising and falling with the political trends, group counseling has shown a steadily increasing trend (28, pp. 197-198).
It was of importance to distinguish and compare psychotherapy and counseling not only because of the historical interest but also because of the frequent confusion in the use of the two terms. Some individuals appear to feel that the two activities are vastly different and require basically different forms of leader training while others are content to use psychotherapy and counseling interchangably. Dreikus (18) has offered a clear cut delineation as follows:

The general procedures of psychotherapy and counseling are much alike, particularly if we counsel older children individually. Psychotherapy is more complete and directed toward personality modification, changing the life style. In counseling we deal more with the immediate situation, the redirection of mistaken goals, and thus, behavioral change (18, p. 198).

It is with this behavioral change and the related attitudes toward self and others that this study deals. The therapeutic approach is more nearly one of counseling than of psychotherapy.

Rationale

Man has lived in the present society at a cost to himself. The quality of his interpersonal relationships has deteriorated in an ear of unparalleled technological advances. Dreyfus reported, "We live in a society that fosters alienation, anomie, disenfranchisement, disso-
ciation, loneliness and schizoid coolness" (19, p. 28).
This feeling of having been cut off from other people has been most easily visible in the difficulties which have followed contact between the economically deprived and others. Rogers reported, "...the most tragic trend is the increasing breakdown of communication between the privileged and the ghetto" (56, p. 265). This gap in the communication between groups has been aggravated by a tendency among people to resist contact with each other. Battegay (2) quoted Martin Buber as follows: "Each of us is hiding in a suit of armour, the purpose of which is to protect us from Signs. Signs befall us all the time. Life consists of being spoken to, we need only to stand still and listen. But this is too great a venture for us..." (2, p. 166). Rogers (56) expressed his concern about the ineffectiveness of relating to one another, citing the antagonisms which exist between those who are materially deprived and those who are not.

What makes it, from my point of view, incredibly tragic is that the deepest, most basic issues revolve around communication. Distrust, suspicion, disillusionment have grown to such mammoth proportions that both sides--though perhaps especially on the part of the ghetto dweller--that it is taken for granted that communication is no longer possible (56, p. 278).

Generalizing from statements concerning the problems between cultural groups to those experienced by individuals was a necessary, but hazardous undertaking. In discussing
the causes of behavior problems, Rogers offered assistance in clarifying the relationship between the group and the individual.

Behavior problems are due to the fact that a child of certain hereditary equipment is dealt with in a certain manner by members of his family environment and at the same time affected by certain broader cultural and social influences. . . . To understand behavior we must view it as the complex result of all these component factors (59, p. 176).

The social aspect has been focused upon by Carter who related behavior problems to school experiences.

Leaders already know that for many adolescent foster children problems of behavior in school, including truancy, are produced by the frustration of continued failure or low academic achievement. These group meetings [conducted by this writer] not only confirmed this assessment, they also strengthened the conviction that remedy was imperative to prevent disaster (9, p. 26).

An explanation is needed as to the rationale concerning the therapeutic impact of groups as it relates to the social milieu. The early work of Rogers (58) offers the necessary theoretical constructs to explain behavior and behavioral problems as they relate to the development of personality. Basically, his position is that as one perceives himself and his surroundings for his reality, so he behaves. In more specific terms,

Given certain psychological conditions, the individual has the capacity to reorganize his field of perception, including the way he perceives himself, and that a concomitant or a resultant of this perceptual reorganization is an appropriate alteration of behavior (58, p. 362).
He further postulates that "...behavior is not directly influenced or determined by organic or cultural factors, but primarily, (and perhaps only) by the perception of these elements" (58, p. 362). The manner in which incoming experiences were accepted and organized was also conceptualized by Rogers.

It would appear that when all of the ways in which the individual perceives himself—all perceptions of the qualities, abilities, impulses, and attitudes of the person, and all perceptions of himself in relation to others—are accepted into the organized conscious concept of the self, then this achievement is accompanied by feelings of comfort and freedom from tension which are experienced as psychological adjustment (58, p. 364).

A somewhat different slant of change in adjustment or in personality was offered by Dreyfus, who pointed to the necessity for "understanding" in conjunction with behaving or participating. He reported that "Both the experiential and the cognitive integration are necessary for effective learning" (19, p. 282).

Behavior change and group experience are related through a developmental process of risking to be open to others. The dynamics involved are illustrated by a statement as to events a person experiences while within a group.

The group is a framework which enables the patient—and the normal person—perhaps for the first time to find the courage to expose himself to the frightening experience of being addressed by fellow humans or the superhuman, or even to address them (or it) in turn. In the security of
the group, he can realize that the fear associated with speech represents, as Kierkegaard says, 'The reality of freedom as the possibility of a possibility,' or in other words, a unique opportunity for him to fulfill himself in himself, in his fellows and in the transcendent and supra-individual element in communication. Group discussion makes it easier for the individual to find the correct proportion between environmental and individual cohesion. . . and between reason and the irrational (2, p. 166).

The group is successful in facilitating openness as a result of the surrogate-parent role it assumes. Foulkes explained this symbolic representation of the group, relating that "On a deep and archaic level, as I have said before, the group represents the mother. On another level, it very often represents a kind of superego, a critical and feared authority" (24, p. 433). This explanation is of interest considering the importance the group of peers assumes as a partial alternative to parent influence. Smith reported that " . . . numerous scholars regard peer-group involvement as essential to the socialization of the adolescent" (63, p. 484).

Thus, a discussion of rationale for the use and value of groups relates to behavior of subjects in the present study and to the impact of groups upon this behavior. Generally these youngsters mistrust all authority figures and display their feelings through various means such as misbehaving in school. When they perceive a relationship
as safe, as in a group counseling setting, they become more free to explore inner conflict and sources of anxiety.

**Features of Counseling Groups**

Five areas related to group counseling were explored to furnish a more specific account of group dynamics. These involved group leadership, the size or number of participants in a group, the role of group subjects, the problem of their resistance, and general discussion of group dynamics.

A necessary component of the group counseling leader who works with delinquents was stated by Didato.

> It is generally accepted that the therapist's anxiety tolerance level must be high to work with this provocative type of patient who unconsciously endeavors to destroy positive elements in his relationships with authorities (16, p. 217).

Didato also recommended against doing or saying anything which might be anticipated by the group participants. His recommendation was to do instead the unexpected so that a high level of interest would be maintained.

Persons responsible for working with delinquents or with subjects having behavior problem histories are confronted with the question of how much control to exercise within the group. Paschal (51) reported that strong, forceful leaders were preferred by deprived boys, adding that academic activities such as reading were generally viewed with disdain. Jacobs (39) offered a
reason for the need to increase control within the group of subjects who were prone to acting out or behavior problems.

Establishing control is of particular importance in this setting, since pressure to explode frequently leads to actual explosion. . . . A certain amount of release of tension is mandatory in order for full expression within the group to occur (39, p. 240).

On the other hand, it has been suggested that the group leader relinquish his position of authority occasionally in order to more easily play the role of member. By this action he is more easily able to avoid judging the group participants as well as to increase the ease with which the clients identify with him. Jacobs further informed readers that an increased degree of "casualness" would occur, adding, "at the same time it encourages freer expression of affect, without which insight cannot occur" (39, p. 242).

Gazda reported that under certain conditions groups have been found to function effectively with a larger than average number of participants.

Groups where several members identify with each other may be able to be larger, since the help received by one member may be applied and incorporated by another member who recognizes what is happening. The normal optimal group size is between five and fifteen. Most groups seem to prefer eight to ten members (28, p. 247).

Another area of research has been the number of sessions group counseling should most effectively include. In a study involving fourteen through seventeen year old
Negro girls, Gilliland (31) found that eighteen sessions represented the most appropriate number as indicated by the criteria of involvement and expression of feelings.

Time span between group counseling sessions was studied by Landreth (43) regarding the effects of daily, weekly, and twice weekly sessions. Three randomly selected groups of ten high school sophomore boys and girls were matched in terms of socioeconomic level and I.Q. Results indicated that problems and feelings were discussed more openly in the once-per-week format; however, all three time spans were found to be equally beneficial.

In addition to time span, size of group and group leadership, the selection of subjects for group counseling has also been the object of research. Slavson found that groups did better when they were homogeneous: mixed groups of Negro and white girls were less relaxed. It was more difficult for the girls to relate to each other when there was wide disparity of intellect or of social or economic status (62, p. 193).

Himber (36) reported that mixed age groups more than same age groups were blocked from depth and openness of encounter. Another study involving Negro boys and girls in group counseling indicated that Negro girls experienced more positive therapeutic movement and did so sooner than did the boys (31).

Resistance, a phenomenon which has been described as occurring most frequently during the early stages of group
counseling, is particularly evident among delinquents and foster children in groups. It results from ambivalent feelings and usually follows a group member's revelation of an emotionally significant part of himself to other members (55). Although Battegay (2) recognizes the importance of resistance, he reports that it is of less importance than involvement. He believes involvement, even resistant involvement, to be a greater concern than resistance itself.

Several phases through which juvenile delinquents move while in a group counseling setting were identified following seventy-five sessions with six delinquent adolescent boys. Included were "initial resistance, blame throwing, discussion of dreams and sex, thoughts of rescue, psychological sophistication on a verbal level, self-confrontation, insight, and behavioral control" (52, p. 482). "Milling around," an early stage noted by Rogers, was described as "initial confusion, awkward silence, polite surface interaction, mild to extreme frustration, and great lack of continuity" (55, p. 27).

In groups children and adolescents with behavior problems often encounter difficulties related to a free release of verbalization. Slavson reported that "free group discussions and interactions can prove too
threatening to persons whose ego organization is weak and who feel too guilty or inadequate to deal with the strong emotions" (61, p. 287).

Both the number of subjects per group and the age of participants in the present study conformed to the consensus recommendation in the literature. Other group dynamics such as milling around and resistance were observed and described in Appendix D Session Reports. These observations reported in the literature were often confirmed in the Session Reports.

**Group Counseling Variables**

The following studies were selected to point out the measurable variables important in group counseling research. Included are research writings dealing with self-esteem, self-image, self-concept, and other more or less synonymous terms. Also added are studies focusing upon the subject or group participant. Special emphasis was placed upon research related to juvenile delinquents and foster or institutionalized children in group counseling.

**Self-esteem.**--Douglas (17) investigated the question as to whether or not the Negro had a unique self-concept as compared to other races. Using the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory with 155 Negro and 105 Caucasian eighth and ninth grade students, he found that
Negro subjects have self-concepts which are no better or worse than those of their Caucasian peers. Thus, it seems reasonable to conclude that a type of self-concept cannot be associated with a particular ethnic group and that a variety of self-perceptions can be found within each race (17, p. 29).

Coopersmith (12) studied responses of ten through twelve year olds to modified items from Rogers and Dymond's scale. Very few examples were found of discrepancy between teacher assessment and student assessment of self-esteem. The author indicated that those subjects who scored themselves high in the face of low self-esteem ratings by teachers apparently were responding to a defensive reaction. Subjects experiencing the opposite circumstances of low-ratings in the face of high ratings from teachers were reportedly experiencing success in the eyes of the teacher but inadequate success in the eyes of students harboring high goals.

In another study Coopersmith (14) investigated the relationship between recall, repetition of success, failure experiences, and self-esteem. Four groups of twelve fifth and sixth grade subjects were asked to complete six pairs of tasks designed so that one of each pair would be failed. Measurements of need achievement were based on story completion and recall upon relating experimental activities to the experimenter. Results indicated that successes were more frequently remembered. Subjects with discrepancies
between self-rating and teacher rating were found to repeat failures while those participants whose self-esteem measures agreed with teacher-ratings tended to repeat successes. A dissertation by Coopersmith (15) involved 152 fifth and sixth grade children who were administered a self-esteem instrument. He concluded that recall and repetition were not equivalent but were dependent upon perceptions and motivations of the subjects. He further called for a more precise definition of the term self-esteem.

Self-concept was studied in relationship to educational, vocational aspiration and sex role of ninety-four neighborhood youth corp participants, forth-six of whom were experimental subjects. Using the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and Drews' Attitude-Toward-Self-As-School Learner Scale, the following conclusions were drawn. Subjects who were not in school were found to have the lowest self-concept. Pre and post test scores were not significantly different (23).

Self-esteem was described by Lidz (45), a writer of psychoanalytic orientation as being affected by, "emotional attitudes toward the child...nurturant capacities...affected by their [parents'] marital interaction, their
knowledge of children and child-rearing, and deficiencies in their own upbringing. . ." (45, p. 44). He further noted that there should be open acceptance by the same sex parent of the child's identification with the opposite sex parent, allowing self-esteem to develop. He explained that parental styles of behavior have promoted delinquency by teaching children to misrepresent their feelings and facts to others and by teaching them distrust and "paranoid trends" (45, p. 45).

Additional research concerning self-image and delinquency was reported by Grant (34). He studied the tendency of delinquent girls to report a more negative self-image than non-delinquent girls. Fifty-one delinquents and non-delinquents were matched in terms of low achievement, average I.Q., low socioeconomic status, age, race, and sex. Findings indicated that there was more negative rating and the anticipation of negative ratings from authority figures among the delinquents. After six months of institutional confinement, a significantly positive change was noted in self-rating and in anticipated ratings from authority persons. There was little in the results of this study to support the contention that behavior and self-image were related.

One study, using 293 subjects obtained from a juvenile hall and public institution, focused upon the self-concept
of delinquents. They were matched with non-delinquents in terms of I.Q., race, socioeconomic status, number of siblings, and age; average age was seventeen years. Conformity, ambition, and adjustment were studied using items taken from personality theories of Freudian and Neo-freudian theorists. Results indicated that delinquent females and delinquent males scored significantly lower on measurements of adjustment and conformity than did non-delinquents. These findings supported the contention that defective parent-child relationships leading to hostility toward authority figures was a contributing cause of delinquency (67).

A study of self-concept as "an insulator against delinquency" involved thirty sixth grade classrooms in a high delinquency area. One-hundred twenty-five "good boys" were nominated by teachers and then checked as to prior contact with juvenile court. The remaining sample which had not been involved with police was tested in areas of delinquency proneness, social responsibility, and personality. Results of the study indicated that, "insulation against delinquency is an on-going process reflecting internalization of non-delinquent values and conformity to the expectations of significant others" (64, 184). A later check on the status of these boys found almost all to be in school and all but three to be in academic programs leading the authors to
suspect that success in school was very significant. This conclusion was similar to one by Glasser (32) who placed school failure near the top of a list of delinquency-causing factors. Other observations based on this research included the apparently valid judgment of teachers concerning a boy's tendency to become delinquent at a later date. It was also noted that the self-concept of the delinquent is not necessarily negative. Tangri (64) labeled self-concept as the probable independent variable while delinquency was suspected as being the dependent one.

Coopersmith (13) studied self-esteem of ten to twelve year old boys using the Rorschach, Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, Figure Drawing, Sentence Completion, and Thermatic Apperception Test. Results indicated that conformity was found in subjects with low subjective estimation of self and low behavior rating while independence was noted in subjects with high scores in subjective and behavioral measures. An additional finding was consistently superior performance on all tests by those who scored high on the subjective and behavioral measures while the opposite was true of the "low-low's." "High-low's" reportedly had aspirations and good ability but below par performance. These findings supported Coopersmith's contention that, "persons with low self-esteem are less capable of resisting
pressures to conform and are less able to perceive threatening stimuli" (13, p. 61). The delinquent often falls into this trap of submitting to the misguided direction of his peers.

A study investigating the relationship between self-concept, school motivation, and occupational aspiration utilized the Index of Adjustment and Values, the JIM Scale, and the Occupational Aspiration Scale with 337 boys in grades nine through twelve. School motivation, a problem among delinquents, was found to be significantly related in a positive direction to self and ideal-self scores (13).

Fourteen thirteen-through seventeen-year-old adolescent female delinquents with acting-out behavior patterns were involved in a ten week group experience aimed at changing self-concept. Although there were no significant differences between the experimental group and the control group, observations included a lowering of extremely high self-concepts and raising of extremely low self-concepts. Girls also reportedly became more spontaneous, open, and self-reflective. Six months after the conclusion of the experimental period, none of the girls had been in serious trouble (10).

Rogers offered a thorough assessment of the nature of positive change in self-perception by citing three examples.
He perceives himself as a more adequate person, with more worth and more possibility of meeting life. He permits more experiential data to enter awareness, and thus achieves a more realistic appraisal of himself, his relationships and his environment. He tends to place the basis of standards within himself, recognizing that the 'goodness' or 'badness' of any experience of perceptual object is not something inherent in that object, but is a value placed on it by himself (57, p. 377).

Findings regarding self-esteem allow the inference that change in this variable would reflect change occurring in subjects in the present study. These youngsters share a number of traits, such a distrust, with delinquent and foster children.

Achievement.--Studies defining the relationship between achievement and group counseling were included in this survey to support a presumption that group counseling may cause improved academic achievement in the subjects in the present study. Almost all of these students had backgrounds of poor school performance, and a measure of probability appeared to exist that positive change in achievement should take place. While achievement was not studied because of the non-graded classroom format in which the present subjects were involved and because of overriding concern with other variables, "grade point average studies" have been reported.

Based upon this survey of literature, the relationship between group counseling and academic achievement has been more widely studied than any other variable. Research
concerning achievement has been quite variable from poor to excellent, serving to exemplify the heterogeneity of group counseling research.

Thayer (65) observed multiple-significantly positive changes in 260 junior high school subjects in thirty-three groups. The hypothesis of significant improvement over non-counseled control subjects was upheld for academic achievement and behavior of the junior high school students. He concluded that group counseling appeared to be effective in helping the habitually failing student to improve behavior patterns and move him toward the "ideal student" image maintained by teachers.

A study was conducted measuring the effects of six fifty-minute group counseling sessions upon thirty-six tenth and eleventh grade underachievers and their self-concepts, academic achievement, and vocational maturity with secondary exploration as to sex, grade, individual versus group counseling, and other variables. Results indicated that ". . . males compared to their female counterparts, were vocationally mature but lower in academic achievement and self-concept of ability" (35, p. 5126A).

Negro high school students were studied for their reaction to group counseling in terms of achievement in vocabulary, reading, and English usage; occupational
aspiration; attitude toward vocations; self-concept; school attendance; and other variables. No effort was put forth to equate age, grade point average, or other factors found among the thirty fourteen through nineteen year old subjects. Results indicated significant gains in vocabulary, reading, English usage, and other variables. Group counseling was credited with changing self-image to a degree, which enabled greater use of academic potential. Although boys required a longer period to achieve rapport, there was evidence of "improved intergroup school and community social relations" (31, p. 151).

Gazda (30) studied thirty sets of parents of bright underachieving fifth graders selected to participate in group counseling using a "pre-wait, pre-counseling, and post-counseling" design similar to that used in the present study. Two one-hour sessions were held each week for the duration of the eight-week experimental period. Findings included a significant increase in acceptance of self and others while a hypothesized rise in grade point average did not occur. He also noted the following:

When approached properly, parents who are experiencing problems which are interfering with the happiness and productivity of themselves and their children, will volunteer for and actively participate in group counseling when they are permitted to set their own pace and goals and when, during the course of counseling, they are also provided information which they seek about child development and behavior (30, p. 240).
Group guidance was investigated as to its effects upon seventh, eighth, and ninth grade underachieving students. The sixty-one experimental subjects and their control counterparts were pre- and posttested using the California Study Method Survey Test and the California Occupational Interest Inventory; behavior ratings and cumulative records were also obtained. Following fourteen weekly group sessions, data indicated that the treatment group had improved in achievement and attitude (72).

Beach (3) studied 192 seventh and eighth grade boys and girls from four schools in seven-weekly counseling sessions. Following a taped message to participants, the counselor reinforced responses considered to be achievement-oriented. Data analysis indicated improved attitude toward school among boys as well as a nonsignificant increase in grade point average.

While results of studies differ, a trend toward improved achievement following group counseling appears to exist. This trend allows for anticipating a possible increase in school achievement among subjects in the present study.

The subject. -- Studies were selected to depict the subject himself, whether a foster child in an institution, a juvenile delinquent or a public school student with a behavior problem. The following reports concern public
school students, the mentally retarded and mentally retarded delinquents, underprivileged or inner-city youth, deprived Negro adolescents, institutionalized foster children and juvenile delinquents.

Brough (8) studied 315 ninth grade students; part had been asked to participate in counseling and the remainder had requested counseling voluntarily. Both groups were matched in terms of sex, ability, achievement and personality. Results indicated that although all preferred the voluntary method, there were no significant differences between the two groups.

Humes (38) conducted counseling groups with thirteen- to seventeen-year-old mentally retarded male and female adolescents. The twenty-eight subjects were assigned to one of four groups, two of which were counseling and two were control. Following twelve weekly hours of counseling a significant positive change was observed in teacher ratings of adjustment, scores on a personality inventory, and increases in mutual choosing on a sociometric test.

Behavior, adjustment, attitude toward others, and attitude toward self were studied in relation to the impact of group sessions with mentally retarded delinquent boys. The two experimental groups contained ten subjects between sixteen and twenty-five years of age with I.Q.'s ranging from fifty to seventy-five. Group sessions extended over
a fifteen week period and were conducted twice weekly for one-hour periods in the other group. Significantly positive change was noted in adjustment to the institution, grades, disciplinary reports, and attitudes toward others following the one-hour sessions. Testing indicated a significant improvement in attitude toward self among subjects participating in the thirty-minute sessions (33).

Aitken (1) studied attitudinal change in six groups of fifteen year old institutionalized youngsters using three forty-five day periods which served as control, treatment, and follow-up. Two experimental groups (a male group and a female group) participated in group counseling and watched filmstrips; two additional groups (male group, female group) watched filmstrips only; and a fifth and sixth group received testing only. Findings indicated a significantly negative effect among control subjects while test data indicated a positive general change among both experimental groups "one" and "two".

Four groups of nine culturally deprived white ninth grade boys and girls were involved in fifteen group counseling sessions to study the content of such meetings. Based on content assessment, the following conclusions were drawn: subjects did not use appropriate means to gain peer-recognition, identification, nor acceptance. It was further observed that families of the subjects did not have
a solid educational background. An excessively strong need for immediate gratification was noted. Finally, parents were viewed as oppressive authority figures and as obstacles to need-meeting (21).

McKnight (49) studied the effects of group guidance procedures on interpersonal relationships of fifty-five twelve- through fifteen-year-old inner-city youth using the California Test of Personality and the Bordelon-Embree-Clark Self-Group Q-sort. Also used was the Cantril Measure of Aspiration and Self-Concept. Results of the investigation indicated that activities involving Picture-Story Role-Playing and Picture-Story Video-tape were more effective with older subjects, while Picture-Discussion and Picture-Story Video-tape were more effective with the younger twelve- and thirteen-year-old participants.

Six Negro eighth grade underachievers participated in twelve group counseling sessions in order to study attitude change and grade point average of deprived Negro underachievers. A twenty-five-item rating scale was constructed to measure attitudes which, upon completion of the study, showed no significant change. Grade point average likewise did not change significantly, however, a teacher attitude rating for the experimental group did improve to a significant degree. Wittmer (70) pointed out the need for these subjects to be involved in physical activity during the
sessions and recommended consideration be given to outdoor outings or the use of a pool table in the counseling room. He further noted that trustworthiness and understanding were sought in the leader by the participants.

Thirty-six culturally deprived ninth grade boys and girls in equal numbers were placed in four groups of nine to participate in seven and one-half weeks of counseling for a total of fifteen hours. The Mooney Problem Checklist, the Bills' Index of Adjustment and Values and a self concept scale were administered before and after the experimental period to group counseling participants and control subjects. Results indicated improved self-concept among males as well as a significantly increased number of home problems, leading Duncan (20) to conclude that boys increased their exploration of home problems.

Carter (9) studied six groups of institutionalized foster children ranging in age from fourteen to seventeen years. Groups met biweekly for two consecutive years. The author made the following observations:

The beginning phase is particularly important; if its tasks are not properly and directly addressed at the outset, they will plague both group and worker—in the prolong testing, in the endless repetition of the what-are-we-doing-here theme, and in the fits and starts with which the group approaches its business (9, p. 24).

Examples of conflict disclosed by these group meetings were guilt, preoccupation and curiosity concerning sex.
Participants also expressed deep concerns to find peer group status. Learning social behavior also reportedly created heavy demands upon group subjects along with strong and perpetual interest in their natural parents. Carter concluded that

Leaders already know that for many adolescent foster children problems in behavior in school, including truancy, are produced by the frustration of continued failure or low academic achievement. These group meetings not only confirm this assessment, they also strengthen the conviction that remedy was imperative to prevent disaster (9, p. 26).

Two groups of twelve institutionalized run-away delinquents participated in twenty weekly sessions of group counseling. A third group of twelve run-aways served as a control. Following the experimental period it was found that a significantly less accepting attitude toward parents or parent substitutes existed among run-aways as compared to non-run-aways. Additional significant observations included increased frustration tolerance among the experimental participants, improved reality testing, reduced number of run-aways, and improved behavior. Friedland (26) concluded that group counseling was valuable in improving frustration tolerance, noting that there was no difference in amount of this tolerance between run-aways and non-run-aways but a difference in method of reacting.

Williams (69) reported a study involving 107 adolescent delinquent girls in a state training school. Participants
in one of three groups received group counseling at a rate of one hour per week for ten weeks while the second group watched films and the third group received no treatment. Non-significant changes were attributed to the lack of appropriate measures and the small number of sessions per week that were conducted.

Alienation and maladaptive behavior in four groups of twenty-one ninth grade students were studied by Brechbill (7). Each unit of twenty-one subjects was divided into three groups receiving individual counseling, group counseling, and placebo counselor contact. Following twelve forty-five minute weekly sessions, Brechbill concluded that both group counseling and individual counseling were effective in reducing feelings of alienation and number of maladaptive behavior acts. Frequency of maladaptive behavior and feelings of alienation were also reduced in the placebo group but no changes were apparent to adult supervisors. The counseled group, however, improved in their attitude toward their environment as compared to other groups.

Didato (16) studied twenty-eight juvenile delinquents, age eleven to seventeen years, with personality characteristics described as psychopathic and occasionally latent homosexual with related anxiety. Subjects spent thirteen months in a group therapy program. Weekly meetings were
held for one and one-half hours along with individual sessions weekly or monthly as dictated by need. Group members were typified as follows:

...he attends reluctantly, with great suspicion, hostility and defiance. Repeated assurances that the therapist is not an agent of the courts, schools, police, or church in the community seem to be insufficient to offset this perception of the therapist as an authority who will either censure or punish him (16, p. 209).

Outside the group, the participants were described in the following manner:

The entire preoccupation with fighting and self-defense becomes a kind of cult in the subculture of the delinquent. Body building, weight lifting, fighting and boxing, skills in the use of knives and other weapons all play into the delinquent's enhanced prestige and status among his peers (16, p. 209).

Didato related that the boys experienced guilt and anxiety despite their extensive experience with sex. Talk of homosexuality also made the boys feel ill at ease; they used this topic, profanity and sexual discussion in general to take out their anger upon each other.

Didato also pointed out that generally parents were weak in interest in the child and in controls exercised over him. He observed that delinquents were unable to notice and understand cues such as facial expressions of affect. Further, high anxiety level was more often noted when group members brought up emotionally laden topics than when the therapist did so.
Jacobs (39) offered a number of reasons behind various delinquent defense behavior following twenty weekly one-hour sessions with six boys ranging from fourteen to seventeen years of age. He observed that

In the main, we may understand the rebellious, delinquent behavior of these boys as masking underlying psychotic processes in the most disturbed or as concealing passive, feminine identities in the healthier members (39, P. 239).

He further noted that the mode of expression is motoric and not generally verbal, adding that talking or even thinking of unpleasant feelings often led to aggression or running away. Examples, many of which were displayed by subjects in the present study, were as follows:

Damage to the room, to property, or to each other is one means of discharge, as in wild throwing of objects, yelling and screaming, pounding on walls and tables, or knocking over furniture, all of which were done in this group. Running from the room reflects the other (39, p. 239).

Oral gratification was also listed as a manner in which the boys defended themselves against unpleasant feelings. The group should offer sufficient control to prevent explosions but adequate freedom to allow tension reduction (39).

Fifteen counselors from ten schools instituted a twelve-week group counseling program with sixty-eight experimental subjects; fifty-seven secondary-level control subjects were also used. The purpose of the study was to
examine the responses of "norm-violating" students who had had more than three disciplinary contacts with school officials. Results indicated that there were no significant changes; a longer treatment period was recommended (53).

Kuntz (42) studied behavior of ninety non-conforming ninth grade adolescents in fifteen groups which met for counseling once per week for ten weeks. He concluded that short-term group counseling with subjects such as those used in his study was an effective means of causing change in self-concept and in certain personality variables. He further noted greater change in social behavior as opposed to personal behavior.

The most concentrated use of group counseling has been in institutions for delinquents. Behavior of juvenile delinquents was studied in terms of return to delinquency as indicated by records kept following discharge. A control group in one institution was used to compare results of group therapy with delinquents in another school. Short-term therapy was found to cause lasting effects (52).

Peters (52) reviewed a study with nine delinquent boys who participated in a group for sixteen sessions. They did not differ significantly from control subjects and were still becoming involved with police after the experimental period had terminated.
Maynard (48) studied two methods of counseling, client-centered group counseling and verbal reinforcement counseling, and compared their effects upon thirty-seven eighth grade subjects who were students in a class for the emotionally disturbed. Fifteen other eighth grade students served as a control after having been diagnosed as emotionally disturbed. Based on results of the study, he concluded that the important question was not which type of counseling was utilized but whether or not a student received counseling. Data further suggested that counselors without specific training to work with emotionally disturbed students may be effective in a counseling relationship.

This rather diverse collection of studies concerning various types of subjects involved in group counseling illustrates that, in the majority of instances, positive change can occur in youngsters typically resisting such change. Foster children, institutionalized adolescents, and those exhibiting delinquent behavior moved toward improved functioning as defined by respective authors. If group counseling is effective in the main with such a variety of clients, then subjects in the present study may be expected to experience positive movement in terms of behavior, self-esteem, and other criteria.
Multiple approaches.--The following studies were selected to represent multi-approach comparisons such as client-centered group counseling with behavior counseling as well as singularly psychoanalytic or behavioral approaches. An example of the latter was offered by Shirts (60) in a dissertation concerning a "retroflexive reformation" method of counseling and a "self-consistency" approach to behavior change. The former term referred to application of new behaviors to which the latter nomenclature was applied. Ten deviant high school students were assigned co-therapist positions with elementary school behavior problem students in an effort to measure the effects of the experience upon the high school subjects. Seven of the ten participants showed behavior improvement at a non-significant level.

Developmental counseling was the topic of a study involving twenty-eight tenth grade underachievers with negative attitudes toward school. The object of the study was to measure change in developing more effective behavior as opposed to insight. Results following eighteen fifty-five-minute sessions indicated that grades and feelings of adequacy improved to a significant degree (4).

Warner (68) conducted a six-month follow-up assessment of the effects of behavioral group counseling upon eighty-four eleventh grade alienated students. Both verbal- and model-reinforcement group counseling (six sessions at
forty minutes each) were found to be valuable in countering feelings of alienation. However, there were no significant differences between the two treatments. Significant changes did occur when the placebo group means were compared to the treatment group means. Six months after counseling, behavior was judged significantly more appropriate in treatment subjects.

Truax (66) studied the effects of group psychotherapy upon self-concept in forty institutionalized mental patients and in forty juvenile delinquents between the ages of fifteen and nineteen. Findings indicated a significant positive change following group therapy over a three month period with mental patients; a negative change was noted in self-concept of delinquents following treatment for an equivalent period.

Forty institutionalized adolescent boys participated in sixteen group therapy sessions over an eight week period. Results indicated lower gains in more silent group members and reduced run-aways among treatment subjects. Younger boys showed greater improvement than older boys (22).

In another study involving twenty fifteen-year-old adolescent institutionalized delinquent boys, the effects of six months of analytic group counseling (fifty biweekly one-hour sessions) upon attitudes towards self and others were
reported. Data indicated a significantly positive increase in accepting attitudes toward self and toward others (25).

Lievano (46) reported a study of fifteen- to seventeen-year-old adolescent delinquent boys who participated in forty-two sessions of group psychotherapy. The group was open-ended and ranged in number from three to nine. Based upon that contact, he concluded that group therapy was speedier than individual therapy, that participants' anxiety was at a lower level in the group, and that therapists' sincerity and openmindedness were quite important.

Joseph (40) conducted twenty-nine one-hour sessions with a group of six fifteen- to seventeen-year-old adolescent girls in a group foster home. He reported these deprived girls to be much more difficult to control than were delinquent boys. Foster home staff resistance was also noted, apparently due to the lack of understanding of the group therapy objectives. The girls reportedly spent time in group sessions discussing various aspects of sex and attempting to readjust from often erroneous information. Meetings were characterized as being full of striving for status, associated frustration, tension, and anger. Joseph summarized the gains made by the therapy group as follows:

... in learning more about, and clarifying their psychosexual roles in regard to relationships with male figures, in giving them an opportunity to talk about sexual topics with an adult who did not require the girls to deny the genital aspect of their sexual thoughts and fantasies; in the girls'
accepting more fully their passive, receptive, feminine position without feeling totally helpless; in coming to more positive terms with body changes; in improving relationships with peers and adult figures, as well as clarifying their social perception (49, pp. 315-316).

Joseph's description of females in his study closely parallels observations of girls in the present study.

The charts of fifty twelve- to nineteen-year-old patients were examined by O'Connell (50) as to number of group therapy sessions attended in relation to other factors, to determine who profited from group psychotherapy. No racial or social differences were ascertained; however, there were approximately ten points difference between mean I.Q.'s, with the lower I.Q. group being among the drop-outs. Other characteristics found among the drop-outs were double the number of previous hospitalizations, twice the number of discharges, increased likelihood of delinquency, higher mean age (1.3 years), a background of impulsive behavior traits, and proneness to act out solutions to problems. It was suggested that a mild nervous system defect might be responsible for many of these characteristics.

Hoss (37) studied the effects of group counseling in conjunction with individual counseling upon self and social adjustment in fifty-five fifteen-year-old potential drop-outs. Subjects were randomly assigned to five groups, including group counseling, individual counseling, group
tutoring, individual tutoring, and no treatment. Data indicated that no significant changes occurred, with the exception of higher social adjustment.

The impact of this selection of ten reports upon the present study is its implied prediction that group counseling, regardless of approach or subjects involved, will likely lead to some form of positive change among participants. This observation was made by each author in this section (multiple approaches), with four reporting significantly positive movement.

Outdoor Group Experience

Compared to group counseling, outdoor group experience has not been seriously investigated. Nevertheless, there is an apparent increasing tendency to use outdoor, open-type facilities to treat young offenders (71).

Some of the earliest and most intensive study of the indoor activity group has been conducted by Slavson, who has received much of the credit for pioneering this approach. Play techniques of Axline and Ginott and the work of Moustakas also have served as a foundation for this means of behavior expression among adolescents (5).

Rationale

Levy (44) established a basis for the use of therapeutic group activity through her explanation of the growth
of the self. Significant persons in the life of a child mold the self with their approvals and disapprovals of him and his behavior. Thus the damaging interaction between people creates maladjustment, according to the Sullivanian dynamic-cultural orientation. This maladjustment in the form of withdrawal or hostile aggression occurs when the child is obstructed from pursuing his natural inclinations toward personal initiative and self expression. A child's poor self-esteem and impaired insight into himself and interpersonal relations occur as a result of being "educated" by derogatory statements from these significant persons. Likewise, hostility toward others is learned through serving as recipient of hate from the important individuals in a child's life.

Coolidge and Grunebaum (11) reported that many youngsters have suffered damaging experiences prior to their learning to effectively verbalize. He explained that "Such children suffer lifelong amorphous anxiety underlying the later more specific symptomatology, and they learn only with great difficulty to communicate such affect through the use of speech" (11, p. 96). He further added that gain is negligible or nonexistent among large numbers of children receiving long-term treatment for such symptoms as hostility, anxiety, and irritability. A needed alternative lies in activity group treatment (11).
The manner in which outdoor group experience responds to needs of children and adolescents is based upon an assumption that problem-laden behavior will occur in the natural setting. The activity rather than a relationship becomes the vehicle of expression. Preverbal problems which are not as accessible to a therapeutic person-to-person contact are effectively ameliorated by the non-interpretive activity approach (5) (11).

Based upon this explanation of the potential value of outdoor activity group experience and upon the apparent wide-spread use of one or another version of this approach, it was selected for comparison with group counseling in the present study. Symptoms of behavior which reportedly respond to such experiences include withdrawal, hostile aggression, "amorphous anxiety," irritability, and difficulty with verbal expression of affect (11, p. 96). A need to prove or disprove some of these claims appears to be in part met by comparing the impact of this approach with that of group counseling upon the adolescent subjects in the present study. That these youngsters commonly exhibit these same behaviors adds to the relevance of such a comparison.

Value and Purpose

Levy (44), in a study of out-of-door therapeutic treatment, conducted five- to seven-hour sessions every two weeks
with eight boys between the ages of ten and twelve. She manipulated group balance of withdrawn members compared to hostile or aggressive youngsters. Those who participated four months or longer were described as having changed dramatically. She summarized, "All eight of the boys show improved social adjustment, and some demonstrate a real reintegration of personality" (44, p. 335). She concluded that attributes of the out-of-door approach were, "It offers a field for spontaneous activity for the expansion of the emotional potentialities of the child and...opportunities for arranging and observing situations in a wonderfully spontaneous and subtle way" (44, p. 333).

Slavson reported the values of activity oriented experience as follows:

They [teacher] are only now beginning to recognize that immobilization of children is well-nigh impossible; that children must be considered and treated as dynamic, reactive human beings with feelings, needs, cravings, desires, urges, aggressions, hostilities, friendships, love and need for love, for security and, above all for respect (61, p. 278).

His work with youngsters essentially similar to those serving as subjects in the present study offers encouragement that an activity approach might facilitate these youngsters improved functioning in terms of the criteria set forth in this study on page 66.
Experimental Variables

Experimental and descriptive studies relating to various aspects of outdoor group experience have been reported in terms of effect upon self-esteem, juvenile delinquency, emotional disturbance, hospitalized patients, and public school children. Self-evaluation of fifteen seventh- and eighth-grade problem boys was studied after a thirteen-week treatment period. Testing indicated no significant differences between the experimental group and the control group. However, trends were noted toward more self congruence, more problems, and more positive perception of the subject by their teachers (6).

Krieger studied the effects of camp experience upon self-concept of 110 young campers. Analysis of results of the Lipsitt Self-Concept Scale for Children and the Bowers' Behavior Rating Scale indicated

a significant (beyond .01 level of confidence) positive increase in self-concept change with a strong decrease in poorly adjusted behavior as measured by the Bowers' Behavior Rating Scale. No differential effect of camping on self-concept change as a result of age or sex was found. No relationship was found between self-concept change and observable behavior change (47, p. 5133).

Marks (47) reported a study of professional and non-professional group leaders and the effects on the self-concept of campers. Data concerning the 243 seventh and eighth grade subjects led to the conclusion that professional group leaders and non-professional group
leaders were effective in promoting improved self-concepts among campers.

Galkin (27) studied 120 boys between eight and sixteen years of age as they participated in a three-week outdoor experience. Subjects reported more ease at making contacts, more self-confidence, and increased happiness. Analysis of data from a prescribed system of observation and record-keeping revealed that "there were many who were helped considerably in one way or another" (27, p. 480).

Rickard (54) described the positive effect of camping upon emotionally disturbed children as "reinforcing and encouraging classes of adaptive behavior and the developing of techniques designed to help the campers gain control of his own behavior through a consideration of consequences and alternatives" (54, p. 319). In this same paper he listed group problem solving as the most common and the most valuable technique used, describing it in this manner:

When a problem occurs the group deals with it immediately. Typically the solution involves two major steps: the identification of the problem, and a consideration of other more desirable behaviors which could be emitted in subsequent, similar situations (54, p. 220).

As previously noted, little or no research has been done to isolate factors which lead to growth in terms of behavior and personality. The relative scarcity of studies directly or indirectly related to outdoor group experience
relative to the number of studies in group counseling amply illustrates this fact (71).

Research of outdoor activity group experience is less consistent than that of group counseling in terms of both design integrity and results. Statements such as "there were many who were helped considerably in one way or another" (27, p. 480), offer little to replication efforts or to original investigatory activities. The present study is an attempt to increase the specificity of conditions under which experimental activities occurred, enabling more clearly delineated outcomes.

Toward this objective, five variables were selected for the present study from those reported in this review of related research. These included self-esteem, personal/social adjustment, rated behavior, sociometric choosing, and accrual of points awarded for behavior. Three frames of reference reflected that of the child, the staff member in charge, and a standardized test instrument.
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CHAPTER III
PROCEDURES

Subjects

Subjects who participated in this study had been referred to the Stanton Campus of East Texas Guidance and Achievement Center, a residential treatment facility located near Tyler, Texas. Prior to being placed in the school, the majority of the youngsters had lived in urban Chicago while the remainder came from various other Illinois cities as well as rural and urban areas in Louisiana.

The background of the student was identifiable according to the reasons they had been referred and placed in the school. These included parent neglect--six students; emotional instability--six; pre-delinquent behavior--thirty-seven children and adolescents (14). Most had failed in public school and had been repeatedly truant. Parents were unable to induce a change in the erratic school attendance behavior, resulting in a survey of family dynamics by state social workers. A decision that parents were unable to cope with the problem led to the placement of the child outside the home.
Other examples of referral reasons included placement by the court as a result of a battering parent and removal from the home following continual conflict between the child and a new step-parent. Several students from broken homes were institutionalized because they could not successfully function in a foster home.

Parent credibility was a problem in that parents frequently told the child he would soon be removed from "that school" while simultaneously the parent would tell the social worker that returning the child to the home was unacceptable. The student commonly experienced doubt of self and others and general suspicion aimed toward adults and authority figures.

A significant number of the subjects had prior drug experience, both prescribed and otherwise. Almost all had been completely removed from behavior-modifying drugs such as thorazine and stellazine. Sexual acting-out behavior was common prior to entry in the East Texas Guidance and Achievement Center (14).

Absence of ability or willingness of the parents to exercise guidance and control for the youngsters was a common finding in sociological and psychological records included with each referral. A measure of parental neglect appeared to be a significant variable influencing placement of a child in this institution. The nature of students
who resided at "ETGAC" also was affected by a policy
dictating that Illinois children must be turned down by
three residential schools within that state's boundaries
before they could be referred out of the state (14).

"Neglected" most suitably describes the population
from which participants in the present study were drawn.
They were selected with the aid of a random number table
(9); names of all students were listed and assigned consec-
utive numbers, followed by choosing until all groups were
filled. One alternate per group was chosen in the event
that a student was prevented from participating in the study.
After taking the first two batteries of tests, a student in
each of the older groups refused to participate and two
alternates were substituted.

Participants ranged from twelve to sixteen years of age.
They were accepted as potential participants if they had a
birthday placing them within the age boundaries at any time
during the study.

A total of forty students, excluding alternates, became
involved in this study. Twenty subjects age twelve, thirteen
and fourteen, and twenty who were fifteen and sixteen years
old were selected. The final group consisted of eighteen
girls and twenty-two boys, of whom eighteen were Negroes,
twenty-one Caucasians, and one an American Indian.
Procedures

Procedures of this study were planned to meet some of the objections of previous group counseling research relating to criteria, test instruments, and methods. Anderson (2) reported absent or inadequate descriptions of treatment procedures, poorly chosen or unnecessarily restricted criteria such as grade point average, and the absence of any rationale as to why a treatment should yield a given outcome.

Similarly, Kagan (7) stated that problems with research have included confusion resultant from vague reports of procedures, the utilization of "homemade" psychometric devices, and ineffective controls. He criticized test instruments by questioning their impromptu construction without objectivity and validation. He also pointed out that "the failure of researchers to describe the nature of their group procedures so that replication by others is possible—was by far the more confounding source of confusion and the greater obstacle to discovery" (7, p. 274).

Procedures in the initial phase of the study began with a control period. At the outset of this period the following instruments, explained on page 89, were administered: (1) The California Test of Personality, (2) a sociometric device, and (3) The Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory. The Behavior Rating Form was also used by child care workers to
rate subjects. The younger group received *The California Test of Personality* designed for grades four through eight, while older students took the form geared to grades seven through ten. Subjects who had difficulty reading were read the tests by a child care worker to reduce the influence of reading ability on test results, as suggested by Sims (11).

Following separation into age groups of twelve through fourteen years and fifteen through sixteen years, ten students were assigned to each of four groups with the use of a random number table. One of the groups, composed of twelve-through fourteen-year-olds, was designated to participate in outdoor activities; a group of fifteen and sixteen-year-old subjects was also appointed to the same activity. The remaining two groups, one of which was composed of fifteen-through sixteen-year-olds, and one of twelve-through fourteen-year-olds, were assigned to indoor group counseling as shown in the illustration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>OD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>OD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Y = Subjects age 12-14 years  
O = Subjects age 15-16 years  
G = Group Counseling  
OD = Outdoor Group Experience

*Fig. 1--Age and treatment*
These four groups of students served two purposes. In the initial phase of the study they were considered the control or pre-wait group, and following administration of a pretest and posttest, they became the experimental group. Thus differences between time periods (a "wait" period followed by a treatment period) and not differences between separate control and experimental group subjects were measured.

Activities for the students proceeded as usual under the direction of the child care workers. Visits to points of interest off the school grounds, classroom instruction in reading and other subjects, participation in YMCA activities, entertainment on the campus such as parties, and off-campus experiences such as church and movies, and vocational or hobby-oriented pursuits were considered as a part of the usual experience provided for students. Unstructured "free" activities also were a significant part of their daily routine. They experienced an environment designed to offer freedom and flexibility with the security of a consistent schedule of activities and a system of token rewards aimed at encouraging productive behavior. Child care workers assigned at a ratio of one per group of eight or fewer students monitored behavior and dispensed rewards as points for clearly defined positive behavior. These points were redeemable at the school store, which sold candy, clothing,
cosmetics, and other items of interest to students. Besides child care workers, a licensed psychologist, three certified associate psychologists, a medical doctor, a licensed vocational nurse, four certified teachers, and staff members totaling in excess of twenty-five had contact with the children.

Activities occurred in a moderately new brick structure modified from its original design for a twelve-grade public school. The facilities, which had been previously closed to facilitate integration, also included a large gymnasium and a vocational building on the twenty-seven-acre campus located ten miles south of Tyler, Texas, in a thickly wooded area away from the main highway.

The group counseling sessions were scheduled indoors three times per week beginning at 6:30 p.m. and ending at 8:00 p.m. Meetings were held on Fridays, Sundays, and Tuesdays. Outdoor groups began at 9:30 a.m. on consecutive Saturdays and lasted until 4:00 p.m. Both indoor and outdoor groups continued for a five-week period, with fifteen sessions for the former and five sessions for the latter.

Group counseling sessions were held in a small room in one of the campus residence buildings. Members and group leaders sat in a circle on the carpet, keeping the drapes drawn to impede curiosity seekers and to dim the light at the request of participants. Each leader attempted
to foster a feeling of safety with minimal threat, enabling students to discuss personal concerns without fear of ridicule or rejection. Members were encouraged to help each other as well as themselves by spontaneously functioning in leadership roles from time to time, thus promoting group-centered leadership.

Outdoor group activities were held at one of three locations offered to group members by their respective leader. Favorites were Tyler State Park, Lake Tyler West, and Lake Jacksonville. Rain became a problem during the first trip away from the campus, necessitating a change in plans. Previously, a decision had been made to reschedule the outing; however, as the groups had already left the campus, this action seemed impractical. Instead, both groups sought and found open-air sheltered areas near a lake, allowing most of the planned sequence of activities. As rains were of short duration, the remainder of the activities were undertaken without significant change in the written guidelines.

Activities within the groups followed two divergent themes which guided the group leaders in their respective approaches to working with the subjects. The outdoor groups, designated group "three" for the younger subjects and group "four" for the older students, were intended to provide conditions leading to a cooperative joint effort
in accomplishing the prescribed tasks. In addition, many individual and joint decision-making opportunities were allowed. A learning situation was set up whereby decisions to cooperate with others toward a common goal (selection of a site, preparation of a meal) resulted in more favorable outcomes than did decisions not to cooperate or to operate solely as an individual.

One goal of the indoor counseling groups was the creation of an environment wherein trust in the leader and in each of the members was established. Sharing and otherwise dealing with concerns not usually discussed were the anticipated outcome. Trust was built on leader honesty and successful communication to members that he (leader) was concerned for their well-being as they defined it.

Students who participated in the four groups were not sufficiently prepared for the experience. The result was a barrage of questions as to "why me?", "why this group and not that group?", and "what is going to happen in the group?". Although an answer was attempted for each question, it was noted that many persons asked a given question several times. In general, students were told that they were selected because "their number came up." They were assured that they were not selected because they were in trouble or sick. The purpose of the activity was described as an attempt to determine the value and feasibility of certain experiences
which might become a regular part of the school's program. There was a generalized resistance to the idea that students could play a vital role in determining the nature of the group experience.

Outdoor activity groups (group three and group four) began each outing by being informed by a child care worker that the leader had arrived, which vehicle was to be used, and where the food was located. The leaders waited in the vicinity of the vehicles until a majority of the students were inside. If the food had not been loaded, this fact was mentioned.

The trip had been planned so as to enable approximately equal time spent in group activities and discussion by the outdoor groups as was spent in group counseling by the indoor groups. Outdoor experience included staying together at all times; when a problem arose all activities stopped while everyone participated in arriving at a solution. Learning cooperation and individual responsibility was emphasized throughout the trips. As in the group counseling groups, a non-threatening atmosphere was established, as was the communication to group members of genuine concern and understanding. Members were encouraged to offer help to each other and to periodically take the role of helper.

Once most of the students were inside the bus or the limousine, the leader boarded and talked informally with
them. After all had arrived, "instructions from outdoor group leader" (Appendix C) were issued for the 9:30 a.m. time segment and at scheduled points throughout the remainder of the outing.

Students then actively discussed who would bring the supplies from the cafeteria and load them into the vehicle and where the group would go. Leaders resisted demands from subjects that they be told where they were going and who would load supplies. Child care workers functioning as aides and being accustomed to planning details of outings had to be coached to take a passive role in the often heated interchanges among students. Decisions were reached usually within twenty minutes of the appointed time for leaving the campus.

The aide drove the group to the chosen site, whereupon students received instructions from the group leader and then surveyed the area, selecting the most desirable location. Informal play such as investigating nearby trails, climbing cliffs, and throwing footballs and frizbees occupied approximately one hour of time.

Meal preparation followed. This sequence entailed leader instructions and activity decisions such as who would unload food and utensils and who would handle each aspect of food preparation. A general lack of organization
characterized early sessions, with several group members failing to receive their share of the meal.

The groups were informed according to the instruction sheet that they were free to pursue activities according to their choice. Most of the subjects chose to resume activities they had terminated prior to eating. For approximately one and one-half hours this segment of the day's events continued.

The group leader then gathered students and informed them of the next activity, a discussion period oriented toward the day's events and associated feelings students experienced. This phase lasted from thirty minutes to one hour and was followed by returning unused food and utensils to the bus, boarding, and returning to the main campus. Group discussions were continued on the return trip when the need was apparent. A schedule describing activities for each block of time is provided in Appendix E, paralleling "Instruction from Group Leader" (Appendix C).

Leaders

Groups were lead by four doctoral candidates from East Texas State University. Each had completed a majority of his course work, at least one course in group counseling, and an internship. Two of the leaders had conducted institutes in the training of group counselors while another had received group counseling experience in the criminally
insane ward of a state prison. One leader received her doctorate degree from East Texas State University two months following her participation in this study; her dissertation topic dealt with group counseling. Each group leader was paid ten dollars per hour for conducting the group sessions.

While leaders used in the four groups had not yet received their doctorate degree, they were considered to be professional. However, in support of their "predoctoral" status, Anderson (2) reported the relative effectiveness of subprofessional leaders as compared to professionals using two experimental groups composed of "group insight counseling" and "systematic group desensitization." Fifty-four college undergraduates were counseled in groups for five weekly sessions by leaders with clinical experience and by inexperienced students in graduate psychology training. All experimental subjects profited significantly more than control groups, which led to the conclusion that "subprofessional counselors who administered the treatments were, in general, as effective as the professional counselors" (2, p. 214).

Techniques utilized in groups "one" and "two" (the group counseling sections) were selected on a basis of the leader's personal counseling rationale. Both leaders professed a Rogersian point of view, refraining from
moralizing, making judgments concerning statements and behavior or subjects, while attempting to communicate a warm, positive and honest concern for group members. Students were allowed to smoke in the area used for group counseling, a privilege not ordinarily permitted. Questions of an information-seeking nature about sex and other anxiety-arousing topics were frankly answered by the leader, and discussion of related feelings and attitudes was encouraged.

Confidentiality of what was said in groups was strictly observed by group leaders, who took a personal interest to see that group members' trust was not violated. Some of the student participants, however, were not as careful with session content.

Group leaders placed great importance on assuming that subjects had the potential for being self-directing and for accurately determining the course of their own behavior. For example, imminent threats of physical violence against a leader were not squelched; instead, the frustration at the root of the threat was reflected along with a communication of warmth and trust in the student's ability to make an appropriate choice.

Leaders and aides participated in a brief orientation wherein they received copies of instructions to be given at various times to outdoor group experience participants,
a general rationale guiding the group counseling activities, a description of duties to be performed by aides, the times and locations at which sessions would be held, and a list of specific activities to be accomplished by the outdoor group. Blank forms were distributed to leaders on which significant events pertaining to group and individual change were to be recorded. Completed forms appear in Appendix D. Questions concerning report forms, the role of group leaders, and the role of aides who participated only in the outdoor sessions were discussed. Aides were instructed that their role would be to handle manual labor tasks such as driving vehicles, loading and unloading, when not accomplished by subjects, responding to leader request to control potential eruptions of physical violence or possible attempts at running away. Aides were instructed to otherwise assume a passive role in terms of decision making, group discussion, and disciplinary actions.

Data Collection

Instruments used in this study were selected to fulfill two purposes, to provide an accurate measure of the trait in question and to assess characteristics relevant to difficulties experienced by subjects. In response to the second objective, informal observation showed students to be deficient in peer relations, attitude toward authority,
attitude toward self, self control, and ability to successfully complete a task. The first two problem areas are measured by one or more of six subtests in the California Test of Personality, which yielded a composite "Social Adjustment Score." The problem of self image required an instrument which offered flexibility in terms of reading level and age of subjects as well as means for checking validity. The Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory satisfied these demands and provided extensive research concerning use of the test.

Self control or response to frustration, an important variable, was measured from two frames of reference. The Behavior Rating Form yielded a picture as seen by adult supervisory personnel, while offering potential for a comparable look through the eyes of the student in his responses on the Self-Esteem Inventory. Further cross-checking was made possible by comparability of several of the six subtests such as "Sense of Personal Worth" and "Withdrawing Tendencies" on the California Test of Personality. Sociometric choosing reflects another facet of peer relations, offering valuable additional input for establishing a composite image of adjustment of the institutionalized pre-delinquent foster child.

Success on campus is most easily related to "points" which were dispensed for objectively defined positive
behavior. This measure made a contribution through reflecting the acquisition of several behaviors (such as completing a task) to which treatment was aimed.

The test battery included three standardized pencil-and-paper instruments, two of which were completed by subjects. These were the California Test of Personality Elementary Form and Secondary Form, and the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory. The Coopersmith Behavior Rating Form was completed by child care workers, while a non-standardized sociometric device measuring quantity of sociometric choosing of a psychotelic nature was answered by subjects.

The Self-Esteem Inventory was designed to derive information from the child after he has been instructed to check one of two choices as follows: "Like Me" or "Unlike Me" in reference to a statement. The information yielded by this device concerned his feelings about himself regarding his peers, parents, personal interests, and school. There is a total of forty-eight items, yielding subtest scores for each of the four areas listed above. The reliability of this instrument was found to be +.88 in a test-retest situation extending over a period of five weeks (4). A similar check over a three-year interval yielded a coefficient of +.70. Validity of the instrument was judged by five psychologists who screened test items and determined their comprehensiveness after applying them to a group of
thirty children (4). Faking of the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory was investigated using thirty-six high school sophomore students who answered questions on three administrations first honestly, second, faking in a positive direction, and finally, faking in a negative direction. Findings indicated that lie responses were fewest among the "fake bad" group (10). Himber related her opinion of the value of self assessment as follows:

... no one can seriously quarrel with a youth who is honestly telling you how he feels. It is important to recognize that one who sees himself as having moved from one point to another on a behavior scale is highly motivated to act according to such a perception (6, p. 311).

The Behavior Rating Form is a five-point scale with thirteen items intended to assist teachers at rating self-esteem in terms of observable behavior. The reliability coefficient was found to be +.73 using teachers and principals as cross-raters. Test-retest reliability over an eight week period was +.96 (4). Tyler (15) in his work with 168 fourteen-through eighteen-year-old male delinquents found that there was a clear predictive superiority of behavior ratings completed by school staff.

The California Test of Personality is designed to yield a measure of each of sixteen variables such as "sense of personal worth," "feelings of belonging," and "total adjustment." The major divisions described by subtests are
"personal adjustment" and "social adjustment." "The California Test of Personality was organized around the concept of life adjustment as a balance between personal and social adjustment" (13, p. 3).

In discussing the validity of this instrument, it was reported in the Educational Research Bulletin of the New York Schools that "(the CTP). . .is perhaps the most diagnostic of any test of this type. . .and is particularly useful with problem boys and girls" (1, p. 28). Sims pointed out,

. . .the additional evidence on validity reported or referred to in the manual not only answers some of the earlier criticism, but convinces this reviewer that as a measure of self-concept in the, as of now, vaguely defined area called adjustment, this test is as valid as most such instruments (11, p. 102).

The Kuder-Richardson Reliability Coefficient for Total Adjustment was +.98 for the intermediate form of the CTP. Subcategory reliability figures ranged from +.82 to +.98.

A sociometric device requested that the student list the names of persons in the school with whom he would like to participate in a "fun activity" such as going to town for a coke. Bonney (3) reported that the number of such choices relates to the emotional need for others and is intimately related to personality regardless of the environment probability of satisfying these needs. Smith and Olson (12) described such choosing as "social reactivity."
They reported that high "association status" or "popularity status" is indicative of high social reactivity. Emotional constriction was found to be related to low popularity or "associational status" in a study conducted by these two authors. Lorber reported a survey of nine writers who had agreed that sociometric measures were highly reliable, adding that

One can consider sociometric responses to be samples in their own right of the very behavior they seek to investigate (as opposed to being measurements relating to a broad and general class of social behavior which they purportedly quantify and of which they are purportedly representative) (8, p. 243).

A tally was kept of the number of points earned by subjects in payment of behavior which was defined as positive. The total number of points accrued by each student was computed for the control period and for the experimental period.

A significant activity sheet was completed by group leaders to document observed changes in the progress of the group as well as members. One form per session was requested of the group leaders; these are reported in Appendix D.

The battery of instruments was administered on February 14, 1972, beginning a five-week period which was terminated by re-administration of the same battery on March 20, 1972. This second administration of the battery also served as pretesting for the experimental period which began the
following week in March and also continued for a five-week period. Experimental activities continued through May 2, 1972, and preceded a third administration of the battery.

All pencil and paper tests were administered in the school cafeteria by teachers assisted by child care workers serving as teacher aides. The assistant director of the school supervised the testing activity and served as consultant when unusual situations arose. Non-readers and students who refused to take the tests were separated from the main group for special treatment. A child care worker read the test to those having difficulty reading. Students who resisted completing the test instruments were encouraged privately by child care workers to comply with the request. This approach proved satisfactory in all cases except one, where the assistance of another student had to be sought.

Treatment of the Data

A 2 x 2 x 2 analysis of variance with repeated measures was used to analyze the data. Anderson supported this type of statistical design, stating that "What is needed are multivariate projects which utilize multiple outcome criteria with the differential treatments" (2, p. 216). The Cohn report on group counseling research suggested "multivariate statistical methods as promising for group counseling research because of the many interacting process variables and complexity of goals in group counseling" (5, p. 61).
No author listed for this reference.
The form I used was taken from dissertations I checked in the N. T. library.
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CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Forty institutionalized youngsters who participated in group experiences were studied for changes in their self-esteem, behavior, social and psychological adjustment, and sociometric choosing. Data were analyzed using a two-by-two-by-two analysis of variance with repeated measures. Hypotheses were accepted if the .05 level of significance was reached. Group means reported were adjusted using pre-control period scores.

Hypothesis I was stated to predict that subjects would score significantly higher in self-esteem, as measured by the Self-Esteem Inventory, following participation in group counseling sessions, than following a control period. Hypothesis II also related to the Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI), predicting that subjects would score significantly higher in self-esteem, as measured by the Self-Esteem Inventory, following participation in outdoor group experience, than following a control period, and than subjects in group counseling. Subjects in group counseling obtained a group mean score of -0.77 for the post-control
evaluation and 2.07 for the self-esteem variables at the post-experimental testing. Analysis of variance between means for treatment at post-control and at post-experimental testing yielded an F level of 0.62, which was not significant at the .05 level. Outdoor group experience means were 0.69 and -1.86 for the self-esteem variable at post-control and post-experimental periods, respectively. Analysis of variance between means for group counseling and outdoor group experience yielded an F level of 0.19, which was not significant at the .05 level. Table I indicates the results of the analysis of the self-esteem variable.

TABLE I
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SELF-ESTEEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variability</th>
<th>Sum SQ</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean SQ</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment (A)</td>
<td>31.98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.98</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (B)</td>
<td>171.73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>171.73</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>52.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52.76</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>5,381.89</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>168.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (C)</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x C</td>
<td>114.84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>114.83</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B x C</td>
<td>316.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316.20</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B x C</td>
<td>176.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>176.02</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>5,945.05</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>185.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12,193.96</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adjusted means, standard deviations, and unadjusted means appear in Appendix F. There was no significant difference between SEI mean scores following the control period and those following the group counseling period. Group means did not differ significantly in terms of post-group counseling measures as opposed to post-outdoor group experience scores. Neither Hypothesis I nor II was supported, and both were therefore rejected.

Hypothesis III stated that subjects would score significantly higher in self-esteem, as measured by the Behavior Rating Form, following participation in group counseling sessions, than following a control period. Further, Hypothesis IV stated that subjects would score significantly higher in self-esteem, as measured by the Behavior Rating Form (BRF), following participation in outdoor group experience, than following a control period, and than subjects in group counseling.

Mean scores on the Behavior Rating Form variable of self-esteem were 0.79 and -2.66 at the post-control (group counseling) and the post-experimental testing, respectively. Analysis of variance between treatment and time produced an F of 1.24, which was not significant at the .05 level. The outdoor group experience post-control mean score was -0.67, while the post-experimental mean score for the same variable was 2.26. The difference between means for the
two treatments reached an F value of 0.25, which failed to reach the .05 level of significance.

While BRF scores decreased among the group counseling subjects and increased in the outdoor group experience subjects, the greatest positive change occurred in younger group-counseling subjects. Losses among older group counseling subjects offset these gains, however. The analysis of variance for the self-esteem variable is shown in Table II.

**TABLE II**

**SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR BEHAVIOR RATING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variability</th>
<th>Sum SQ</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean SQ</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment (A)</td>
<td>43.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43.13</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (B)</td>
<td>133.26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>133.26</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>299.61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>299.65</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>5,722.68</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>173.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (C)</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x C</td>
<td>216.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>216.76</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B x C</td>
<td>706.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>706.05</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B x C</td>
<td>87.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>87.13</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>5,755.21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>174.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12,968.48</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table II failed to support either Hypothesis III or Hypothesis IV, as there were no significant differences between post-control mean measures and post-outdoor group
experience mean scores. Neither was there a significant difference between the post-outdoor group experience BRF mean and the equivalent post-group counseling measure. The apparently significant .05 level of probability in Table II was in fact rounded from a nonsignificant .052 level. Hypotheses III and IV were both rejected.

While the measures of significance failed to reach the necessary level, a definite interaction between time and age was established at a probability level of .05. A t-test was used to determine where means differed, causing interaction between age and time. While there was no significant difference at the .05 level, using a two-tailed test, there was a trend in that direction on age means. Results of the t-test appear in Table III.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post Control</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>-4.06</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Experimental</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>-1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>-1.80</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It appeared that, on this variable, age caused an interaction. Younger subjects increased in self-esteem on the Behavior Rating Form and older students decreased in self-esteem. At the post-control stage the two groups were far apart, but at the close of the experimental stage the groups were much closer together.

Hypothesis V stated that subjects would score significantly higher in social and personal adjustment, as measured by the California Test of Personality (CTP), following participation in group counseling sessions than following a control period. Hypothesis VI stated that subjects would score significantly higher in social and personal adjustment, as measured by the California Test of Personality, following participation in outdoor group experience than following a control period, and than subjects in group counseling. Subjects in group counseling obtained a group mean score of -1.12 for the post-control evaluation and -0.27 for the social and personal adjustment variable at the post-experimental testing. Analysis of variance between means for treatment at post-control and at post-experimental testing yielded an F level of 0.06, which was not significant at the .05 level. Outdoor group experience means were 0.95 and 0.23 for the social and personal adjustment variable at the post-control and the post-experimental periods, respectively. Analysis of variance between means
for group counseling and outdoor group experience yielded an F level of 0.06, which was not significant at the .05 level. Results of the analysis of variance for social and personal adjustment reported in Table IV indicated that no significant difference existed between post-control group mean scores and post-outdoor group experience in terms of personal and social adjustment. Neither was there a significant difference between post-outdoor group experience and post-group counseling group means for this variable. All measures of significance failed to reach the necessary .05 level; therefore, both Hypothesis V and VI were rejected.

**TABLE IV**

**SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR PERSONAL ADJUSTMENT/SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variability</th>
<th>Sum SQ</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean SQ</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment (A)</td>
<td>18.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.33</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (B)</td>
<td>412.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>412.25</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>446.61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>446.61</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>10,049.39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>304.53</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (C)</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B x C</td>
<td>147.91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>147.91</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B x C</td>
<td>23.21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.21</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>8,296.28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>251.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,409.71</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis VII stated that subjects would score significantly higher in the number of sociometric choices following participation in group counseling sessions than following a control period. Hypothesis VIII predicted that subjects would score significantly higher in number of sociometric choices following participation in outdoor group experience than following a control period, and than subjects in group counseling.

The means for the sociometric choice variable for group counseling subjects were 0.34 following the post-control period and -0.50 following the experimental period. Outdoor group experience means were -0.29 and 0.43 for the sociometric choosing variable at the post-experimental periods, respectively. Analysis of variance between post-control and post-experimental means yielded an F of 1.10, while treatment means at the post-experimental testing were computed to produce an F factor of 0.01. Both F ratios failed to reach the established .05 level of significance. Results of the analysis of variance concerning the sociometric choice variable are reported in Table V. There were no significant differences between post-control mean scores and post-experimental mean scores. Neither were there significant differences between post-experimental treatment means for the sociometric choice variable. Further, none of the F ratios reached the prescribed .05 level of significance. Hypotheses VII and VIII were both rejected.
Hypothesis IX stated that subjects would score significantly higher in number of points issued by school staff for positive behavior following participation in group counseling sessions than following a control period. The post-control group counseling mean of 1264.41 increased to 3763.94 at the post-experimental evaluation. An analysis of variance between treatment means following post-control and post-experimental testing yielded an F factor of 4.16. The mean number of behavior points was significantly greater (<.05 level) at the end of the experimental period than at the end of the control period; therefore, Hypothesis IX was accepted.
Hypothesis X predicted that subjects would score significantly higher in number of points issued by school staff for positive behavior following participation in outdoor group experience than following a control period, and than subjects in group counseling. Group means for the points variable were 1091.00 and 2676.85 for the post-control testing (outdoor group experience) and the post-experimental assessment (outdoor group experience), respectively. Behavior point means were 3763.94 and 2676.85 at the post-experimental level for group counseling and outdoor group experience, respectively. Table VI reflects the analysis of variance for behavior points, and relates to Hypotheses IX and X.

TABLE VI
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR BEHAVIOR POINTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variability</th>
<th>Sum SQ</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean SQ</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment (A)</td>
<td>7,726,787.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7,726,787.32</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (B)</td>
<td>173,444.45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>173,444.45</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>9,912,893.74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9,912,893.74</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>86,437,865.80</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2,619,329.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (C)</td>
<td>76,803,035.26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76,803,035.26</td>
<td>82.19</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x C</td>
<td>3,887,066.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,887,066.40</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B x C</td>
<td>43,909.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43,909.10</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B x C</td>
<td>514,201.63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>514,201.63</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>30,836,228.05</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>934,431.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>216,335,431.75</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An analysis of variance between group means at the post-control and the post-experimental testing was computed to yield an F factor of 89.19. A significant difference (<.01 level) existed between the outdoor group experience and the control period mean totals of behavior points.

A t-test was used to determine differences among means producing the interaction effect. Group counseling and outdoor group experience means were not significantly different at the post-control testing. However, a t-value of 3.41 indicated a significant difference between the two forms of treatment at the post-experimental level. Table VII indicates t values obtained from time and treatment interaction using a two-tailed test.

**TABLE VII**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Treatment Means</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indoor</td>
<td>Outdoor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Control</td>
<td>1264.41</td>
<td>1091.00</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Experimental</td>
<td>3763.94</td>
<td>2676.85</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A significant difference (<.01 level) was observed between group counseling and outdoor group experience in
terms of behavior point means. However, the significance was not in the predicted direction of greater scores for the outdoor group experience; Hypothesis X was therefore rejected.

The major thrust of this study was to determine the comparative impact of group counseling with outdoor group experience on mean measures of self-esteem, behavior, and adjustment in groups of institutionalized adolescents. The preponderance of formal test data failed to suggest that any significant change occurred in the subjects; however, significant results were obtained from a measure of actual participant behavior. When this behavior was examined in terms of number of points awarded by school staff members, both group counseling and outdoor group experience differed markedly from the control period counterpart. Further, group counseling produced significantly greater behavioral change than did outdoor group experience.

In summary, each of ten Hypotheses was discussed in relation to the data presented. A three-factor analysis of variance with repeated measures and a t-test were used to treat the data.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, RESULTS, OBSERVATIONS, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was conducted to compare the impact of group counseling with that of outdoor group experience upon twelve- through sixteen-year-old institutionalized adolescents. Subjects were evaluated in terms of their behavior, self-esteem, social and psychological adjustment, and sociometric choosing. An effort was made to test the effectiveness of two approaches to treating disturbed, pre-delinquent youngsters who had failed in their attempts to function in a community setting.

It was anticipated that in general, students participating in this study would show greater progress on all measures following their participation in group counseling than following their participation in group counseling than following an equivalent period of time in which they were subjected to the school milieu (the control period). Moreover, it was anticipated that even greater progress would be observed in those participating in the outdoor group experience as compared to either the group counseling group or the control period.
Subjects were youngsters between the ages of twelve and sixteen who were residents of the East Texas Guidance and Achievement Center's Stanton Campus. They had been referred for residential treatment by state family service agencies in Illinois and Louisiana for a variety of reasons which could be loosely grouped under the categories of parent abuse and/or neglect; school failure, truancy, or other related problems; and general inability to conform to authority whether in the home, the community, or the school.

Forty subjects were selected from this school population with the aid of a random number table. They were then placed by age in one of four group, two of which received group counseling and two of which received an outdoor group experience. The forty participants were administered a test battery including the California Test of Personality, the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory, and a sociometric device. Concurrently a behavior rating form was completed by school staff members having close contact with these students. Further, records were kept concerning points which were awarded to students for behavior that was defined by the school staff as positive.

The California Test of Personality yielded thirteen measures of adjustment. For the purposes of this study, a single index combining both social adjustment and personal adjustment was utilized.
The Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory yielded measures of self-esteem and defensiveness, of which the former was utilized. The subject checked "Like Me" or "Unlike Me" in regard to such statements as "I can't be depended on."

The Coopersmith Behavior Rating Form yielded a measure of behavior which was intended to be somewhat parallel to the Self-Esteem Inventory while providing a different source of input, that of the school staff member. Thirteen ratings were completed, using a five-point scale.

Subjects were also asked to "write the names of people in this school with whom you would like to go to town for a coke" in order to provide a measure of friend-oriented sociometric choosing. Quantity of choosing or social reactivity was the sought after measure.

Finally the battery included a check of routinely kept school records concerning behavior points awarded by staff members to students. These points were valued at one-half cent each in the school store and were paid to students for cleaning their room, attending class, and other similar activities.

A control period for the forty subjects was established, with the second administration of the test battery following a five-week period during which the school milieu was unchanged. At this point in time, twenty subjects became involved in an outdoor group experience while the remaining
twenty participated in group counseling. The experimental period terminated with a third administration of the test battery.

Testing was conducted in the school cafeteria and was supervised by teachers and child care workers. Non-readers and those who were reluctant to take the tests were separated from the main group and assisted individually.

The treatment or experimental period included two approaches, group counseling experience and outdoor group experience. The group counseling approach was described by leaders as primarily client-centered and followed a format of fifteen ninety-minute sessions over a five week period. The outdoor group experience included five weekly meetings lasting approximately seven hours each. Activities followed a structured time format which included both printed directions to the leader and a written dialogue for his use in coordinating activities. The focal point of the day's events was the group's cooperative effort in preparing a meal. Group decision-making junctures were placed throughout the day's activities.

Both group counseling participants and outdoor group experience subjects were divided according to age, promoting a measure of homogeneity of maturity and interest. The younger age group in both instances consisted of
twelve- through fourteen-year-old students, while the older group contained fifteen- and sixteen-year-olds.

The design used in this study, a post-wait--post-experimental plan, enabled a greater utilization of a small population. An additional advantage which appeared later in this study was the ability to separate and maintain integrity between measures of control-period subjects from experimental-period subjects. The chain-reaction effect of any significant event on the campus would have made isolation of experimental group members from control subjects impossible.

Results

Following administration of the third test battery, data were analyzed, using a three-factor analysis of variance with repeated measures. Results failed to support Hypothesis I in its prediction that group counseling sessions would result in significantly higher self-esteem scores on the Self-Esteem Inventory, as compared to scores obtained following a control period. Data also failed to support Hypothesis II, in which it was anticipated that outdoor group experience would effect significantly higher scores in self-esteem measured by the Self-Esteem Inventory, as compared to scores obtained following a group counseling period and following a control period.
Analysis of scores obtained on the Behavior Rating Form failed to support Hypothesis III, which predicted that significantly higher self-esteem would follow participation in group counseling sessions, as compared to a control period. Hypothesis IV, predicting that self-esteem scores on the Behavior Rating Form would be significantly higher following outdoor group experience, as compared to other scores following group counseling sessions and following a control period, also failed to gain support.

Results of data derived from the California Test of Personality failed to support either Hypothesis V or Hypothesis VI predicting significant change in social and personal adjustment. There was no significant increase in adjustment following group counseling sessions as compared to change during a control period. Nor was there a significant increase in personal and social adjustment following outdoor group experience sessions compared to a control period.

Sociometric choosing did not differ significantly between measures taken following group counseling sessions and those following a control period; therefore, Hypothesis VII was not supported. Data also failed to support the prediction in Hypothesis VIII that subjects would score significantly higher in number of sociometric choices
following participation in outdoor group experience than following a control period, and than subjects in group counseling.

Hypothesis IX was supported at the .01 level of significance. Following group counseling sessions subjects had received a significantly larger number of behavior points than following a control period. Figure 2 represents change in group means for behavior points following a control period and following an experimental period of group counseling.

Fig. 2--Mean number of behavior points received following post control and following post experimental periods.
Hypothesis X, however, was rejected because the significant change which occurred was in favor of the group counseling subjects instead of the outdoor group experience subjects as predicted. Analysis of this data indicated that group counseling was a more effective means of eliciting point-reward behavior. Figure 2 also represents mean change in behavior points for the outdoor group experience subjects.

Summarizing, Hypotheses I through VIII and Hypothesis X were rejected because significant change was not observed. Hypothesis IX was supported at the .01 level of significance.

Test data was also reviewed manually in terms of number of individuals whose test scores increased to a "high" or "low" degree. Four measures were considered; these were sociometric choosing, the Self-Esteem Inventory, the Behavior Rating Form, and the California Test of Personality "total score" (personal adjustment/social adjustment). Post-experimental scores were compared with post-control scores for gain. The range was determined and those falling in the upper half of the range were labeled high gainers while those in the lower half were called low gainers.

Ten students experienced increases in the variable of sociometric choosing. Two of these fell into the high gain area, and both students were from the outdoor group.
experience groups. Of the eight low gainers, five came from the outdoor groups and three from the group counseling groups. There was a slight edge in favor of improvement among the younger students on this variable.

Twenty-one subjects, five of whom fell in the high gain category, improved in terms of the Self-Esteem Inventory. They were approximately equally divided as to both age and treatment. Low gainers tended to come from the group counseling groups with a slightly greater frequency of older students.

The Behavior Rating Form responses indicated that fifteen subjects improved following the experimental period. The five high gains came primarily in the outdoor group experience subjects who fell in the younger age group. Low gainers were equally divided between group counseling and outdoor group experience, with younger students dominating older students for improvement in this category.

Sixteen students experienced improved personal and social adjustment on the California Test of Personality. Of the eight high gainers, half came from the group counseling group and half from the outdoor groups. Slightly more older students experienced high gains, as opposed to the younger age groups. Three-fourths of the low gains were among group counseling subjects, with older students having a higher frequency of growth in this category than younger students.
The largest number of high gainers was on the California Test of Personality, while the Self-Esteem Inventory was associated with the largest total number of gains.

**TABLE VIII**

**FREQUENCY OF HIGH AND LOW GAINS ON SOCIOMETRIC CHOOSING, THE SELF-ESTEEM INVENTORY, THE BEHAVIOR RATING FORM, AND THE CALIFORNIA TEST OF PERSONALITY BY AGE AND BY TREATMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Variable</th>
<th>Group (Age/Treatment)</th>
<th>Gain Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sociometric Choosing</strong></td>
<td>Younger Group Counseling</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older Group Counseling</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Younger Outdoor Group</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older Outdoor Group</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Esteem Inventory</strong></td>
<td>Younger Group Counseling</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older Group Counseling</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Younger Outdoor Group</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older Outdoor Group</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavior Rating Form</strong></td>
<td>Younger Group Counseling</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older Group Counseling</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Younger Outdoor Group</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older Outdoor Group</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>California Test of Personality</strong></td>
<td>Younger Group Counseling</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older Group Counseling</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Younger Outdoor Group</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older Outdoor Group</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Each group contained ten subjects
There were, however, no consistent trends in terms of test variables, age or treatment groups. Thirty-nine percent of the subjects experienced gains in all four criteria, and there were sixty-two score improvements among the participants. The table above indicates the number of gains observed on the four test criteria, the two age groups, and the two forms of group experience. High and low gains have been dichotomized.

Observations

Several subjective observations were made during the course of data collection. Based upon written reports in Appendix D and verbal self-reports, two of the four leaders participated in a moving emotional experience at some point during the five-week span of time. One such incident reported in relation to group one, session eleven, was preceded by "fantastic hostility toward the therapist." The event climaxed with a female subject's advances toward the leader with a hoe as she threatened to kill him. The leader reflected the girl's intense feelings but made no attempt to physically restrain her as she struggled to maintain self-control. It was reported that during this session the individuals became a group and other members were able to express warm positive feelings toward each other and toward the therapist.
Based upon this observation, there is an implied need for experience and internal stability on the part of the group leader. The tendency of these institutionalized youngsters to vent their hostility upon the leader demands that he be able to withstand the onslaught.

Another observation related to the manner in which boys and girls dichotomized themselves in groups. This behavior was most evident during and following a trip taken by the female subjects, necessitating their missing one of the group sessions. Male subjects expressed delight at the absence of the girls, and implied that this would allow the group to proceed more effectively. The girls upon returning also expressed negative feelings toward the boys. However, group leaders agreed in their inference that much of the negative verbalization was superficial.

A generalized resistance among subjects to enter and remain in group rooms or vehicles was noted throughout much of the experimental periods. Requests for cigarettes and snacks as reasons for leaving may have suggested students' attempts to reduce anxiety. Conflict also was noted when recreational activities off-campus were scheduled concurrently with the Friday meetings, adding to subjects' reluctance to attend the group sessions. A similar resistance to taking pencil-and-paper tests was also observed. Resistance to test-taking increased with each
administration of the battery, while movement into group settings appeared to occur more easily during the later sessions. All leaders reported rapport to be at a peak near the end of the experimental period, suggesting a need for more or longer sessions.

There may be a parallel between resistance to test-taking and the findings of greater change indicated by non-test measures such as behavior points. Subjective data provides support for this contention in that group leaders unanimously agreed that positive behavior change had occurred among the subjects. Appendix D contains leader comments in this regard.

Informal observation of the subjects further revealed that, more than six months following termination of the group activities, students continued to request that the groups be re-established. As several forms of group activities are currently underway at the school, these requests were interpreted to indicate a need for group counseling and outdoor group experience such as occurred in this study.

Discussion

Based upon analysis of objective data and review of subjective observations, it may be assumed that two forms of change would probably occur due to the extremely close contact between those who profited from the experience and others who either did not or were not involved as
subjects. Those who improved in the variables measured in this study would probably decrease somewhat from their peak level of adjustment, while the mean functioning of non-participants should improve slightly through association with high gainers. Support for this conclusion is found in work by Slavson (2), on group balance, and by Mosteller (1), who discussed Galton's writings on regression.

Despite the fact that some of the instruments utilized had been normed on subjects defined as delinquents, an intact institutionalized population is generally not available for test standardization in sufficiently large size to permit comparison with the population in the present study. This use of basically normal norming groups creates questions as to the appropriateness of any available standardized instrument for such a unique group of subjects as utilized in this study.

Another conclusion related to the training of the child care worker staff who maintain the majority of the direct adult supervision and other contact with the students. While concern for student needs was observable in the staff, awareness of the use of techniques such as those demonstrated by group leaders was not apparent.

Greater improvement was shown among participants in the group counseling groups; however, students generally appeared to be better adapted to the activity-oriented
experiences. Low frustration tolerance and short attention span create heavy demands upon their ability to sit in a group and participate in primarily verbal activity.

Finally, where there was a difference in age groups; younger subjects appeared to profit more from both group counseling and outdoor group experience. Greater gains were observed by leaders, and objective data supported this observation.

Recommendations

On the basis of the observations and findings of this study, it is recommended that

1. future studies include behavior-oriented dependent variables as opposed to comparatively nebulous attitude or adjustment variables;

2. institutional workers be provided with on-going training experiences promoting skills and techniques in group-centered, activity-oriented experiences;

3. training sessions be provided for institutional workers in elementary principles of counseling with groups;

4. group counseling and outdoor group experience programs be utilized with institutionalized fourteen year old and younger persons;

5. food be made available in the group room for participants;
6. group sessions be scheduled so as to avoid competition with off-campus activities or on-campus events such as movies;

7. leaders be acquainted with the nature of institutionalized youngsters and their needs and have had sufficient contact with them to allow a self judgment as to potential leader effectiveness; and,

8. a time-sampling research design be used, as opposed to a pretest-posttest design.
CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY


APPENDIX A

COOPERSMITH SELF-ESTEEM INVENTORY (SEI)

Please mark each statement in the following way:
If the statement describes how you usually feel, put a check in the column, "Like Me." If the statement does not describe how you usually feel, put a check in the column, "Unlike Me."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Like Me</th>
<th>Unlike Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I spend a lot of time daydreaming.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I'm pretty sure of myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I often wish I were someone else.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I'm easy to like.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My parents and I have a lot of fun together.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I never worry about anything.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I find it very hard to talk in front of the class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I wish I were younger.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. There are lots of things about myself I'd change if I could.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I can make up my mind without too much trouble.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I'm a lot of fun to be with.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I get upset easily at home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I always do the right things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I'm proud of my school work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Like Me</td>
<td>Unlike Me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Someone always has to tell me what to do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. It takes me a long time to get used to anything new.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I'm often sorry for the things I do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I'm popular with kids my own age.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. My parents usually consider my feelings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I'm never unhappy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I'm doing the best work that I can.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I give in very easily.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I can usually take care of myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I'm pretty happy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I would rather play with children younger than me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. My parents expect too much of me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I like everyone I know.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I like to be called on in class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I understand myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. It's pretty tough to be me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Things are all mixed up in my life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Kids usually follow my ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. No one pays much attention to me at home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I never get scolded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Like Me</td>
<td>Unlike Me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>I'm not doing as well in school as I'd like to.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>I can make up my mind and stick to it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>I really don't like being a boy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>I really don't like being a girl.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>I have a low opinion of myself.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>I don't like to be with other people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>There are many times when I'd like to leave home.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>I'm never shy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>I often feel ashamed of myself.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>I often feel upset in school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>I'm not as nice looking as most people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>If I have something to say, I usually say it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Kids pick on me very often.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>My parents understand me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>I always tell the truth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>My teacher makes me feel I'm not good enough.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>I don't care what happens to me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>I get upset easily when I'm scolded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>I'm a failure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Most people are better liked than I am.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Like Me</td>
<td>Unlike Me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. I usually feel as if my parents are pushing me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. I always know what to say to people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. I often get discouraged in school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Things usually don't bother me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. I can't be depended on.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

COOPERSMITH TEACHER RATING SCALE

1. Does this child adapt easily to new situations, feel comfortable in new settings, enter easily into new activities?
   - always _usually _sometimes _seldom _never

2. Does this child hesitate to express his opinions, as evidenced by extreme caution, failure to contribute, or a subdued manner in speaking situations?
   - always _usually _sometimes _seldom _never

3. Does this child become upset by failures or other strong stresses as evidenced by such behaviors as pouting, whining, or withdrawing?
   - always _usually _sometimes _seldom _never

4. How often is this child chosen for activities by his classmates? Is his companionship sought for and valued?
   - always _usually _sometimes _seldom _never

5. Does this child become alarmed or frightened easily? Does he become very restless or jittery when procedures are changed, exams are scheduled, or strange individuals are in the room?
   - always _usually _sometimes _seldom _never

6. Does this child seek much support and reassurance from his peers or the teacher, as evidenced by seeking their nearness or frequent inquiries as to whether he is doing well?
   - always _usually _sometimes _seldom _never
7. When this child is scolded or criticized, does he become either very aggressive or very sullen and withdrawn?
   __always  __usually  __sometimes  __seldom  __never

8. Does this child depreciate his school work, grades, activities and work products? Does he indicate he is not doing as well as expected?
   __always  __usually  __sometimes  __seldom  __never

9. Does this child show confidence and assurance in his actions toward his teachers and classmates?
   __always  __usually  __sometimes  __seldom  __never

10. To what extent does this child show a sense of self-esteem, self-respect, and appreciation of his own worthiness?
    __always  __usually  __sometimes  __seldom  __never

11. Does this child attempt to dominate or bully other children?
    __always  __usually  __sometimes  __seldom  __never

12. Does this child publicly brag or boast his exploits?
    __always  __usually  __sometimes  __seldom  __never

13. Does this child continually seek attention, as evidenced by such behaviors as speaking out of turn and making unnecessary noises?
    __always  __usually  __sometimes  __seldom  __never
APPENDIX C

INSTRUCTIONS FROM OUTDOOR GROUP LEADER

Verbal Instructions to outdoor group are as follows:

9:30  (After supplies are left in the cafeteria and after group members are assembled by the child care worker) "My name is __________. (After first meeting, instructions begin here) We are going on a short trip together. We will go to (A), (B), or (C). Before we decide where, I must tell you some things. Six of you must agree on a choice of one of the three locations. The rest of you must agree to come along even though you would prefer going to another place. Also, before we can leave, you must choose what you will need for the trip from the supplies which have been left in the cafeteria, and you must load them into the bus. You may decide among yourselves who does what. As this will be the only time you leave the campus today, I know you will want to work together so that this trip can begin."

10:00 (No instructions are given unless problems, questions or inactivity exists. In such case, the part of the 9:30 instructions emphasizing cooperation as a
prerequisite to travel will be paraphrased and repeated.)

10:30 (No instructions.)

11:00 (Upon arrival) "We will use this hour to look over the area and find a good place to camp; remember we must all stay together. When you find a place you can agree on, we will start work on our lunch."

12:00 "Our job now is to decide who of us will do what in preparing our lunch. Mr. (Child Care Worker) and I will answer questions. We will also perform duties equal to yours only if all of you accept jobs and there is still a need for more help."

1:00 "You may now decide our next activity. Remember we must stay together and six or more of you must agree upon what we will do. Mr. (Child Care Worker) and I will try to not influence you unless we become concerned for someone's safety."

2:30 "We are going to sit down in a circle and talk a few minutes about what we have done today. (Student's name), will you start by telling what your feelings were when we were trying to decide how to prepare our lunch. If you wish you may prefer talking about another activity of today."
3:00 "It is time to go back to the school. We will return as soon as we and the gear are loaded on the bus."

4:00 (Upon arrival) "If you care to, Mr. (Child Care Worker) and I would like to have your help in unloading the bus."
If acceptable I would prefer leaving the group counselor notes unchanged. I felt that changing them would risk changing either their meaning or emphasis. I considered the material to be similar to a direct quote from a reference source.
APPENDIX D

GROUP SESSION REPORTS

Group I
Leader: Cunningham Date: 3-31-72

I. Progress, Change, Significant Events (group)

Resistance of the group was at the point of breaking off into sub-groups of three and four. Towards the middle, I introduced an exercise to attempt to bring the total group together. It was a physical exercise and some members of the groups became very rough and hostile in their treatment of the one group member. I expressed my feelings about the roughness and this seemed to bring about a discussion of real feelings about selves and each other. There was a direct confrontation by one member to two others. Some interpretation by several members about the role of leader and what the group was about. There were many interruptions: one member was going to go away for the weekend; one member's clothes were in dispute and he had a message to attend to them.

II. Progress, Change, Significant Events (Individual)

There was participation by everyone except Moses who played with matches throughout the session and refused to become part of the group. Lillian refused to take part from
the very beginning and read a book most of the time. Although Pam stated she was not going to participate at first since she had been in a group before and it brought back memories; she was actively involved at the end. Kathy confronted Lillian and Constance and played the role of interpreter for the group in terms of my role and the function of the group.

Group I
Leader: Cunningham Date 4-3-72

I. Progress, Change, Significant Events (Group)

There was resistance to the group and much visiting and chatting among the members. One member expressed the idea that this (group method) could not have any significant change on their lives so it was not worth the effort. There was a fire in part of the building and this brought interruption and concern. Lots of coming and going was observed. One member was gone quite a while and returned with part of a watermelon to share with some of the group. The group fragmented into sub-groups and talked. There was much physical violence in terms of hitting and wrestling with each other.

II. Progress, Change, Significant Events (Individual)

Don, Frankie, and Patrick and I were a sub-group at one time and discussed superficially what each of us were like particularly hostile towards me and engaged in lots
of immature and attention getting behavior. She and Kathy displayed a close relationship.

Group: I
Leader: Cunningham Date: 4-5-72

At the first of the meeting, group members seemed disinterested, and even hostile to the idea of needing "head shrinking." Group members voiced continually such comments as "I'm not crazy", "I don't need a shrink", and "why are you here, we're not crazy." All of the group members showed signs of being extremely hostile and frustrated, as well as somewhat fearful of being forced into participating in this group.

This ventilation of hostile feelings will continue up until the 12th meeting by all but one member of the group. At that time a crisis incident occurred which not only jelled the participants into a group, but also brought feelings of tremendous hostility into the open so that warm positive feelings could at last be expressed.

Group: I
Leader: Cunningham Date: 4-7 to 4-16-72

I have combined all of these sessions together because in most ways they were all a continuation of the group expressing the same feelings of frustration and hostility. In all of these sessions the members of the group continued
to express verbally strong hostile feelings about being forced into such a group as this. They continually lambasted the school administration for not being interested in them, or even caring about them as "people." Each member continued to express overtones of "fear" about self-disclosure in their peer group, even though several of the group members ventured out a little in disclosing some personal things about themselves. Throughout these sessions the therapist became the target for the group members venting their feelings. Several times one of the group members would say, "We know it's not your fault. We are not mad at you personally, but the you that is here, because of them."

In the fifth session Dan C. asked if he might not bring his friend Vic into the group. The group all agreed that he could if he wished. Since the fifth session Vic has been a group member. He has demonstrated many leadership qualities, and has sought to have a calming effect on the group.

Group: I
Leader: Cunningham Date: 4-18-72

In this session all of the girls were absent from the group, due to the fact that they were all away from the school on a seek's group trip. In this session the boys were somewhat subdued. They talked about those "dumb girls,"
and "how they wished they would never come back." The boys expressed few hostile feelings, since they were feeling lonely, and somewhat depressed over the girls' absence. The session was passed in somewhat quiet, with most of the group members talking in little groups. All attempts of getting the group to express their feelings to the total group failed.

Group I
Leader: Cunningham Date: 4-21-72

This was a significant session. First, the girls were back from their camp trip, having gotten back only a few hours before the group meeting. Lots of time was spent in the group with the boys telling the girls how great it was for the girls to be gone, and with the girls telling the boys what a relief and enjoyment it was for the girls not to have the dumb boys around. Both groups were expressing feelings of missing each other, as well as fond feelings for each other.

However, toward the end of the session, two of the boys suddenly appeared with a tape recorder to record the therapist's words. This led to a crisis, in which several group members lambasted these two boys for doing such a "stupid" thing. This crisis situation set the stage for the eleventh session.
Group: I  
Leader: Cunningham  
Date: 4-23-72

This was the most significant session of the series for in this session the participants all expressed fantastic hostility towards the therapist (the symbol of everything bad) through the action of one member, Linda. At the start of the session the group members expressed hostile feelings towards the therapist for being forced into psychotherapy. They expressed earlier feelings that they were not crazy or nuts. Linda came storming into the group room late, and demanded that either the therapist go to the administration and tell them that he quit or she would force him to go. First, she went out and got a broom, and then got a garden hoe. She told the therapist that she hated him, and could "kill him," because she was so mad. The therapist became quite Rogerian and non-directive, and tried to help the girl express her pent-up anger, since he felt he was reading her feelings at the time. Linda continued to vent hostile feelings towards the therapist, even to the point of saying and tokenly doing it that "unless you go tell them, I'm going to bloody you up and cut you up."

Because Linda could express such feelings, and because the therapist could help her express such feelings, Linda worked through many pent-up hostile feelings towards "men"
and "authority figures." After the crisis situation, Linda ran out of the room for a few minutes, and then returned crying. Shortly she began expressing guilt feelings for having done such a thing. A tremendous amount of good resulted from the following dialogue that the therapist had with Linda. At the end of the session, the group (seemingly, all keyed up with the happenings of the session) burst out, when time was called. Linda came out to the therapist at his car and apologized for her actions; then she spontaneously hugged the therapist. For a moment, Linda could express very warm, positive trusting, loving feelings towards a man.

Group: I
Leader: Cunningham  Date: 4-25-72 and 5-2-72

These sessions are grouped together because they all are very similar in mood and temperament. After the eleventh session, the group became a "group." Group members expressed warm, positive feelings towards the group and therapist, and hostile feelings, although present in the sessions, were fantastically reduced. Getting the group members together for sessions was not difficult at all for the counselors, as it had been. The young people seemed to enjoy coming to the sessions, and talking. However, they refused to get into discussions about themselves and
their problems. They expressed fear that they only had a couple sessions more, and that they just could not get "with" themselves.

Judging from the movement of the participants in the group, it is the opinion of the therapist that these young people were at the place (after fifteen sessions) to begin to benefit from therapy. They were only ready and able at the end of the session to be able to look at themselves, and each other. It is unfortunate that this group could not have continued. All of the young people could have greatly benefited from their group if it had been allowed to be an on-going thing.

Group: I
Leader: Cunningham

Group Therapy Evaluation

It is the opinion of the therapist that group therapy was beneficial to all of the young people who took part in it. It is indeed regrettable that the sessions had to end with the completion of fifteen sessions. It seems quite apparent that it was only at the end of the therapy sessions that the group members were at the point where therapy would have been meaningful and helpful for them. The group experience however, should have laid the foundation for continued positive regard of the individuals for therapy.
Group: II
Leader: White Date: 3-31-72

I. Progress, Change, Significant Events (Group)

There was milling around and many questions as to the purpose of the group, such as who I was, how long it would last, etc. There was a decision to introduce themselves. They discussed confidentiality.

Resistance to Personal Expression was noted. They related some personal feelings about themselves and others but generally in a superficial way. Movement from questioning the purpose of the group to hostility and resentment toward others was observed.

A description of Past Feelings was given. Much catharsis about the things that had happened at the school, about their homes (in Chicago) followed. Almost all admitted they missed home and some were very emotional about it.

II. Progress, Change, Significant Events (Individual)

All participated except #4 who sat in the window with his back to us.

III. Other Observations

There was much cursing, and physical hitting and wrestling with each other. There was not so much direct hostility toward each other as it was a means of releasing frustration and resentment-somewhat like displaced hostility.
Group: II  
Leader: White  
Date: 4-3-72

I. Progress, Change, Significant Events (Group)

Milling Around: There was much small talk and restlessness in the group. The fact that the outdoors groups were leaving was an added negative factor. The group fragmented until there were only three members in the room. We talked the rest of the time.

II. Progress, Change, Significant Events (Individual)

Group member #4 who had not participated the last time stayed the entire time and interacted with me and another member. He went over the same ground the group had covered last time, questioning me as to my purpose, the group's purpose, etc. Description of past feelings: he expressed much resentment and hostility to the way he was treated and gave glowing examples and his accompanying feelings about it.

III. Other Observations

The fact that the outdoor group was leaving initiated hostility and the feeling that this (off campus travel) was another example of the unfair treatment (differential treatment) that is given.
Group: II
Leader: White
Date: 4-5-72

I. Progress, Change, Significant Events (Group)

Milling Around: There was small talk and talking among themselves in sub-groups. Resentment and hostility were observed to the fact that they were being made to be here and that a counselor was stationed outside the door to keep them in. RESISTANCE TO EXPRESSION OF PERSONAL FEELINGS: There was expression of the fact that this would do no good and not be beneficial to them and they would not participate (They can make me stay here but they can't make me participate). EXPRESSION OF NEGATIVE FEELINGS: Some hostility was expressed toward me with continued demand for me to take the responsibility for their being here and questions as to the worth of the group experience. The T.V. was on and they did not suggest turning it off. They pretended real interest in what was going on in the program.

II. Progress, Change, Significant Events (Individual)

At one time #5, #6 and myself became a sub-group and talked superficially. They were asking about who I was and my purpose, etc. Really trying to see if they could trust me. During a program on T.V. with cops in it, #8, #1, #3 expressed some of their experiences with cops and the accompanying feelings (Description of past feelings).
III. Other Observations

I accepted their behavior and feelings and did not force or become directive. I would not watch T.V. with them. I interpreted some of their behavior as testing me to see what I would do and also attempting to find out if they could trust me. There was continued physical hitting and wrestling and cursing.

One significant thing was expressed that meant to me that we have become a group and consider ourselves a closed group--they (several members) told people who would come in from the outside that they were a group and could not talk while they were in there. In other words, they took care of intruders because they were interfering in their group.

Group: II
Leader: White                      Date: 4-7-72

I. Progress, Change, Significant Events (Group)

Milling Around: The group started out very causal and chatty 'til finally some individuals suggested we get down to serious talk. One member suggested we move from chairs to the floor so everyone could sit in the circle. At that point one member turned out the lights and pulled drapes (I interpreted as a need for privacy and to keep out intruders and sometimes it is easier to talk when we can't see others faces). Much discussion as to "what" we could talk about. The "topic" of sex was decided upon.
Expression of personally meaningful material: Each member talked about such things as when he began to have intercourse, the kinds of people he preferred, under that conditions, and other general information. From this superficial level, the discussion went to differences between people and especially boys versus girls as to their attitudes toward sex, love, being virgin, marriage, etc. There was hesitation to talk about each other or to give feedback. The closest they came to feedback was asking each member if they would have intercourse with any boy in the group with a "yes" or "no" answer. One member pressed for names but the group decided that was "too personal." I interpreted both verbal and non-verbal behavior to mean that "we are willing to talk about ourselves but we will only go so far--we don't know if we trust each other or you."

There was discussion of how parents had raised them concerning moral behavior and some significant expression of their home life, parents, and parental teachings.

II. Progress, Change, Significant Events (Individual)

All members participated on a feeling level except #6, #9, #3, #2. I felt these people were pretty threatened by revealing personal things about themselves.

III. Other Observations

The group functioned as a group. Leadership roles were taken by several members from time to time. There was no
physical violence, no cursing, there was evidence of caring behavior--one member rubbed another's back in a gentle way. The group continued to take care of intruders--they made them leave and told them this was a private group which could not function with outsiders in there. Individuals demanded democracy with everyone having an opportunity to speak and everyone should listen; they further demanded that people be honest and talk about themselves rather than people in general. They set limits by consensus as to how far they would go and some things were too personal. The group was self-directed and I was another member--I clarified at points, but for the most part, the group determined itself.

Group: II
Leader: White
Date: 4-9-72

I. Progress, Change, Significant Events (Group)

Milling: There was discussion of what can we talk about, need for members and me to suggest something. I repeated that it was a group decision and the responsibility was on all of us not just me. We decided to continue the previous discussion. EXPRESSION OF PERSONALLY MEANINGFUL MATERIAL: There was a similar kind of expression as last time but this time there was no resistance to EXPRESSION OF IMMEDIATE INTERPERSONAL FEELINGS IN THE GROUP. It was revealed that some members had dated and had intercourse
with others in the group. Members gave feedback to each other, there was confrontation between various members as to how they treated each other while dating and after, there was a real encounter between two members in particular who had obviously mistreated (as they perceived it) each other and who now had come to some understanding. There was EXPRESSION OF POSITIVE FEELINGS AND CLOSENESS IN THE GROUP and at the end several people hugged each other in a non-sexual way. At one point there was evidence of a healing capacity in the group with the members helping another member to deal with herself. Although slight, several members verbalized that this was the way they were, perhaps it was not the best way to be, they wanted to change but they didn't know how so I would say a small beginning of SELF-ACCEPTANCE. In response, the group accepted that and tried to suggest ways that they would help—that is eliminate some aspects of behavior. Like one member who had expressed that his goal was to quit drinking bleach and jumping off the gym—they pointed out very rationally (reminded me of Albert Ellis...) that this was pointless and ineffective behavior.

II. Progress, Change, Significant Events (Individual)

At this point the most verbal and willing members are #8, #4, #10, #1, #7, #5. Number 3, #9, #2, #6 seem to be with us but hesitant to get involved, especially with their
own feelings. Number 10 was the most mature that I have seen her thus far. She accepted feedback, was willing to be honest, listen and expressed self-acceptance but desire to change. Number 7, #8, #1, and #5 were most therapeutic and shared in the encounter with #10. Number 4 continues to be very hostile and takes the opportunity to express it towards others. I see him as able to explode at any time given the "right" set of circumstances.

III. Other Observations

It was a beautiful group tonight and I was amazed at the depth at which they developed thus far as a group. I have worked with college students who were unable to go this far in five sessions. The group was totally self-directed and I was just another member. I clarified some and participated out of myself.

No cursing, no physical violence occurred.

Group: II
Leader: White
Date: 4-11-72

I. Progress, Change, Significant Events (Group)

Milling: We began with small talk and jumping from "out there" topics to what shall we talk about. Resistance to Personal Expression: There was verbalization that we had talked about everything there was to talk about. Expression of Negative Feelings: They demanded that I think of
something for them to talk about; very hostile when I would not comply. Description of Past Feelings: Members began talking about other times in life at other schools and at home and the accompanying feelings they had.

II. Progress, Change, Significant Events (Individual)

The most hostile people were the ones who had revealed themselves significantly to the group last time. Number 10 who had been very much in the group last session seems to have backed away, verbally and physically. This person has resumed her attention getting behavior and physically hitting others in the group. Numbers 6, 3, 9, 2 are backing even farther away. Number 9, 3, and 2 are in and out of the group with lots of leaving and coming back. The main participants are #8, #1, #7, and #5. Number 4 continues to express his hostility when ever possible but refuses to share much of himself.

III. Other Observations

I have no real way to account for the resistance to talk tonight except that the last two sessions had been so real, so intense, that sometimes, in my experience with groups, after very emotional intense sessions, there is a tendency to back away--its almost as if they are saying--look what I revealed about myself last time--I'm not sure I'd better continue. The fact that they became a group so quickly and became intense with each other so fast leads
me to accept this. Some writers say a group reveals and then begins to trust in order to risk again. Either way, I think the trust factor is being tested. Sometimes it is harder for people who live intimately together to work together in a group than it is for complete strangers to work in a group--I wonder if this has bearing on it. (Rogers speaks to this point.)

Group: II
Leader: White        Date: 4-14-72

I. Progress, Change, Significant Events (Group)

EXPRESSON OF NEGATIVE FEELINGS: The group came in very silent and hostile and to my statement of I wonder why we are so silent, they replied that I had lied to them, they had discovered I was being paid and they accused me of being a psychiatrist due to the fact that I was being paid. We had covered this in the very first meeting as to who I was and since they perceived themselves as "sick" kids, then any attempt to do anything means that the person is a shrink. EXPRESSION OF IMMEDIATE INTERPERSONAL FEELINGS IN THE GROUP: We mainly confronted each other as to my feelings. They insisted that if I were being paid it was a job to me and I couldn't care for them as they had previously thought, so therefore I was a liar. I attempted to explain on a rational level about my degrees, etc., but went back to a feeling level. They were very hurt and refused
to talk about it. DESCRIPTION OF PAST FEELINGS: The group talked about home, other schools, etc.

II. Progress, Change, Significant Events (Individual)

Number 7 was the most hostile and said she felt she could not trust me. Number 4 said I was a liar and he refused to listen to me: This gave him an opportunity to vent some of his hostility.

III. Other Observations

I can understand their feelings because we had shared some rather significant feelings about ourselves and they felt they could trust me, and that I was an individual "with no ax to grind" who really cared about them. Now if it were a job and if I were a psychiatrist, then perhaps I was being "phony". I don't think this has hurt the group put it may have delayed our progress some.

Group II
Leader: White Date 4-16-72

I. Group:

EXPRESSION OF NEGATIVE FEELINGS: There was further testing of their group and resistance to expression of personal feelings. The record was on when I came in and there was refusal to turn it off. After a time, I insisted that I ethically could not tolerate this; that if the group did not want to discuss then we didn't have
to but we could not listen to records for an hour and a half. Number 4 said I could leave if I wanted to and when I did get up the rest of the group asked me not to leave but said #4 could leave if he wanted to. The group discussed their resistance and reasons they did not participate and hostilities they felt toward the school for making them stay. The idea was expressed that they might as well get down to serious talk. **EXPRESSIONS OF IMMEDIATE INTERPERSONAL FEELINGS IN THE GROUP:** The group gave verbal and non-verbal feedback to each other. Mainly positive feelings were expressed although some negative ones were discussed. I feel the feedback was honest as far as it went. **BASIC ENCOUNTER:** There was very warm and caring feelings between some members. It was a very close group. **POSITIVE FEELINGS AND CLOSENESS.**

**II. Individuals:**

The persons who participated were: Numbers 6, 8, 10, 1, 7, and 5. The rest of the group members sat away from us and did not participate of their own choosing—no one coerced them. They were: 9, 3, 4, and 2. These members have always been on the outer edges of the group and have given very little of themselves to the group.

**III. Other Observations:**

This was a very significant group—although most expressions were positive there was indication that
members were saying--I recognize the negative feelings I have for you but I accept them and I like you. (Rogers speaks to this point of the mingling of positive and negative feelings.) No cursing or physical hitting or wrestling.

Group II
Leader: White
Date 4-18-72

I. Group:

The group was somewhat different without the girls especially #7 who has much informal power in the group.

MILLING AROUND: There was usual chatty talk and questioning what we could talk about. Everyone was asked in turn by #8 (who emerged as a leader) what each one wanted to talk about. EXPRESSION OF PERSONALLY MEANING-FULL MATERIAL: There was a discussion of what was going on in the other group which led to personal expression of feelings about the topic. The group was most disdainful and disapproving of the other group leader's behavior. Several members called him sick and abnormal and wanted me to agree with them. One member (#8) stated that he felt this activity was up to each individual and that some people might prefer it while others did not. Although I agreed that that was one way of looking at it, most of the other members continued to express negative feelings toward the leader and the sexual activity. From
this discussion of the "then and there" there were expressions of personal feelings about self--the ethics of boy-girl relationships, how individuals treat their girl friends, etc. There was a very close feeling between group members. I feel that there was an added closeness without the girls for some reason I can't pinpoint.

II. Individual:

Number 8 emerged as a leader and #4 became more active in the group than I have seen him thus far. For some reason there was a reduction of his need to be hostile. He revealed a very significant thing about how he feels about himself--that if he were to tell me and this group about himself, we would not like him. We dealt with this to some extent, but the rest of the group was hesitant to say much to him although they listened intently. I would say this is the first time that #4 "warmed" any to the idea of the group or to me. And I can't account for it.

III. Other Observations:

My feelings about the discussion of the other group leader is that the group's (mine) reaction probably reflects their immaturity and non-acceptance of people who have different ideas than they do. Further, I think this points up the inappropriateness of the topic--these kids are having enough problems finding their own sexual
identity without the additional factor of a controversial practice which they can not handle. The group made such statements as warning me to be careful riding home with him, questioning me if he had attempted to hurt me, threats that they would take care of him if he had.

Group: II
Leader: White Date: 4-21-72

I. Group:

MILLING AROUND: Group was very restless and jumped from one conversation to another. There was discussion of girls' trip to Oklahoma.

EXPRESSION OF IMMEDIATE INTERPERSONAL FEELINGS IN GROUP: There was a belittling attitude toward the girls from the boys and the girls seemed to gloat over the fact that they had a vacation and the boys had to stay there. Everyone was on the edge of hostility; very restless and resentful. Much physical violence and cursing towards each other was observed.

II. Individuals:

Number 10 was back to her aggressive and violent behavior. The boys numbers 3, 8, 4, 1 and 5 were particularly susceptible and fought her back. The girls revealed they had been told that they might get to move away and live separately from the boys; a counselor had told them they said.
III. Other Observations:

I have not seen the group this fragmented since the first few sessions. There was an unusual and peculiar air in the group—the hostility was at the highest level yet: unusual frustration, resentment toward each other and the school, more physical violence than ever manifested in the group. I can't account for it: I can hypothesize. Perhaps it had something to do with the trip, perhaps it was the fact that the girls may be leaving in the future, perhaps it was a culmination of the manipulation of their lives without their having a voice in it. Previously the boys had been upset that the girls were going on the trip. They (boys) were also unhappy at the thought of being separated from the girls in the future; they said they would not stay in an all boys school.

Group II
Leader: White
Date: 4-23-72

I. Group:

MILLING AROUND: Group began with much chatty small talk; a restlessness and uneasiness that continued from the last session. DESCRIPTION OF PAST FEELINGS: There was talk of the weekend. The feelings of frustration, resentment, and hostility were expressed. There was some discussion of trust between some members (#3, 1, 8). There was
discussion of the other group leader and the Assistant Director and the fact that the school did not like the idea of group counseling. Two members observed the other group and reported back what was happening to the leader. The group expressed that I did not have to worry for they would not do that to me. Several members began talking about the there and then--life in other schools and at home, how they felt, what they did, and how they lived in the streets.

II. Individuals:

Everyone who was there participated.

III. Other Observations:

No violence or cursing occurred--instead there seemed to be a definite feeling of "we-ness" and they seemed to trust the group and me as a place where confidential things can be discussed. Lots of compensating for loss of esteem with lots of boasting and story telling of past experiences was observed.

Group II
Leader: White Date: 4-25-72

I. Group:

MILLING AROUND: A very depressed and sad feeling seemed to be in the group. It was expressed that several members had been told that the administration did not like the group counseling, that part of the reason was the other
and when they were present they were either in and out of the room or refused to participate at the feeling level. Now they are no longer a part of the group. 

**EXPRESSION OF PERSONALLY MEANINGFUL MATERIAL:** Much hostility was expressed about what was going on in the school in regard to the group. There seemed to be much distrust of the administration and expression that groups would never be allowed again. I noted further generalization that the three members who were no longer a part of the group were partially a reason for the bad impression the administration had of the groups. Frustration, discontent, hostility were the key feelings.

**II. Individuals:**

**III. Other Observations:**

There was no cursing or physical violence--very close feeling and we-ness.

**Group II**

Leader: White  
Date: 4-30-72

**I. Group:**

**MILLING AROUND:** They began by asking what the group wanted to talk about and the fact they couldn't talk with some people in the room--namely, #3, and #2. There was small talk and talk of other people outside the group-there and then kind of situations. Very much restlessness and uptightness in the group members was observed. It was a
very strange group tonight. Much sub-grouping into pairs and communication between themselves occurred.

II. Individuals:

III. Other Observations:

Everyone was very calm in many ways yet there was a different kind of restlessness. There was some aggressive behavior between and among numbers 6, 10, 7 and 5.

Group: II
Leader: White

FINAL SUMMARY OF GROUP AND INDIVIDUAL PROGRESS

Group:

I feel that the group has reached some significantly deep levels of interaction. The group was definitely close and closed to the point of trusting the regular members who had revealed something of themselves and not trusting those members who were highly irregular in attendance and who had resisted the personal expression. By the expression of feeling, I would say they trusted each other and the leader and the group in general as a place where confidential things could be discussed. At times there was expression of much understanding, caring, and concern for the group members. The environment does not support the group's goals of acceptance of self, belief that people are of worth as human beings. The fluxuations of the group from deep and
meaningful expression to less meaningful expression is natural in the process of groups, I feel that if the group had the following consideration more progress could be made:

1. Continued time—with a group this cohesive at this point, much could be done and it seems if we have just started.

2. Support from the counselors, and administration—much as milieu therapy where each person who touches the person's life is concerned with building self-concept (positive) and helping the child.

3. Support from the administration to the effect that group counseling is a good thing, we are not threatened by it, and we support and understand the process.

Individuals:

#1 This member received feedback that was somewhat significant; he was regarded as a valuable member of the group; he was very therapeutic to some of the group; people listened to him when he spoke and he was an influential member. He was somewhat quiet at first but slowly warmed to the group where he expressed himself. He was insightful in regard to self and others. I would expect some change in regard to self-concept—a positive self was certainly
reinforced in the group.

#2. This member gave nothing of himself to the group and seemed reluctant to even by present when the others were being highly personal. I doubt there is any change (measurable) and there is no evidence to me that he was affected by the group experience. His attendance was very irregular and when he was there he did not participate or left when he could get by the counselor outside.

#3. This person was ambivalent toward the group as I see it. There was evidence to me that he was afraid to reveal himself yet he participated for several sessions before he joined the other three reluctant members in escaping from the group. He would avidly join in when it was not about himself but about other group members or then and there situations. His attendance was irregular. I would not expect much change but he did receive some positive feedback from some of the group; they tended to accept his behavior.

#4. This person may have changed to a very slight degree; he was the most hostile member of the group and has seemed to reduce some of those feelings. Since he has shared very little of himself with the group, there is no way of knowing exactly were he is. He expressed very negative feelings about himself and I don't know
how much of these feelings have deepened or changed. His hostility seemed internal rather than having real cause in other people, yet he displaced it onto others, especially me. Perhaps the fact that I accepted his feelings and did not reject him because of them may have been important. I think the group might have helped him for although he was silent most of the time, he was "with" us always. There was a real fear I think of expressing himself, especially to me, for fear that if the truth were known it would be so bad that he would be rejected. As many people with low self-concepts do, he rejected me first so that he would not have to risk rejection himself. He perhaps more than any other group member needs a counseling relationship. I think he is bright and insightful or at least has the capacity to develop insight.

#5. This person contributed to the group and received negative and positive feedback from others. He did not have much status in the group--he would ask the members if he could talk--he was not a leader. I feel very close to him and he and I established a good relationship. He is perhaps not as mature as some of the others and they tended to laugh at his comments and put him down. Yet there was a genuine liking for him by most of the group perhaps because of his immaturity. I'm
not sure if this was communicated to him or not. #1 who was a very strong member of the group seemed to have a close relationship with him. There may be some measurable change.

#6. This person was somewhat reluctant to personal expression although attendance was very good. This person was on the fringes of the group and was not a leader at any time. The group didn't listen or respect her opinion. She received positive feedback from the members and felt very much a part of the group. She and I established a fairly close relationship and there was indication that she would have liked to talk to me individually but not in the group. I can't say about change--possibly so; I don't think it was a negative experience for her.

#7. This member had the most influence in the group and was well liked. She was a willing member in regard to personal expression and was very therapeutic to others. She displayed an unusual capacity for insight into her self and others. She admitted to the group that she was not happy with herself but was not sure how to go about changing. I think there is real possibility of change and a better concept of self.

#8. This person was a willing participant and emerged as an influential person in the group. He was given
highly positive feedback and I think this made a marked impression on him. I would expect real change in this person.

#9. This person revealed nothing of himself to the group and finally quit coming. When he did attend the sessions he left when he could get by the counselor outside. I saw him as being very much afraid to enter into personal expression of feelings. I just can't say about him--I doubt any change took place and if it did it might be negative--the group in the last few sessions told him they could not trust him since he had not been with them regularly or had been a member--he may not be able to deal with this knowledge of himself.

#10. This person has been an off and on contributor to the group. She manifested real insight and mature behavior in two of the more intense sessions and was given feedback which she took in a mature way and experienced some caring from the group members. Her main descriptor would be instability--in some sessions she is very quiet and mature and participated on a deep feeling level and in the next session she was very loud, boisterous, aggressive, physically violent in the group activities. Some of the members call her down and ask her to be serious or at least not to bother us. There may be possibility of real growth and then again I would not
be sure of it. In the last few sessions she has been rather calm and mature. At the intense sessions, she was honest and pretty much open about herself, accepted the feedback, stated she wanted to change but did not know how, and behaved in a remarkable fashion. I think she has the capacity for insight but it would take a lot of individual work with someone she trusts and likes.

Group III
Leader: Garza Date: 4-3-72
I. Progress, Change, Significant Events (Group)
   Very little group togetherness was observed. There was lack of cooperation. It rained off and on all afternoon.
II. Progress, Change, Significant Events (Individual)
   One member was very hostile and one member was very uncooperative.

Group III
Leader: Garza Date: 4-8-72
I. Progress, Change, Significant Events (Group)
   The group played chase. Almost all of the group was involved. A destination was selected. This was a group decision. Lunch was prepared. This was a group decision. Group members played frisbee and football. Not all of the group participated, but most did.
II. Progress, Change, Significant Events (Individual)
Total group attentiveness seemed much better. One member's attentiveness was much improved.

Group III
Leader: Graza Date: 4-16-72
I. Progress, Change, Significant Events (Group)
   More cohesion in the group was observed today. Members understood the powers of group decision (decision process) to an improved degree. There was some frustration about not having a sufficient number of alternatives for activities.

II. Progress, Change, Significant Events (Individual)
   Richard S. was more cooperative today. Frank K. exhibited a somewhat greater amount of independence. Kevin G. remained cooperative but became quieter.

Group III
Leader: Garza Date: 4-21-72
I. Progress, Change, Significant Events (Group)
   This meeting was very confused again, similar to the first outdoor session. Toward the end, however, there was somewhat more group participation.

II. Progress, Change, Significant Events (Individual)
   Cheryl was more independent. Andre was the only one who seemed distant from our group.

   Aids requested more guidance in fulfilling their
role as assistants.

Group III
Leader: Garza  Date: 4-28-72

I. Progress, Change, Significant Events (Group)

This was the best session ever. The group actually participated as a group for a change. Members cooked as a group better; the food division was better and everyone cooperated more.

Two games of chase were actually played in an organized manner. Most participated except for two persons. The group worked together. The ride back to the school was also the best to date. No loud radio music was noted on this trip as most told personal incidents of a private nature having to do with adventures at the school.

II. Progress, Change, Significant Events (Individual)

This trip was characterized by much more individual interaction with the leader, personally. Hostility was observed early in the session related possibly to the previous trip. However, it subsided, and toward the end of the day, much significant interaction occurred.

III. Other Observations

M. K. has definitely established himself as leader of this group. There were many interactions but when he was included in the beginning of some of these interactions,
progress improved. A delicate balance existed with the others.

Group IV
Leader: Bone Date: 4-3-72

I. Progress, Change, Significant Events (Group)

Generally the group went well. There was a lot of hesitation from two or three of the members. About three did not take part; they were not forced to participate.

II. Progress, Change, Significant Events (Individual)

Certain individuals did not participate in group activities. However, they generally enjoyed the outing. There were no particular hard feelings discerned.

Group IV
Leader: Bone Date: 4-8-72

I. Progress, Change, Significant Events (Group)

The group cooperated well with group activities. I had no trouble getting them to settle down for a specific activity. I was pleased with results. I feel that, as a whole, the group was more trusting this time than last.

II. Progress, Change, Significant Events (Individual)

Only one person seemed to react badly to group activity. However, she recovered quickly as the day progressed. I would foresee no particular harm from the uncomfortable encounter.
Group IV
Leader: Bone Date: 4-16-72

I. Progress, Change, Significant Events (Group)

The group was generally less organized than last time. However, time was taken to discuss this problem, and the group decided to take certain responsible measures to avoid future complications.

II. Progress, Change, Significant Events (Individual)

Only one person (a male) refrained from taking part in the group discussion. This did not seem to inhibit anyone else in the group.

Group IV
Leader: Bone Date: 4-21-72

I. Progress, Change, Significant Events (Group)

Generally, the cookout progressed well. Some of the students took precautions against the mistakes made last time.

II. Progress, Change, Significant Events (Individual)

Certain individuals broke away from the group. I had to lay the law down about this. It got better toward the end.

III. Other Observations

I felt okay about the day's events especially toward the end.
Group IV

Leader: Bone  Date: 4-28-72

I. Progress, Change, Significant Events (Group)

The group went very well today. They did a few extra activities, e.g. fishing, and planned the cooked lunch well.

II. Progress, Change, Significant Events (Individual)

Each person took part well in the group activities; there were no problems at all.

III. Other Observations

I felt that the group became cohesive during this outing. They felt that they would like to continue the outings.
APPENDIX E

SCHEDULE OF ACTIVITIES

9:30 - 10:00 Students were told by the group leader of the location of food and gear and informed that the trip would begin immediately following loading of supplies and boarding the bus. In addition, the group was told of three possible alternative destinations, one of which had to be selected by a majority of the ten persons. The leader then moved away from the group to allow subjects an opportunity to prepare for the trip. Students worked on collecting the necessary food and equipment. Decisions were made as to what would be needed and who should take responsibility for each item.

10:00 - 10:30 Supplies and equipment were loaded aboard the bus followed by the return of a group leader with a child care worker. Problems or questions not resolved by the students were dealt with at this time with the aid of the two adults.

10:30 - 11:00 The child care worker would drive the group to the selected site.
11:00 - 12:00 Upon arrival the area was explored and a site agreeable to the majority was selected.

12:00 - 1:00 Unloading of gear and preparing the noon meal took place with the leader serving as consultant in disputes and decision making.

1:00 - 2:30 The group was instructed that the next time period would be used for an activity to be decided upon by the majority of the group and participated in by all ten members.

2:30 - 3:00 The leader stopped the activity and facilitated a discussion of inquiry into feelings and dynamics involved in student participation in the preceding activity.

3:00 - 4:00 Gear was loaded and group returned to school. The child care worker requested but not insisted on assistance from group members in unloading the bus upon arrival at the school.
APPENDIX F

TABLE I
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR SELF-ESTEEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Post Control</th>
<th></th>
<th>Post Experimental</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger (GCY)</td>
<td>-2.54</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>17.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older (GCO)</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>12.71</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>17.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger (ODY)</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td>-5.99</td>
<td>16.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older (ODO)</td>
<td>-2.45</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>10.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(GC)</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>11.29</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>17.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(OD)</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>-1.86</td>
<td>14.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE II
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR BEHAVIOR RATING-SELF ESTEEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Post Control</th>
<th>Post Experimental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCY</td>
<td>-6.33 15.63</td>
<td>-1.88 10.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCO</td>
<td>8.79 12.68</td>
<td>-3.53 9.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODY</td>
<td>-2.01 18.17</td>
<td>4.95 11.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODO</td>
<td>0.68 14.56</td>
<td>-0.42 9.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>0.79 15.90</td>
<td>-2.66 9.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OD</td>
<td>-0.67 16.08</td>
<td>2.66 10.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE III
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR PERSONAL ADJUSTMENT AND SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Post Control</th>
<th>Post Experimental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCY</td>
<td>-3.81 10.37</td>
<td>-6.68 11.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCO</td>
<td>1.90 16.12</td>
<td>6.95 17.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODY</td>
<td>1.91 15.88</td>
<td>-0.53 23.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODO</td>
<td>0.00 11.92</td>
<td>0.99 20.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>-1.12 13.27</td>
<td>-0.27 15.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OD</td>
<td>0.95 13.70</td>
<td>0.23 21.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE IV
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR SOCIOMETRIC CHOOSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Post Control</th>
<th>Post Experimental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCY</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCO</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>7.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODY</td>
<td>-2.04</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODO</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>5.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OD</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE V
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR BEHAVIOR POINTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Post Control</th>
<th>Post Experimental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCY</td>
<td>1020.00</td>
<td>500.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCO</td>
<td>1539.38</td>
<td>979.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCY</td>
<td>1399.00</td>
<td>775.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODO</td>
<td>783.00</td>
<td>532.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>1264.41</td>
<td>784.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OD</td>
<td>1091.00</td>
<td>720.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE VI

PRE-CONTROL, POST-CONTROL, AND POST-EXPERIMENTAL UNADJUSTED MEANS FOR THE SELF ESTEEM INVENTORY VARIABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Group</th>
<th>Pre Control</th>
<th>Post Control</th>
<th>Post Experimental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Counseling Younger (GCY)</td>
<td>55.60</td>
<td>56.60</td>
<td>57.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Counseling Older (GCO)</td>
<td>57.10</td>
<td>60.22</td>
<td>68.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Younger (ODY)</td>
<td>62.00</td>
<td>62.40</td>
<td>55.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Older (ODO)</td>
<td>66.00</td>
<td>63.75</td>
<td>67.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Counseling (GC)</td>
<td>56.32</td>
<td>58.32</td>
<td>62.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor (OD)</td>
<td>60.33</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>60.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE VII

PRE-CONTROL, POST-CONTROL, AND POST-EXPERIMENTAL UNADJUSTED MEANS FOR THE BEHAVIOR RATING FORM VARIABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Group</th>
<th>Pre Control</th>
<th>Post Control</th>
<th>Post Experimental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GCY</td>
<td>54.60</td>
<td>59.30</td>
<td>58.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCO</td>
<td>60.67</td>
<td>75.33</td>
<td>59.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODY</td>
<td>62.00</td>
<td>64.90</td>
<td>66.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODO</td>
<td>56.75</td>
<td>70.25</td>
<td>63.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>57.46</td>
<td>66.89</td>
<td>59.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OD</td>
<td>56.22</td>
<td>67.28</td>
<td>65.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE VIII
PRE-CONTROL, POST-CONTROL, AND POST-EXPERIMENTAL
UNADJUSTED MEANS FOR THE SOCIAL AND
PERSONAL ADJUSTMENT VARIABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Group</th>
<th>Pre Control</th>
<th>Post Control</th>
<th>Post Experimental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GCY</td>
<td>21.20</td>
<td>16.70</td>
<td>10.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCO</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>19.67</td>
<td>26.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODY</td>
<td>32.78</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>21.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODO</td>
<td>25.25</td>
<td>25.88</td>
<td>19.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>18.26</td>
<td>18.11</td>
<td>18.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OD</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>28.17</td>
<td>20.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE IX
PRE-CONTROL, POST-CONTROL, AND POST-EXPERIMENTAL UNADJUSTED MEANS FOR THE SOCIOMETRIC CHOOSING VARIABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Group</th>
<th>Pre Control</th>
<th>Post Control</th>
<th>Post Experimental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GCY</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCO</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODY</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODO</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>6.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OD</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE X

PRE-CONTROL, POST-CONTROL, AND POST-EXPERIMENTAL UNADJUSTED MEANS FOR THE BEHAVIOR POINTS VARIABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Group</th>
<th>Pre Control</th>
<th>Post Control</th>
<th>Post Experimental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1057.50</td>
<td>3380.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1546.11</td>
<td>4100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1399.00</td>
<td>3201.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>871.88</td>
<td>2465.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1288.95</td>
<td>3721.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1164.72</td>
<td>2874.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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