

APPLICATION OF A QUESTIONNAIRE IN A CAMP
SETTING IN AN ATTEMPT TO DIFFERENTIATE
CHILDREN WITH BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS FROM
CHILDREN WITH LESS SERIOUS BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS

PLAN B REPORT

Social Work 293 -- 9 credits

Instructor -- Mrs. Gisela Konopka

In partial fulfillment
of the requirements of
the Degree of Master of Arts
in Social Work

By

Gerald Butis

June, 1950

University of Minnesota

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Acknowledgement is gratefully made to my adviser, Mrs. Gisela Konopka, Assistant Professor of Social Work, for her timely suggestions and criticisms; to Dr. Elio Monachesi, Professor of Sociology, from whose class the idea for this study came, for his patient help and many suggestions; to Miss Mary Blake, Executive Director of Elliot Park and Mrs. Louise Shoemaker, Supervisor and Camp Director for Elliot Park, for permission to conduct this study at Norway Point Camp; and finally to the counsellors at Norway Point for collecting the data and without whom this study could not have been made.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>CHAPTER</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
I	Introduction	1
	Need for Sound Grouping Practices	3
II	Definitions	10
	Method	10
	Hypothesis	22
III	Findings	23
	A. Boys	23
	Conclusions	29
	B. Girls	31
	Conclusions	38
	General Conclusions	40
IV	Summary	42
	Appendix	
	Tables	45
	Questionnaires:	
	1. Norway Point Questionnaire Filled Out by Males	48
	2. Norway Point Questionnaire Filled Out by Females	55
	Bibliography	64

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

"But that kid is just wrecking everybody else's good time in the cabin with his actions. If only we'd have known before what we know now -- we'd never have put him in this group".

How often has that plaintive cry arisen at camp, sometimes too late to be of any help to the group or the individual involved. This would be only one reason for determining and using grouping criteria in a camp situation. There are many more.

The camp that is conceived of here would be one which is committed to social work philosophy and group work method.

In such a camp the main concern is with the camper. The attempt is made to see that the camper has the most purposeful experience possible. The philosophy underlying all this is one intimately bound up with the richest sense of the concept of democracy and its principles. Included in this would be a sincere and profound belief in the integrity of the individual of all ages, and the humble belief that as a professional, one can be of aid in helping an individual to develop to the limit of his potential, thus contributing to the enrichment of his life. This calls for the awareness of social relations and "involves both his (the group worker's) capacity to understand the interpersonal relations between members and the sensitivity to the total group process".¹

1. Coyle, Grace. Group Work with American Youth. Harpers, 1948, p. 27.

He is aware of the pressures that bring themselves to bear on the situation and how the individual reacts to these pressures.

Perhaps one of the most intense types of setting is that of a camp. Here individuals come together in face-to-face relationships while they work, play, eat, rest, swim, hike and otherwise live and camp together. Because of the intensity of the situation, the interactions between the individuals become that much more important and it is in this setting that they become especially meaningful. As always, in the small living group² dynamics are at work. Here we find the give and take of group living. One boy shares the candy he got from his parents on visiting day. His bunkmate hides the cookies he got in the mail. Johnny lends a pair of socks to Jim who has no dry ones left. One group we see has divided up the work to be done and is seen busily cleaning the cabin, while two other cabins are bickering and arguing as to their assignments. Teddy argues that he cleaned up to his crack in the floor, and he's not going to clean one inch further. Over in the corner, Lenny goes busily about his work cleaning up where the other individuals have missed. Here we see interactions at work. The question inevitably arises, "Why are these particular children in this particular cabin together?"

2. "Two or more persons in a relationship of psychic interaction whose relationships with one another may be abstracted and distinguished from their relationships with all others so that they must be thought of as an entity". Eubank, Earl, The Concepts of Sociology. Boston: D. C. Heath Company, 1932. p. 163.

GROUPINGS

Many factors are involved when camp staff considers the problem of grouping.

It has been said that "grouping principles and practices cannot be viewed entirely apart from other group work processes which occur concurrently".³ Indeed whatever grouping practices are consciously used will depend on the awareness of the group process that the staff has.

We have long since discarded the notion that haphazard grouping, such as shuffling camper's cards together and pulling out six, is sufficient. As our knowledge of groups has increased, the need for intelligent grouping based on sound practice has manifested itself. We have come to see that a group comprises a "minimum of five or six individuals and a maximum of infinite numbers limited in practice by the fact that when the group exceeds twenty-five or thirty persons, the worker actually deals with the division of the larger group rather than with the group as a whole".⁴ This definition formulated by group workers is more suitable for our purposes than Eubank's traditional definition. Who these individuals shall be and what the bases for selection should be are questions of the moment.

It has taken no great amount of research for counselors to see that some groups acted differently than others or that

3. Schreiber, Meyer, Group Principles and Practices in Formed Groups for the 8 to 10 Year Old Child in Three Selected Group Work Agencies. Thesis (unpublished), N.Y. School, Columbia University, January, 1949.

4. Wilson, Gertrude and Ryland, Gladys, Social Group Work Practice. Riverside Press, 1949. p. 44.

individual campers present different patterns of behavior when with different groups.

It is now generally agreed that "collective behavior is something more than and different from the sum of individuals who produce it".⁵ It is an identifiable entity with certain observable dynamics,⁶ which are being increasingly objectified with the advent and increase of use of research methods.

Knowledge has been forthcoming from various sources as to the impact of the individual on the group and vice versa. "Group Pressure" is a commonly used term, the dynamics of which are understood by professionally trained group workers. Attention has been given to the types of leadership in groups, both indigenous and that given by the worker. The flexibility of the individual to adjust to groups has been dealt with. Trecker has rightly pointed out how this will always depend in part upon the group members present and previous group experiences.⁷ He also points out that "some people are dangerous to groups and must be removed or temporarily excluded".⁸ These writings and many more are at the base of our group work practice as it exists today, in whatever setting. It seems commonly agreed by the writers in the field that the surface has barely been scratched, and that much more remains to be done in basic research in group work practice.

5. Coyle, Grace, op. cit., p. 45.

6. Bernstein, Saul, Criteria for Evaluation of Group in Supervision of Group Work and Recreation, Dimock and Trecker, Association Press, 1949, pp. 231-234.

7. Trecker, Harleigh B., Social Group Work, Woman's Press, 1948, p. 97.

8. Ibid, p. 93.

Partial answers to some questions are being arrived at.

Jennings has concluded on the basis of her research that "people we like will influence us more than do either things or people having no personal meaning to us".⁹

This has great ramifications in the area of groupings. We are now aware of the need to work through natural leaders in helping a group to grow. We have come to see the need an individual has for "roots" in a group. The unknown is fearful and feared in turn. So we see Jennings' findings as more than words, but instead something basic in human mechanisms. The camper must like his counselor if we expect wholesome growth to take place through this medium. The counselor must like children and know how to work with children to bring this about. When a homogeneous club group comes to camp, will we break this group up and place the individuals into different cabins so that they all may have "new experiences", or will we temper our grouping practices with that which we now know about groupings, as relatively little as that may be. We are aware of the need of new experiences, but it is not met automatically. Rather, all our knowledge is brought to bear in a specific situation, and that decision which will be most pertinent for the specific situation is made.

A practical limitation that faces most camps is the short time the campers spend at a camp. It has been pointed out that "short term relationships (are) of less value, (and) call for dif-

9. "Sociometry in Action - How We Get Together", Jennings, Survey Mid-Monthly, p. 44.

ferent focus and expectation¹⁰. This cannot be denied but suggests the need to utilize the time, to its utmost. The need for sound grouping practices looms ever larger so that the camp is better able to utilize the potential present to the utmost. This calls for a conscious weighing of factors present in a situation so that a combining of individuals and sub-groups will result in as profitable an experience as possible. The value of sound grouping practices has been well summed up by Jennings, who points out that "when an individual is with others who respond to him and with whom he wants to be, he has greater security. The more secure he is as a person, the more released he feels and can behave in the group. As he is emotionally freer of tension and doubt and hesitations of different sorts, he can contribute and function better within the total group. The internal morale of the group increases as the individuals find that they can contribute and interact broadly with one another".¹¹

The literature is still relatively sparse on the matter of social contagion. Relatively little is known as yet as to the types of people that can be put together in a group and have a mutually benefiting experience. Last summer, the writer was at a camp which had a few referrals from a child guidance clinic, some of whom exhibited some rather bizarre and socially unacceptable behavior. Some parents were fearful of this situation and wondered how it would affect their child who was exposed to children from the clinic. No absolute answers can yet be given to the parents because the answers

10. Trecker, op. cit., p. 77-78.

11. Jennings, op. cit., p. 40.

have not been found yet. Some findings are available in certain areas which should be utilized when indicated. It has been pointed out that "there is a certain natural affinity between some types of disturbances and a certain natural repulsion between others....We have noticed that children with a trend toward stealing but no open conflict along sex lines can be perfectly safely grouped with youngsters who have some sex problems -- the two will not reinforce each other's disturbance pattern rather they will show open repulsion about it. In short, the question whether problem trends reinforce each other is highly dependent on the type of disturbance patterns, on its degree and the distance between the various members in terms of intensity. Careful grouping therefore avoids some of the contagion danger from the onset".¹²

The problem of grouping then becomes two-fold. Not only must there be a knowledge gained of what behavior pattern the camper has, but also with whom he may be placed so as to reinforce in himself and others the "positive" aspects of his behavior pattern.

Knowledge of the group the camper is being placed in thus looms large in the practice of groupings.

Of first importance is the individual's ability to adjust in a group situation.¹³ It is noted that "the mature individual seeks to accommodate himself to the demands of each group up to the point of consistency with the values and norms he has accepted for

12. Hedl, Detroit Group Project Summer Camp, Spring, 1945. Case Workers Manual, Detroit.

13. Trecker, op. cit., p. 96.

himself as inviolate".¹⁴ This suggests that those who are less mature or immature would tend to be less accommodating. If this person is to have a successful experience, the group he is placed in will need to be more accepting and less demanding of such a member. This in turn has implications as to the type of group that could do this. Trecker has stated that "groups respond to the needy individual on the basis of what they have been and now are as a group. If groups are themselves secure they can stand much more from individuals in the way of deviating behavior".¹⁵

This should not be taken as meaning that grouping is done with a view to doing away with conflict. We must understand that "the everpresent situation in groups is caused by the variety of values and norms which the members bring to the groups",¹⁶ and that growth results from conflict - but within limits for the group's conflict "solution is just as essential to their survival".¹⁷

Grouping must be thought, then, as setting conditions for the maximal learning experience and consequent growth possible for the individuals and the group.

Use of a questionnaire before camp begins is thought of as one of the tools to better know the camper, and, in turn, be better able to use groupings more consciously to better help meet the camper's needs and interests. As knowledge of group process grows and with it the knowledge of those combinations that make for more productive and meaningful group experiences, we shall approach group-

14. Wilson, Ryland, op. cit., p. 41

15. Trecker, op. cit., p. 97.

16. Wilson, Ryland, op. cit., p. 37.

17. Wilson, Ryland, op. cit., p. 55.

ing on a much sounder and scientific level than is possible at present.

It can be seen that in light of our present knowledge we do have some conceptions, experience, and principles having to ^{do} with groupings. The further knowledge gained by use of a questionnaire as suggested here is a possible tool for better understanding of the camper before groupings are made, and consequently being able to place him more consciously in that group which will fit him best.

Although the age, sex, physical size, educational attainment, social distance patterns, etc., loom large in determining how to proceed with grouping, this study is confined to that area involving behavior and that behavior which shall be defined as "problem behavior".

This study was made in an attempt to develop some tool which might conceivably be an aid to better grouping practices on the part of camp staff, so that the plaintive cry of the counselor would rise that much less, and the campers would enjoy camp that much more.

CHAPTER II

DEFINITIONS

The arbitrary definition of a behavior problem is taken from the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman manual, and it is as follows: "a behavior problem represents the discrepancy between the capacities of the individual to adjust himself, and the demands of his environment". The operational definition following from this would be that "a behavior problem may be any activity that is objectionable to a social group - home, school, or community".¹⁸

English and Pearson define problem behavior as reactions to a feeling of discomfort producing behavior regarded as different from normal.¹⁹ Haggerty's definition suggests that any behavior such as being honest, washing the hands before a meal, etc., might be objectionable to a specific group. George Washington was certainly a problem to the British and a behavior problem by this definition. It can be seen that the objectionable behavior of today may be acceptable tomorrow. The definition then is open to some question, but will be used in this study because it is part of the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman manual, which is a basic part of this study.

METHOD

In this study, those scoring in the upper quartile are considered to be those with behavior problems, while those in the

18. Manual of Directions, Haggerty, Olson, Wickman, Behavior Ratings Schedule, World Book Co., 1930, p. 3.

19. English and Pearson, Emotional Problems of Living, W. W. Norton and Co., 1945, p. 32.

lower quartile are those with less serious problems.

There is an admitted emphasis upon aggressive behavior in the questionnaire, which reveals a tendency to miss the disturbed child who has withdrawn or who shows withdrawal symptoms,²⁰ and it is conceivable that this factor affects the findings more than a little.

The authors, on the basis of their studies, however, feel that the lower scores tend to be children with lesser problem tendencies.

The questionnaires which were filled out by the camper were an outgrowth of an unpublished study conducted in Red Wing, Minnesota, schools March 20 and 21, 1944, by Dr. Elie D. Monachesi. The questions used in my study were those in Red Wing which were found to be statistically significant insofar as there were differences in response between the children with behavior problems and those with no serious behavior problems. Through the use of the formula of chi square (χ^2)²¹ it was ascertained that the

20. Ibid, Haggerty, p. 2.

21. The use of χ^2 as a statistical tool was made for two reasons: (1) By using χ^2 it is possible to apply statistical measures to categories not strictly quantitative in nature; (2) Every case in the distribution is weighed proportionately to every other case.

With this tool it is then possible to state to what degree an item is significant, statistically speaking. The significance is determined by probability (P). That is, by figuring P it is possible to ascertain to what degree the distribution was due to chance. Thus when P is written $P < 0.01$ it means that the distributions in the category presented could be attributed to sampling error 1 time in 100. As probability increases, it is possible to assume that the category is more meaningful in the sense that there was a real, rather than a chance, difference between the responses of the highs (those with serious behavior problems) and the lows (those with less or no serious behavior problems).

differences were not due to chance. The study included all students at school in the fifth through the twelfth grades which made for a total population of eleven-hundred. Of these it was possible to analyze 986 questionnaires of which 446 were boys and 540 were girls. Because quartiles were used, a final total of 280 boys and 276 girls were used for the findings noted in the study.

The revised questionnaire based on the findings of the Red Wing study was then given in a camp setting. There was an unduplicated count of 142 girls who filled out the questionnaire. One of the girls filled out a questionnaire twice as she was at camp for more than one session. One of her two questionnaires was taken at random for use in this study. There were 128 boys by an unduplicated count, six of whom filled out the questionnaire twice for the same reason noted above.

One questionnaire was chosen at random from the pair filled out by each of the afore mentioned boys. Of our total population of 272, three questionnaires proved unusable because they were incompletely filled out. Of the 269 cases used in this study, 127 were boys and 142 were girls. The final findings are based on the quartiles of these groups, or a total of 64 boys and 72 girls.

This used camp had three children's periods lasting twelve days each. The age range was 9-14 years for boys and 8-14 years for

The formula of χ^2 ($\chi^2 = \sum \frac{(fo - ft)^2}{ft}$) thus is a test to ascertain how the actual data fits with the theoretical distribution one would expect in a normal frequency distribution. It is, in other words, possible to compare actual results with expected results.

The data is taken from Statistical Methods, F. C. Mills, Henry Holt and Company, 1924, p. 543.

girls. On the last day of each period the questionnaires were distributed by the counselor to his or her group. The camper was given at least one hour to fill out his questionnaire. The counselors helped the campers fill out the questionnaires to varying degrees depending upon the reading comprehension of the camper. In some cases where the child was especially young, the counselor rephrased the questions, and had the child answer them verbally after which he (the counselor) checked the answer desired by the camper. It is conceivable that some may have responded as they thought they should in order to conform or in such a way as they felt to be conforming, yet many of them admitted to having been in trouble with the police or to having appeared in juvenile court.

As a check for reliability, the responses of seven sets of siblings were compared on those questions of a factual nature, and they were found to be 99% consistent with each other.

The seven children at camp who completed the questionnaire twice had at least a two week lapse between filling out their responses. Their answers showed a consistency of 91.2% with each other.

Six of these seven campers had different counselors each session at camp. As scored by two different counselors in each case, four of the six had a score difference ranging from 5 to 12. Thus with independent rating by different counselors the difference was slight enough so as not to be significant. In the other two cases, the campers had highly dissimilar scores on the behavior rating schedules when rated independently by their respective counselor. Investigation showed that there had been a change of overt behavior

to a marked degree in both cases. One had shot up from the lower quartile to the upper, while the other had gone from the upper to near the mean score.

The counselor spent from ten to fourteen hours a day with his camper for a twelve day period. It was felt that he or she would know the camper better than anyone in camp, and thus was the person picked to do the rating of the children in his or her respective group.

Prior to rating the children each counselor was given a manual of directions for the behavior rating schedule. The writer went over the pertinent information with them. They were advised to observe the child with the schedule in mind, so that when the time came for the rating they would have as clear a picture as possible as to the child's behavior. It was pointed out to the counselors the necessity of remaining impartial in explaining the questions so that they would not give the child the impression that one answer was "better" than another. For example, when explaining the question pertaining to the marital status of the parents, the counselor was impressed with the necessity of not conveying the feeling to the children that everyone should have parents and be living with them. Thus, a child of divorced parents, for example, hopefully would not be influenced by the counselor's attitude to state that his parents were not divorced. Thus, the counselors were helped to realize that in many instances children would respond as they felt an adult wanted them to, so the strict necessity of being non-judgmental when helping the children fill out the questionnaire was stressed. The necessity of not

having the children communicate with each other was also stressed. The degree to which all of this was achieved is not known. The degree of maturity and educational attainment of the counselor was such²² that it could be suggested the import of strict controls was meaningful to them.

The counselor explained the purpose of the questionnaire to the camper making it clear that the information was confidential. Special pain was taken to explain the uses and reasons for the questionnaire in the child's language. The paragraph preceding the questionnaire was that which was paraphrased as the need arose.

In interpreting the findings, it must be kept in mind that they are applicable only for the group tested and studied and then only insofar as the responses were true, which cannot be ascertained for a certainty.

Because the counselor had to interpret and explain the meaning of some of the words in the questionnaire, we have an uncontrolled variable at work and no idea if, or to what, degree the findings were affected by this.

The methodology used in analyzing the data was the same as used in the Red Wing study.²³

The scores achieved on Haggerty-Olson-Wickman scale were tabulated separately for each sex. The upper and lower quartile of each group was ascertained statistically.²⁴ In the female group

22. Average age = 21.4, range, 19-24. Educational attainment average = 3 years of college, range 1-4.

23. Ibid, p. 10.

24. Tables I and II.

thirty-six cases with a score of 5 and below became the lower quartile, while a like number with a score of 50 and above became the upper quartile. In the male group 32 cases with a score of 19 and below became the lower quartile and a like number with a score of 60 and above became the upper quartile.

The responses on the questionnaire of each individual in these four groups were then tabulated. These formed the basis for statistical comparison to ascertain if some constellation were present which differentiated those with behavior problems (the upper quartile) from those without serious behavior problems (the lower quartile) on the basis of their responses to the questionnaire.

While the findings of the study can be interpreted only in the light of this group, comparisons will be made of the responses at camp and those in the Red Wing study. As will be shown some of the significant categories of the latter proved to be significant at camp also. As a search for more and more proven tools as aids in better groupings, it is suggested that questions which proved statistically significant in both studies might form the basis for a third questionnaire so that such a technique be further refined.

In some cases the categories as a whole showed no statistical significance while within the category itself some obvious difference of response were noted. In these instances the classifications within these categories were analyzed by the use of the formula of C.R. (critical ratio).²⁵ (See footnote 25 on page 17). With the use of this formula it was ascertained to what degree these differences were or were not due to chance.

The Haggerty-Olson-Wickman schedules were drawn up for use in the schools. The schedule items used for rating behavior were the following:

1. Disinterest in school work
2. Cheating
3. Unnecessary tardiness
4. Lying
5. Defiance to discipline
6. Marked over-activity
7. Unpopular with children
8. Temper outbursts
9. Bullying
10. Speech difficulties
11. Imaginative lying
12. Sex offenses
13. Stealing
14. Truancy
15. Obscene notes, talk or pictures

For use at camp items 1 and 14 were changed to read as follows:

25. The formula is $C.R. = \frac{\text{diff.}}{\sigma \text{ diff.}}$. Thus it is the ratio of the difference to its standard error. We are, through the use of this formula, able to ascertain the degree to which the difference that seemingly exists is certain beyond a reasonable doubt. If the C.R. is at least 3.00 the difference is termed significant beyond any reasonable doubt. If it is between 2.00 and 3.00 the difference is fairly certain.

This formula is easily applicable when working with 2 groups and served the purposes of this study of examining the cell differences within certain of the categories.

This information is taken from Guilford, J. P., Psychometric Methods, McGraw-Hill Company, 1936, p. 60 and p. 499.

1. Disinterest in camp work
14. Absence from activities at which camper
previously agreed to be present

The definitions for the categories were those used in the rating schedule and are as follows:

1. Disinterest in school work.

Under this heading any action of the child that you interpret as showing lack of interest in school work (camp duties).

2. Cheating

Consider all forms of cheating in reference to school work (camp living).

3. Unnecessary tardiness

Consider his tardiness record. If the tardiness is unexcused and due to his own failures, it should be interpreted as unnecessary. Consider also the promptness with which he returns from recess periods (rest hours, etc.)

4. Lying

Include under this head all misrepresentations of facts.

5. Defiance to discipline

Consider how well he accepts authority and obeys the rules of the school (camp).

6. Marked over-activity

Consider under this head the child's physical output of energy. Marked over-activity

is characterized by a general restlessness, by an inability to stand or sit still, by playing constantly with objects, by uncontrolled activity about the school and playground, by involuntary movements of the hands, feet, or other parts of the body.

7. Unpopular with children

Under this head consider how well he is liked by other children.

8. Temper outbursts

Consider the child's reactions to unpleasant situations and to frustrations of his behavior. Temper outbursts may be manifested by crying, by violent physical reactions, or by abusive language.

9. Bullying

Consider whether the child attempts to dominate his playmates by physical force and abusive language and whether he picks quarrels with smaller children. If a girl, the activity may be somewhat different. Consider whether she delights in tormenting, teasing, or making fun of other girls.

10. Speech difficulties

Under this heading include stuttering or stammering, the substitution of one sound for another, and aural inactivity, as

indicated by pronouncing letters or sounds incorrectly or by slurring letters or sounds.

11. Imaginative lying

Under this head consider the child's tendency to tell tales not based on fact. Such lying might include claims of unusual prowess or possessions, air castles, tales of extraordinary happenings, of being pursued by animals or persons, of being persecuted, etc.

12. Sex offenses

Under this head consider all acts relating to sex behavior which are objected to by conventional standards of health and morals.

13. Stealing

Consider the child's honesty with regard to the property of others.

14. Truancy

Consider unexcused (illegal) absences from school (camp), wherein the child absents himself on his own responsibility.

15. Obscene notes, talk or pictures

Under this head consider whether the child circulates notes, pictures, or stories of a suggestive nature among members of the class and whether he uses filthy or profane language about the school or playground.

All words in the definitions above that had to do with the school situation were changed to those which would refer to the camp setting.

The symptomatic behavior listed above is only considered meaningful as it presents a constellation of the child's behavior. No one symptom can arbitrarily be taken to mean that the child has a behavior problem.

Because there is the possibility of cultural backgrounds having an impact on the import of behavior and its "normalcy", it must be re-emphasized that there are no norms for this scale. Value judgments and cultural values become very important. The adjudicated delinquent from Hell's Kitchen may show an "abnormal" pattern of behavior in society's eyes while if he didn't manifest the behavior, his society, i.e. his peers, would soon expell him from the gang or socially ostracize him in other ways. We see why there can be no norms for such a scale. In the situation mentioned above the so-called delinquent manifests "normal" behavior by his groups standards, in fact, would be considered a "sissy", a mamma's boy, i.e. "abnormal", if he didn't. The use of this scale in that group could, then, give us the extremes of that group, but does not bring with it any values to measure the responses of the group being tested as to their "normalcy". The results can only be interpreted in light of the group it is being used with. In that way no matter what pattern of behavior is average for that particular group, the use of this scale claims only to be able to point out the extremes in the curve.

HYPOTHESIS

The hypothesis of the study is formulated as follows:

Those classified as children with behavior problems will present a different response pattern on the questionnaire than those with no serious behavior problems. This difference will not be due to chance.

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS

As a result of the findings of the Red Wing study, the questionnaire proved to differ for the boys and girls.

Generally speaking those categories concerning the mother proved to be more significant for the boys while the contrary was true for the girls. General conclusions will be discussed later. Because the questionnaires for boys and girls differed they will be discussed separately.

A. Boys

Age. Of the 64 boys studied at camp, 19 of them were 9 years old, 12 were 10 years, while 33 were 11 or older. Nearly $\frac{2}{3}$ (21) of the lows (those with no serious behavior problems) were 11 years or over, while nearly $\frac{2}{3}$ (20) of the highs (those with behavior problems) were 10 years of under. To put it another way, those boys with behavior problems tend to be younger than those with no serious behavior problems. This coincides with the findings of the Red Wing study.

Grade in School. Nearly 80% (25) of the highs were in the 5th grade or below, while 43.7% (14) of the lows were in the same grades. While it is natural that because the highs were younger they tend to be in a lower grade, the figures show some slight tendency to be in an even lower grade than would be expected for their age. There are too many factors to be considered before one could

make a statement as to the significance of this fact, but it should be kept in mind. This finding, too, coincides with those of the Red Wing study.

There were no significant differences found in question 6 and 7 which had to do with urban or rural origin in the first instance and marital status of the parents in the other. Thus there was no difference in response between those born in the rural areas and those in the urban areas. Divorce or separation of the parents does not loom up as a factor of importance with the boys although this was the case in the Red Wing study.

Question 8 attempted to ascertain how often the father was out of the house for organizational meetings. Nearly 1/6 (5) of the highs reported their father as being out of the house more than once a week for meetings, while none of the lows recorded this as taking place. On the other hand, 5 of the lows reported their father's being out of the house once a week, while none of the highs stated this as being the case. On the other divisions of the question there were no statistical differences. It can be concluded from this that where difference was shown to exist, the fathers of those with behavior problems tend to be out of the house attending meetings oftener than those with no serious behavior problems.

The findings of questions 9 and 10 had to do with the mother's job, if any, and educational attainment of the mother and showed no statistically significant differences. The number of mothers not working was almost the same in each group, being 17 of the highs and 18 of the lows. We are able to conclude from this that the backgrounds of the children in both quartiles were relatively

homogeneous when related to the type of work the mother did and what her educational attainment was.

The kind of work done, as stratified in the Minnesota Occupational Scale into seven categories,²⁶ shows almost no difference between the two groups, with neither group having mothers doing professional or semi-professional work. Educational attainment for both groups of mothers is almost identical with most of those responding (14 out of 19 in each case) having a twelfth grade education or less.

These findings together with others later noted would suggest that the two groups come from relatively homogeneous backgrounds, speaking in terms of social classes. This is in contrast to the Red Wing study which found differential rankings in terms of occupation, religion, education, etc.; those objective criteria used in ascertaining class.

Question 11 attempted to ascertain how many groups the mother belonged to according to the child. Ten, or 1/3 of the highs, gave no answer while over 1/2 (17) out of the lows had no response. One or more clubs could be checked and we find 32 responses of the highs stating their mothers belong to various groups, 15 of them to PTA, while there is only a total of 17 responses by the lows. These findings can be interpreted in three ways, in my opinion. The first is that the mothers of those with behavior problems actually belong to more groups than the mothers of the other group. A second interpretation might be that those with behavior problems are more insecure

26. Goodenough and Anderson, Minnesota Occupational Scale from Experimental Child Study, Century Company, 1931, p. 234-238 501-512.

and are showing a tendency toward wishful thinking. Still a third might be that the highs feel their mothers should belong to such organizations as church clubs or PTA's. No attempt was possible to ascertain if, in fact, the mothers belonged to the groups their children claimed they did. It is interesting to note that the same general findings were in the Red Wing study. The mothers of the highs tended to belong to more groups according to the children's responses.

Question 12 was an attempt to get at the feelings of the mother toward her brothers and sisters as seen by the children. The findings generally were not conclusive. One cell within the category, "Does not like them but tries not to show it" showed some difference when analyzed using Critical Ratio, but the probability of the difference being due to chance was somewhere between 10 and 50 times out of 100. The findings in the cell showed more responses to the question on the part of the highs.

The 13th question attempted to ascertain the type of punishment used by the mother. The Red Wing study showed a significant difference with more of the lows feeling their mothers to be "fair" or "firm but not cruel" than was true for the highs. The camp study findings were that twice as many of the highs felt they were allowed to get away with what they did. This difference could have occurred by chance anywhere from 10 to 50 times in a hundred, so is not to be taken as being statistically highly significant. The trend, however, is in the direction of the Red Wing findings and shows the same pattern of response, to a lesser degree.

In response to a question (14) attempting to ascertain the child's perceptions of his mother's reactions when he did something wrong, there was a tendency for the highs to feel their mothers blamed them entirely. Statistically this pattern of response could have occurred from 10 to 50 times in 11 by chance, so too much weight cannot be given to the response. This, too, followed the pattern of the Red Wing study.

A statistical pattern of chance of the same nature was found in question 15, with a tendency shown by the lows to like school more than the highs. Again it was not a strong differentiation, and one that may or may have not been due to chance. The response in the Red Wing study was of the same nature but was much stronger. It must be noted again that we are dealing with a relatively homogeneous group in this study, and their values about school would probably not show as much variance as would be seen when analyzing the responses of a heterogeneous group such as is found in the Red Wing study.

The findings in question 16 which attempted to ascertain whether or not the child had to work at home bore out the findings in the Red Wing study, but again not to the statistical degree found there. Although the majority of both groups had to work at home, there was a slight tendency for fewer of the highs being made to work at home. Again the findings could have occurred by chance anywhere from 10 to 50 times out of 100, but they are in line with the Red Wing findings.

Some interesting findings came to light in question 17. The highs, in response to a question asking with whom they spent

their time, noted that they spent significantly more time with their brothers, sisters, father, mother and gangs than did the lows. The Red Wing study found the highs spending more time with their brothers, sisters and gangs than the lows, while the lows spent more time with their parents. Again, the responses of the children may be due to some elements of wishful thinking. Whatever the reasons for the responses, there are definite patterns of difference in the responses between the two groups, which did not occur by chance.

Questions 18 through 22 again were of a type attempting to get at environmental background. The questions were, in order, asking the child if he had a recreation room, if he lived on a farm or in town, whether parents rent, own, or are buying a home, and what language was spoken in the home. There were no differences between the groups. Again, it is my feeling that this was because of the economic and social homogeneity of the camp group as a whole.

Question 23 dealt with contacts of the child with the police and/or juvenile court. More of the highs had been in contact with police while 7 of them had appeared in juvenile court in contrast to none of the lows. This again bore out the findings of the Red Wing study. These findings would probably be expected in light of some of the anti-social behavior manifested by these children whom we call the highs. Thus the highs had been "in trouble with the law" oftener than the lows.

In the last question of the boy's questionnaire, it is found that more of the lows are scolded for punishment rather than whipped, while the opposite is true for the highs. This is not to suggest that there was no overlap, for there was much. Again, though,

the same general trend was found in the Red Wing study. In both instances, it is quite unlikely that the difference was due to chance, probability being 80 to 90 times out of 100 that the differences of the two groups responses did not occur by chance.

CONCLUSIONS

In reviewing the findings of this study, it is interesting to note that with one exception (and that was a cell within a category), there is no contradiction with the Red Wing study findings. It is true that not all those questions of the Red Wing study which proved statistically significant in having differing responses between the highs and the lows proved so in this study. However, most if not all, of these questions (specifically, questions 6, 7, 9, 10, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22) were those which would not be expected to show differentiation in a homogeneous group. This might not be true of question 7, but even here the findings did not contradict the Red Wing study but rather were just not significant.

The findings are that much more interesting when we see different responses coming from the two groups when their backgrounds are essentially much the same. In other words, in spite of having common backgrounds, a different pattern of response is noted. Here we find the educational and economic background of the mothers much the same; urban and language background, housing much alike, and yet a pattern differentiating the two groups does present itself.

The pattern is in no case distinct. In every category analyzed there is overlapping of responses between the groups, yet

we do find trends and tendencies which are discernible.

A general picture of these tendencies of the child with behavior problems would show us a younger child than those with no serious behavior problems with some chance of not having achieved the grade in school commensurate with his age. We would find that his father tended to be out of the house to meetings oftener than the father of the child with no serious behavior problems. Further, if the child's responses were true, his mother tended to be out of the home more than the mother of the child with no serious behavior problems. Again there was a tendency for more of those with behavior problems to feel they were allowed to get away with something instead of being chastised or punished when they did something wrong. On the other hand, they were more likely to feel that when their mother felt they had done something wrong they were blamed entirely while the lows felt their mothers took part of the blame or blamed others, too. We find a slight tendency for the highs to dislike school more than the so-called lows. It is interesting to note, in passing, the high aura around going to college, for in both groups many who didn't like school or saw no reason for it, wanted to go to college.

Continuing our imaginary picture of a child at camp with serious behavior problems, we would find him tending to spend more time with his family and his gang than does the other group. He would more likely have been in juvenile court or had police contact than would the child with no serious behavior problems. He was more likely to get whipped in the way of punishment than the children with no serious behavior problems.

Again, it must be emphasized no clear differentiating pattern is presented with no overlapping. On the other hand, the findings very closely follow the Red Wing study findings as far as the direction, if not the degree, goes. Our findings are those of tendencies, not allowing for clear cut conclusions as to those factors which will differentiate boys with behavior problems from boys with no serious behavior problems. It must be remembered, too, that the findings presented are group findings and would be of little use in individual cases by themselves. The implications of the foregoing statements will be further discussed under the general conclusions of the study.

B. Girls

Age. There was no indication that age was a factor differentiating the two groups, although the highs in the Red Wing study tended to be younger. This is to say that the findings here neither bear out nor contradict the previous study made. The figures show a slight tendency for the lows to be younger which could have occurred by chance 50 to 90 times out of 100.

Grade in School. The lows (those with no serious behavior problems) tended to be in lower grades than the highs even though both groups were nearly identical as to age. Thirteen of the highs were in the 5th grade or below, while 18 of the lows were in the 5th grade or lower. These findings could have occurred by chance 20 to 30 times in 100, so are not to be taken as being of the strongest statistical evidence possible. It should be noted, however, that this finding contradicts with both the Red Wing findings

and the findings of the boys in this study, which found the highs tending to be in the lower grades.

Neither church denomination nor frequency of attendance of the father proved to be of any significance in this study. The proportion of the group that were Catholic, Protestant, and other, respectively were almost identical.

Question 8 related to marital status of the parents. Although there was a tendency for more of the parents of the highs to be divorced this was not statistically significant. In other words the difference shown in the findings could have occurred by chance.

Again in relation to occupation strata (professional, semi-professional, skilled, etc.) there was almost no difference between the two groups in this study. It followed that the question relating to the payment of the father showed no significant differences. Financial independence of the parents showed almost no difference either.

In the Red Wing study responses to these questions showed the highs tending to come from the less privileged economic groups.

We see, therefore, what was true with the boys; mainly that the two groups at camp proved to be relatively homogeneous groups insofar as religious, social, and economic background went. Again, this suggests that whatever differences do come to light cannot be explained by these aforementioned factors.

Question 12 attempted to ascertain the type of groups the father belonged (service, church, labor, veteran) showed no significant difference but attendance did. Again as in the case of the boys and the Red Wing study as a whole, the fathers of the

highs tended to be out of the house oftener for meetings. The findings in this study could have occurred by chance 5 to 10 times in 100.

The question attempting to ascertain the type of punishment used by the father showed a tendency for the fathers of the highs to be more inconsistent and/or indecisive in their approach. Thus more of the highs responded that their father (1) allowed them to get away with their actions; (2) threatened punishment but seldom carried it out; (3) left the punishment to the mother and/or (4) disagreed with the mother on how punishment should be carried out. The findings are not clear out and could occur by chance 20 to 30 times in 100, but they are generally consistent with the findings of the Red Wing study and the boys in this study. It would seem generally that the parents of the lows handle their children more consistently and fairer in the eyes of the children than do the parents of the highs.

The question asked to ascertain the child's impressions of her father's reaction when she did something wrong show one slight trend which would occur by chance 10 to 50 times out of 100. The father of the "high" tended to blame friends or playmates or "become angry and disgusted" with his daughter more often than the father of the child with no serious behavior problems. In the Red Wing study the father of the low tended to blame the child entirely more than twice as often (38 responses compared to 14 of the highs) according to the child. I can find no explanation for the differences in the findings and feel no conclusions can be drawn from them.

Educational attainment of the mother showed almost no difference in the findings, and I feel no conclusions can be drawn from them.

In the opinion of the child, the mothers of the lows tend to be more affectionate toward the child's siblings than is the mother of the highs. There were 26 responses of the lows stating their mother was less affectionate while 17 of the highs so responded. There was also a slight tendency for the highs to feel more often their mother played favorites or was "changeable", and they never knew "how she feels about them". Taking the category as a whole the distribution found within it could occur by chance 5 to 10 times in a hundred. These findings within the category bear out the findings of the Red Wing study. When the cells were analyzed individually (cell a and combined cell c - h) with C.R. (critical ratio) the difference was found to have no significance.

The next question asked (no. 13) attempted to ascertain the child's opinion of how her mother felt towards her. The responses showed a tendency of the low to feel her mother was "very affectionate" more often than the high. These cells when analyzed by C.R. show slight or no significance by themselves, but when analyzed as a whole by χ^2 , significance increases to where it is felt the pattern of responses in the whole category would not occur by chance, 70 to 80 times in 100. Again looking at tendencies, cell by cell, it is seen that there is some tendency for the high to feel her mother is changeable. This difference in the cell could have occurred by chance 10 to 50 times in a hundred, so is not to be taken as strong statistical proof of anything. Again, although these findings are not highly conclusive, they present the same response pattern found in the Red Wing study.

The findings of the mother's feelings toward her husband are more conclusive. Nineteen of the lows feel their mother to be "very affectionate" toward her husband while 11 of the highs so indicate. The differences could occur by chance 2 to 5 times in 100. In other words, 95 to 98 times out of 100, this difference would not occur by chance. Again, there was a tendency showing the mother of the highs to be changeable, nagging, etc. The general findings could have had a chance occurrence anywhere from 5 to 10 times in 100. These findings, too, tend to bear out the Red Wing findings.

In response to a question regarding the mother's feelings towards her parents, there was a slight tendency for the lows to feel that their mothers were more affectionate. This could have been a chance occurrence 20 to 30 times in 100. The trend of the findings is the same as those of the Red Wing study.

Question 21 referred to the method of punishment used by the mother. Cells a, b, e, f, and g were grouped together for statistical analysis, all having in common some measure of inconsistency or passivity to them. More of the highs felt their mothers to respond as was suggested in these categories. To put it another way, more of the lows felt their mothers to be fair in what she did in correcting or punishing the child. There was a tendency for more of the highs to feel their mother was firm but not cruel. Multiple responses were made to this question so we find 36 highs making 58 responses and the 36 lows making 50 responses. Forty-four of the 50 were cells e or d (e- she is fair, d- she is firm but not cruel), while 6 were in all the other categories combined. Sixteen of the

58 responses of the highs were in all categories except c and d, and of these two categories the tendency was for more of the lows to feel their mothers to be fair. These findings also bear out the findings of the Red Wing study, generally. The probability in this case was this could occur by chance, 5 to 10 times in 100.

The responses to a question concerning the child's attitudes toward school are not too conclusive. There is a tendency for the lows to like school more than the highs. Conversely, there is a tendency for more of the highs to either dislike school or to like school but "rather do something else". These differences could have occurred by chance from 10 to 50 times in 100, so cannot be accepted as being very meaningful. Here, too, the findings were in keeping with the Red Wing study. Interesting here is the fact that while the highs tended to dislike school or would rather do something else, more of them wanted to go to college.

In question 23 only the combined cells f, g, h, i, j, k, and l proved of any significance. These cells referred to the poor health, mental illness, swearing, etc., of siblings. The tendency was for the highs to check responses in these cells oftener than the lows. This could happen by chance 10 to 50 times in 100. Of the cells noted, the two most frequently checked were "uses a lot of curse words" and "causes trouble at home". Thus, the findings of the Red Wing study are borne out generally with the general tendency for the siblings of the highs to manifest more socially unacceptable behavior. It should be noted that 21 of the highs gave no answers as did of the lows. Of the 15 of the highs responding there were 37 responses and for the 14 of the lows there were 16

responses. Well over half in each group then had no siblings or had no siblings fitting into the classifications listed. There is no way of ascertaining if this is fact or if the children felt they could or should not tell the truth. Again, it can be suggested on the basis of the checks made which are previously noted, that these responses, when compared, were in general consistent.

Neither question relating to work done in the home nor the child's health proved of any significance.

In question 26, there was no overall significance of the category. Within it, two of the cells show some slight tendencies which could have occurred by chance 10 to 50 times in 100. More of the lows tended to spend more time alone or with their brothers than was the case of the highs. There were more responses from the highs stating a tendency to spend more time with boyfriends and girlfriends.

There was nothing of significant difference in answer to the question attempting to ascertain if the child had most of her good times in the home or away from home.

Answers to a question ascertaining with whom the child lived showed some difference with half of the highs reporting not living with both mother and father, while over 69% (25) of the lows live with both parents. This difference could have occurred by chance 5 to 10 times in 100. This finding was in the same direction as that in the Red Wing study.

The last question analyzed, No. 29, asked the question "Is there any member of your family with whom you constantly quarrel?" Again, half of the highs reported quarrelling with various members of their family, while over 69% (25) of the lows report

constantly quarrelling with no member. This pattern of difference could have been a chance occurrence 5 to 10 times in 100. The findings bear out those of the Red Wing study.

The last question in the girl's questionnaire related to police and juvenile court contacts. Although the figures were not subject to statistical manipulation, the slight tendency for more highs to have checked the categories, although it could have occurred by chance, still bore out the pattern of the Red Wing study.

CONCLUSIONS

The same general remarks made in relation to the boys' findings in this study hold true again. Generally speaking, when categories proved significant they were of such a nature as to coincide with the Red Wing study. There were two exceptions (grade in school; father's reaction when child did something wrong) where the findings showed opposite tendencies than did the Red Wing study.

Relative homogeneity of the highs' and the lows' backgrounds was evident in the girls as it was with the boys. Again we see no clear cut picture but one of overlappings and tendencies. Generally, it can be said that the odds are very good that most of the differences that do exist do not exist by chance.

Reviewing the findings concerning the girls which coincide with the trends of the Red Wing study, it is seen that the father of the high tends to be out of the home oftener than does the father of the low. In punishing his child he will tend to be more inconsistent and less fair than the father of the lows. The child with serious behavior problems believes her mother to be less

affectionate than do the lows. A slight tendency noted also was for the high's mother to play favorites or be changeable in her approach.

The highs also tend to feel that their mothers are less affectionate toward their husbands than do the lows. This tendency is also noted to a lesser degree concerning the mother's feelings towards her own parents.

Punishment by their mother tends to be less consistent and less fair for the highs than it does to the lows.

Some slight indication is given that a high either might not like school or prefer to do something else, even though she might want to go to college.

A high would more likely have siblings manifesting socially unacceptable behavior of some sort or another.

A slight tendency evidenced itself for the highs to spend more time with their boyfriends and girlfriends than did the other group.

It is less likely that a girl with serious behavior problems will be living with both parents than would be the case of a child with no serious behavior problems.

Within her home she would be more likely to be engaged in constant quarrelling with other members of her family than would the lows.

To repeat, the findings above, tendencies as they are, are the same tendencies as those in the Red Wing study, albeit not as conclusive.

The other questions, with the two exceptions previously noted, showed no significant differences between the groups.

The responses to questions 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 16 showed the two groups to have relatively homogeneous background from a racial, religious, economic, educational, and social standpoint.

In general, most of the differentiation in the case of the boys and the girls between highs and lows was apparent in questions relating to the family and relationships in the family. It would seem then that if it were possible to have access to information about the family and the relationships within this family, it might be possible to do some predicting about the behavior of the child. This is, of course, a near impossibility in most cases. Thus unless agency contact with the family had been very intense, the information would be lacking and it is questionable whether such information could be procured during an intake interview.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

In view of this, a questionnaire such as this might be a tool to use in predicting problem behavior at camp. Pertinent findings showing trends differentiating those with serious behavior problems from those with no serious behavior problems are evident from the questionnaire. It is possible that its use before camp is not feasible because: (1) of the rapport needed before the child would answer such a questionnaire truthfully; and (2) of the difficulty in administering and analyzing the findings. Further at no time can it be said that a child, on the basis of his responses to the questionnaire, has serious behavior problems.

All that can be said when a child shows the same pattern of response that was shown by the highs is that the odds are such and such that he will be a child with serious behavior problems, and he would be a child to observe closely for manifestations of such problems.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY

A need was shown for sound grouping practice at camp based on a knowledge of the child before he arrives at camp. One such concern in grouping is to know which children have serious behavior problems, so that they may be placed so as to afford them the most profitable experience possible.

After defining problem behavior as socially unacceptable behavior a questionnaire was set up based on the Red Wing study findings. This questionnaire was administered in a camp setting to all campers during three 12 day periods. The quartiles of each sexual group were taken as "highs" and "lows" (children with serious behavior problems and children with no serious behavior problems). Their responses to the questionnaire were compared. It was the hypothesis of this study that "those classified as children with behavior problems will present a different response pattern on the questionnaire than those with no serious behavior problems. This difference will not be due to chance".

Although no dichotomous trends manifested themselves, certain observable tendencies were found to exist between the groups. Because in this particular study the backgrounds of the groups were relatively homogeneous, economic, religious, educational, and social differences of the parents were of no significance.

It would seem that a questionnaire such as this is able to differentiate children with serious behavior problems from children

with no serious behavior problems, in a general way. Because of the overlappings of responses between the groups, only a pattern of tendencies present themselves for analysis.

As the questionnaire is presently constituted with the need for rapport, controls, and consistency in administering, it is possible that it would not be a feasible tool to use before camp as a method for differentiating children with serious behavior problems from those with no serious behavior problems. It would seem that a study might be conducted in which this questionnaire could be administered before camp begins. Thus an attempt to ascertain if it is a useful tool for differentiating the groups mentioned could be made. Only under these circumstances might it be determined whether or not the rapport, controls, etc., needed would prove to be shortcomings. If such a study were done, a further recommendation would be that the language of the questionnaire be geared to that age group it is being used with. The questionnaire might be further refined by removing all questions relating to the social, economic, religious, racial, and educational background of the parents. Thus an attempt could be made to isolate that complex of factors which serves to differentiate children with serious behavior problems aside from the factors mentioned above.

This study, then, has shown that a questionnaire can be used to find tendencies and trends of differentiation between children with serious behavior problems and those with less or no serious behavior problems. Such an instrument is only a tool which gives indications rather than clear cut conclusions. It would be

one to be used as such. Under no circumstances could conclusive statements be made about where to place a child or how to work with a child on the basis of his or her response patterns to the questionnaires. It might be better said that the findings could contribute to the mosaic upon which we base our actions for the good of the child in the camp setting.

APPENDIX

LIST OF TABLES

<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
I	Mean Score of Males on H.O.W., Norway Point Study	45
II	Mean Score of Females on H.O.W., Norway Point Study	46
III	Upper and Lower Quartiles of Males and Females	47
IV	A. χ^2 and P. of Norway Point Males	51
	B. χ^2 and P. of Red Wing Males	53
	C. χ^2 and P. of Norway Point Females	59
	D. χ^2 and P. of Red Wing Females	62

Table I

MALES -- Score on H.O.W.
Norway Point Study

C.I.	f	mp	dev.	fd
0 - 9	18	5	-3	-54
10 - 19	23	15	-2	-46
20 - 29	21	25	-1	-21
30 - 39	14	35	0	0
40 - 49	6	45	1	6
50 - 59	9	55	2	18
60 - 69	7	65	3	21
70 - 79	3	75	4	12
80 - 89	4	85	5	20
90 - 99	7	95	6	42
100 - 109	3	105	7	21
110 - 119	3	115	8	24
120 - 129	3	125	9	27
130 - 139	4	135	10	40
140 - 149	1	145	11	11
150 - 159		155	12	0
160 - 169		165	13	0
170 - 179	1	175	14	14
	<u>N = 127</u>			<u>135</u>

$$\bar{X} = \bar{Z} + \sum (fd)c$$

$$\bar{X} = 45.630$$

Table II

FEMALES -- Score on H.O.W.
Norway Point Study

C.I.	f	mp	dev.	fd
0 - 9	36	5	-2	-72
10 - 19	16	15	-1	-16
20 - 29	24	25	0	0
30 - 39	18	35	1	18
40 - 49	13	45	2	26
50 - 59	6	55	3	18
60 - 69	7	65	4	28
70 - 79	2	75	5	10
80 - 89	6	85	6	36
90 - 99	5	95	7	35
100 - 109	2	105	8	16
110 - 119	0	115	9	0
120 - 129	2	125	10	20
130 - 139	1	135	11	11
140 - 149	1	145	12	12
150 - 159	2	155	13	26
160 - 169	0	165	14	0
170 - 179	0	175	15	0
180 - 189	1	185	16	16
	<u>N = 142</u>			<u>184</u>

$$\bar{X} = \bar{Z} + \sum (fd)C$$

$$\bar{X} = 37.958$$

Table III

Upper and Lower Quartiles
of Males and Females

FEMALES

Lower Quartile	Score of 5 and below	N = 36 highs and 36 lows
Upper Quartile	Score of 50 and above	N = 72

MALES

Lower Quartile	Score of 19 and below	N = 32 highs and 32 lows
Upper Quartile	Score of 60 and above	N = 64

YOUTH SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE (Male)

Please answer the following questions as accurately and as truthfully as you can. NO ONE YOU KNOW WILL EVER SEE YOUR ANSWERS. The information you give us is going to help us to understand the problems of youth. Thank you for your help. We know that you will be careful and honest.

1. Name: _____

2. Date of birth: _____
Month Day Year

3. Sex: (Check)

- a. ☐ Male
- b. ☐ Female

4. Race: (Check one)

- a. ☐ White
- b. ☐ Negro
- c. ☐ Oriental (Chinese, Japanese, Filipino)
- d. ☐ Other: _____
Specify

5. Your grade in school: _____

6. Where were your parents living at the time of your birth: (Check one)

- a. ☐ On a farm.
- b. ☐ In town.

7. Which of the following apply to your parents? (Check as many as apply).

- a. ☐ Parents live together.
- b. ☐ Parents divorced.
- c. ☐ Parents living apart but not divorced.
- d. ☐ Mother dead.
- e. ☐ Father dead.
- f. ☐ Both parents dead.
- g. ☐ One parent dead, the other gone away.
- h. ☐ One parent gone away.
- i. ☐ Father in Army, Navy, Marines. (Check one)
- j. ☐ Father in defense or war work away from home.

k. ☐ Mother dead, father remarried.

l. ☐ Father dead, mother remarried.

m. ☐ Parents divorced, mother remarried.

n. ☐ Parents divorced, father remarried.

8. How often does your father go to the meetings of the organizations or clubs he belongs? (Check)

- a. ☐ More than once a week.
- b. ☐ Once a week.
- c. ☐ Once a month.
- d. ☐ Twice a month.
- e. ☐ Just a few times per yr.
- f. ☐ Not at all.

9. If your mother has a paying job, what kind of work does she do?

10. How far in school did your mother go?

11. Does your mother belong to any of the following? (Check)

- a. ☐ Church club.
- b. ☐ Social club.
- c. ☐ Bridge club.
- d. ☐ Woman's club.
- e. ☐ Home Bureau.
- f. ☐ Lecture course.
- g. ☐ Parent-Teachers Assoc.
- h. ☐ Other: _____

Specify

12. In your opinion, how does your mother feel toward her brothers and sisters?
- a. ☐ Is very affectionate.
 - b. ☐ Is affectionate.
 - c. ☐ Does not like them but tries not to show it.
 - d. ☐ Is fault-finding, nagging.
 - e. ☐ Is cruel.
 - f. ☐ Is not interested in them.
 - g. ☐ Is changeable, never know how she feels about them.
 - h. ☐ Plays favorites.
 - i. ☐ Has no brothers or sisters.

13. How does your mother correct or punish you when you do something you shouldn't? (Check one or more).
- a. ☐ Allows you to get away with it.
 - b. ☐ Threatens punishment, but seldom carries it out.
 - c. ☐ She is fair in what she does.
 - d. ☐ She is firm but not cruel.
 - e. ☐ She leaves all discipline to your father.
 - f. ☐ Father and mother disagree on how you should be punished.
 - g. ☐ She is unfair in what she does.

14. How does your mother react when you do something wrong? (Check one or more).
- a. ☐ She blames you entirely.
 - b. ☐ She blames your father.
 - c. ☐ She feels she is partly to blame.
 - d. ☐ She blames your friends or playmates.

15. How well do you like school? (Check one or more).
- a. ☐ You like to go to school and hate to miss a day.
 - b. ☐ You hope to go to college.
 - c. ☐ You like school but would rather be doing something else.
 - d. ☐ You dislike school and don't see any reason for going.

16. Do you have to work at home? (Check)
- a. ☐ Yes
 - b. ☐ No

What do you do: _____
 (Specify if answer above is "Yes")

17. With whom do you most often do things? (Check one or more).
- a. ☐ Alone
 - b. ☐ Brothers
 - c. ☐ Sisters
 - d. ☐ Girl friend
 - e. ☐ Boy friend
 - f. ☐ Mother
 - g. ☐ Father
 - h. ☐ Gang
 - i. ☐ Chums

18. Do you have a recreation room in your home? (Check one).
- a. ☐ Yes
 - b. ☐ No

19. Did you spend your childhood on a farm or in town? (Check one).
- a. ☐ On a farm.
 - b. ☐ In town.

20. If in town, what town?

_____ Town _____ State

21. Ownership of your home.

(Check one or more).

- a. ☐ Is owned by parents.
- b. ☐ Parents are buying the home.
- c. ☐ Parents rent the home.
- d. ☐ Parents rent the home although they own other houses.

22. What language do you speak at home?

Specify

23. Check any of the following which apply to you.

- a. ☐ For some mischievous act, you have been caught, given a talking to by the police and let go.
- b. ☐ You have appeared in Juvenile Court.

24. Which of the following is the most usual kind of punishment? (Check one).

- a. ☐ Whipping.
- b. ☐ Scolding.
- c. ☐ Not allowed to do what you like to do.
- d. ☐ Other: _____

Specify

Table IV A

Norway Point Camp Study
Males

- 2.) $\chi^2 = 9.832$ df 3
 $p > .05 < .02$
- 5.) $\chi^2 = 8.218$ df 2
 $p > .02 < .01$
- 7.) $\chi^2 = .432$ df 2
- 8.) $\chi^2 = 10.076$ df 4
 $p > .05 < .02$
- 9.) $\chi^2 = .062$ df 1
- 10.) $\chi^2 = 0$ df 2
- 11.) $\chi^2 = 6.516$ df 2
 $p > .05 < .02$
- 12.) $\chi^2 = .783$ df 2
cell a C.R. = .88 $p > .50 < .10$
- 13.) $\chi^2 = 1.407$ df 3
cell a C.R. = .895 $p > .50 < .10$
- 14.) $\chi^2 = 1.777$ df 2
cell a C. R. = .98 $p > .50 < .10$
- 15.) $\chi^2 = 1.662$ df 2
cell a C. R. = .785 $p > .50 < .10$
- 16.) $\chi^2 = .863$ df 1
cell a C. R. = 1.06 $p > .50 < .10$
- 17.) $\chi^2 = 11.219$ df 6
 $p > .10 < .05$

18.) $\chi^2 = .364$ df 1

20.) $\chi^2 = .408$ df 1

21.) $\chi^2 = .000$ df 1

22.) $\chi^2 = .000$ df 0

23.) $\chi^2 = 8.310$ df 2
 $p > .02 < .01$

24.) $\chi^2 = 6.143$ df 3
cell a C. R. = .65 $p > 1.00 < .50$
cell d C. R. = .42 $p > 1.00 < .50$

Table IV B

Red Wing Study
Males

- 5.) $\chi^2 = 54.12048$ df 6
 $p > .001$
- 6.) $\chi^2 = 8.28647$ df 1
 $p > .01 < .001$
- 7.) $\chi^2 = 8.31920$ df 3
 $p > .05 < .02$
- 8.) $\chi^2 = 9.53295$ df 4
 $p > .05 < .02$
- 9.) $\chi^2 = 6.10312$ df 2
 $p > .05 < .02$
- 10.) $\chi^2 = 11.09278$ df 5
 $p > .05 < .02$
- 11.) $\chi^2 = 18.8258$ df 7
 $p > .01 < .001$
- 12.) $\chi^2 = 8.27076$ df 3
 $p > .05 < .02$
- 13.) $\chi^2 = 9.29491$ df 4
 $p > .10 < .05$
- 14.) $\chi^2 = 17.06900$ df 4
 $p > .01 < .001$
- 15.) $\chi^2 = 18.942503$ df 3
 $p > .001$
- 16.) $\chi^2 = 6.350152$ df 2
 $p > .05 < .02$

17.) $\chi^2 = 16.58479$ df 9
 $p > .10 < .05$

18.) $\chi^2 = 8.28484$ df 2
 $p > .02 < .01$

19.) $\chi^2 = 7.03114$ df 2
 $p > .05 < .02$

20.) $\chi^2 = 17.71706$ df 2
 $p > .001$

21.) $\chi^2 = 6.7044$ df 3
 $p > .10 < .05$

22.) $\chi^2 = 6.562$ df 1
 $p > .02 < .01$

23.) $\chi^2 = 10.573942$ df 2
 $p > .01 < .001$

24.) $\chi^2 = 10.505334$ df 3
 $p > .02 < .01$

YOUTH SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE
(Female)

Please answer the following questions as accurately and as truthfully as you can. NO ONE YOU KNOW WILL EVER SEE YOUR ANSWERS. The information you give us is going to be used to help us to understand the problems of youth. Thank you for your help. We know that you will be careful and honest.

1. Name: _____
2. Date of birth: _____
Month Day Year
3. Sex: (Check)
a. _____ Male
b. _____ Female
4. Race: (Check one)
a. _____ White
b. _____ Negro
c. _____ Oriental (Chinese, Japanese, Filipino)
d. _____ Other: _____
Specify
5. Your grade in school: _____
6. What church does your father attend: _____
Name of Church
7. How often does your father go to Church? (Check one)
a. _____ Every Sunday.
b. _____ Once or twice a month.
c. _____ Attends only on special occasions, such as Christmas, Easter, etc.
d. _____ Never goes to Church.
8. Which of the following apply to your parents? (Check as many as apply).
a. _____ Parents live together.
b. _____ Parents divorced.
c. _____ Parents living apart but not divorced.
d. _____ Mother dead.
e. _____ Father dead.
- f. _____ Both parents dead.
g. _____ One parent dead, the other gone away.
h. _____ One parent gone away.
i. _____ Father in Army _____, Navy _____, Marines _____.
(Check one)
j. _____ Father in defense or war work away from home.
k. _____ Mother dead, father remarried.
l. _____ Father dead, mother remarried.
m. _____ Parents divorced, mother remarried.
n. _____ Parents divorced, father remarried.
9. What kind of work does your father do? _____

10. How is your father paid? (Check one)
a. _____ Gets a salary or wages.
b. _____ Has his own shop, business or farm.
c. _____ Receives public relief.
d. _____ Other: _____
Specify
11. How independent (financially) are your parents? (Check one)
a. _____ Parents are well-to-do.
b. _____ Parents have enough to get along on, but are not rich.
c. _____ Parents have a hard time getting along on what they have.
d. _____ Parents cannot get along without financial help from someone.

12. Does your father belong to any of the following? (Check)
- a. ☐ Rotary Club.
 - b. ☐ Kiwanis Club.
 - c. ☐ Church Club.
 - d. ☐ Labor union.
 - e. ☐ American Legion.
 - f. ☐ Others: _____
13. How often does your father go to the meetings of the organizations or clubs he belongs to? (Check)
- a. ☐ More than once a week.
 - b. ☐ Once a week.
 - c. ☐ Once a month.
 - d. ☐ Twice a month.
 - e. ☐ Just a few times per year.
 - f. ☐ Not at all.
14. How does your father correct or punish you when you do something you shouldn't do? (Check one or more)
- a. ☐ Allows you to get away with it.
 - b. ☐ Threatens punishment but seldom carries it out.
 - c. ☐ He is fair in what he does.
 - d. ☐ He is firm but not cruel.
 - e. ☐ He leaves all discipline to your mother.
 - f. ☐ Father and mother disagree on how you should be punished.
 - g. ☐ He is unfair in what he does.
15. How does your father react when you do something wrong? (Check one or more)
- a. ☐ He blames you entirely.
 - b. ☐ He blames your mother.
 - c. ☐ He feels he is partly to blame.
 - d. ☐ He blames your friends or playmates.
 - e. ☐ He becomes angry and disgusted with you.
 - f. ☐ He thinks what you have done is all right.
 - g. ☐ He doesn't know what to think about it.
16. How far in school did your mother go?

17. In your opinion, how does your mother feel toward your brothers and sisters? (Check one or more)
- a. ☐ Is very affectionate.
 - b. ☐ Is affectionate.
 - c. ☐ Does not like me but tries not to show it.
 - d. ☐ Is fault-finding, nagging.
 - e. ☐ Is cruel.
 - f. ☐ Is not interested in them.
 - g. ☐ Is changeable. Never knows how she feels about them.
 - h. ☐ Plays favorites.
18. In your opinion, how does your mother feel toward you?
- a. ☐ Is very affectionate.
 - b. ☐ Is affectionate.
 - c. ☐ Does not like me but tries not to show it.
 - d. ☐ Is fault-finding, nagging.
 - e. ☐ Is cruel.
 - f. ☐ Is not interested in me.
 - g. ☐ Is changeable, never know how she feels about me.
19. In your opinion, how does your mother feel toward your father? (Check one)
- a. ☐ Is very affectionate.
 - b. ☐ Is affectionate.
 - c. ☐ Does not like him but tries not to show it.
 - d. ☐ Is fault-finding, nagging.
 - e. ☐ Is cruel.
 - f. ☐ Is not interested in him.
 - g. ☐ Is changeable, never know how she feels about him.

20. In your opinion, how does your mother feel toward her parents? (Check one or more)

- a. ☐ Is very affectionate.
- b. ☐ Is affectionate.
- c. ☐ Does not like them but tries not to show it.
- d. ☐ Is fault-finding, nagging.
- e. ☐ Is cruel.
- f. ☐ Is not interested in them.
- g. ☐ Is changeable, never know how she feels about them.
- h. ☐ Plays favorites.

21. How does your mother correct or punish you when you do something you shouldn't do? (Check one or more)

- a. ☐ Allows you to get away with it.
- b. ☐ Threatens punishment, but seldom carries it out.
- c. ☐ She is fair in what she does.
- d. ☐ She is firm but not cruel.
- e. ☐ She leaves all discipline to your father.
- f. ☐ Father and mother disagree on how you should be punished.
- g. ☐ She is unfair in what she does.

22. How well do you like school? (Check one or more)

- a. ☐ You like to go to school, and hate to miss a day.
- b. ☐ You hope to go to college.
- c. ☐ You like school but would rather be doing something else.
- d. ☐ You dislike school and don't see any reason for going.

23. Do you have any brothers or sisters who fit into one or more of the following? (Check as many as apply)

- a. ☐ Is now or ever has been at the State Training School for either Boys or Girls. (As, for example, Red Wing or Sauk Center)
- b. ☐ Plays hockey from school.
- c. ☐ Has a bad temper.
- d. ☐ Tells a lot of lies.
- e. ☐ Is very nervous.
- f. ☐ Uses a lot of curse words.
- g. ☐ Hangs around pool halls, taverns.
- h. ☐ Runs away from home.
- i. ☐ Causes trouble at home.
- j. ☐ Is in poor health.
- k. ☐ Is mentally sick.
- l. ☐ Others: _____

Specify

24. Do you have to work at home? (Check)

- a. ☐ Yes
- b. ☐ No

What do you do? _____

Specify if answer above is yes.

25. What is the state of your health at the present time? (Check one)

- a. ☐ Am in good health, seldom suffer from colds, headaches, indigestion, rarely have to miss school.
- b. ☐ Health is good on the whole, but must miss school a few days or a week now and then because of minor ailments.
- c. ☐ Am frequently ill and must take time out from school quite often.
- d. ☐ Have been ill for a long period of time due to some such disease as tuberculosis, heart disease, etc.

26. With whom do you most often do things in your spare time?

- a. ☐ Alone
- b. ☐ Brothers
- c. ☐ Sisters
- d. ☐ Boy friend
- e. ☐ Girl friend
- f. ☐ Mother
- g. ☐ Father
- h. ☐ Gang
- i. ☐ Chums

27. Do you have most of your good times at home or away from home?
(Check one)

- a. ☐ At home.
- b. ☐ Away from home.

28. With whom do you live? (Check one)

- a. ☐ With your father and mother.
- b. ☐ With one parent and a step-parent.
- c. ☐ With mother alone.
- d. ☐ With father alone.
- e. ☐ With parent and relative.
- f. ☐ With relative.
- g. ☐ With friends.
- h. ☐ Live in an orphanage, adoptive home, or boarding home.

29. Is there any member of your family with whom you constantly quarrel? (Check one or more)

- a. ☐ With no member.
- b. ☐ With both parents.
- c. ☐ With father.
- d. ☐ With mother.
- e. ☐ With step-parent.
- f. ☐ With sisters or brothers.
- g. ☐ With relatives, if you are living with them.
- h. ☐ With guardian.

30. Check any of the following which apply to you.

- a. ☐ For some mischievous act, you have been caught, given a talking to by the police and let go.
- b. ☐ You have appeared in Juvenile Court.

Table IV C
Norway Point Camp Study
Females

- 2.) $\chi^2 = 1.880$ df 3
 $p > .9 < .5$
- 5.) $\chi^2 = 3.207$ df 2
 $p > .3 < .2$
- 6.) $\chi^2 = .232$ df 2
- 7.) not computed
- 8.) $\chi^2 = 2.782$ df 3
cell b C. R. = 467 no sig.
- 9.) $\chi^2 = .677$ df 2
- 10.) $\chi^2 = 1.184$ df 1
- 11.) $\chi^2 = .296$ df 1
- 12.) $\chi^2 = .762$ df 2
cell c C.R. = .113 no sig.
- 13.) $\chi^2 = 5.366$ df 2
 $p > .10 < .05$
- 14.) $\chi^2 = 3.953$ df 3
 $p > .30 < .20$
cell a C.R. = 62 no sig.
cell c C.R. = 57 no sig.
- 15.) $\chi^2 = 1.331$ df 4
cell d C.R. = .90
 $p > .50 < .10$
- 16.) $\chi^2 = .574$ df 2

- 17.) $\chi^2 = 5.916$ df 2
 $p > .10 < .05$
 cell a C.R. = .435 no sig.
 cell g C.R. = .448 no sig.
- 18.) $\chi^2 = 2.551$ df 2
 $p > .30 < .20$
 cell a C.R. = .619 no sig.
 cell b C.R. = 1.04 $p > .50 < .10$
 cell d C.R. = 1.01
- 19.) $\chi^2 = 6.423$ df 3
 $p > .10 < .05$
 cell a C.R. = 2.10 $p > .05 < .02$
 cell c C.R. = .425 no sig.
- 20.) $\chi^2 = 3.137$ df 2
 $p > .90 < .20$
 cell a C.R. = 1.27 $p > .50 < .10$
 cell c C.R. = .519 no sig.
- 21.) $\chi^2 = 5.548$ df 2
 $p > .10 < .05$
 cell a C.R. = .475 $p =$ no sig.
 cell c C.R. = .472 $p =$ no sig.
 cell d C.R. = .87 $p > .10 < .05$
- 22.) $\chi^2 = 1.850$ df 2
 cell a C.R. = .724 $p > .50 < .10$
 cell b C.R. = 1.27 $p > .50 < .10$
- 23.) $\chi^2 = 2.011$ df 3
 cell f C.R. = .90 $p > .50 < .10$
- 24.)
 not computed
- 25.) $\chi^2 = .532$ df 2
- 26.) $\chi^2 = 1.682$ df 5
 cell a C.R. = .88 $p > .50 < .10$
 cell d C.R. = 1.42 $p > .50 < .10$
- 27.) $\chi^2 = .932$ df 2

28.)

$\chi^2 = 2.826$ df 1

$p > .10 < .05$

cell a C.R. = .58 no sig.

cell b C.R. = .58 no sig.

29.)

$\chi^2 = 2.894$ df 1

$p > .10 < .05$

cell a C.R. = .54 no sig.

Table IV D

Red Wing Study
Females

2.)	$\chi^2 = 21.61034$	df 6
	$p > .01 < .001$	
5.)	$\chi^2 = 31.93228$	df 6
	$p > .001$	
6.)	$\chi^2 = 17.47984$	df 2
	$p > .001$	
7.)	$\chi^2 = 9.60708$	df 4
	$p > .05 < .02$	
8.)	$\chi^2 = 7.62959$	df 2
	$p > .05 < .02$	
9.)	$\chi^2 = 27.35686$	df 6
	$p > .001$	
10.)	$\chi^2 = 5.47346$	df 2
	$p > .10 < .05$	
11.)	$\chi^2 = 4.6778$	df 1
	$p > .05 < .02$	
12.)	$\chi^2 = 11.15618$	df 4
	$p > .05 < .02$	
13.)	$\chi^2 = 12.01110$	df 5
	$p > .05 < .02$	
14.)	$\chi^2 = 21.79051$	df 4
	$p > .001$	
15.)	$\chi^2 = 10.06567$	df 4
	$p > .05 < .02$	

- 16.) $\chi^2 = 16.35502$ df 4
 $p > .001$
- 18.) $\chi^2 = 7.66744$ df 2
 $p > .05 < .02$
- 17.) $\chi^2 = 8.44974$ df 4
 $p > .20 < .05$
- 19.) $\chi^2 = 8.62538$ df 4
 $p > .10 < .05$
- 20.) $\chi^2 = 11.90684$ df 3
 $p > .01 < .001$
- 21.) $\chi^2 = 11.78994$ df 3
 $p > .01 < .001$
- 23.) $\chi^2 = 29.76704$ df 7
 $p > .001$
- 22.) $\chi^2 = 30.66732$ df 3
 $p > .001$
- 24.) $\chi^2 = 9.32530$ df 1
 $p > .10 < .05$
- 26.) $\chi^2 = 22.61847$ df 8
 $p > .01 < .001$
- 27.) $\chi^2 = 20.10603$ df 2
 $p > .001$
- 28.) $\chi^2 = 23.51754$ df 1
 $p > .001$
- 29.) $\chi^2 = 19.09790$ df 3
 $p > .001$
- 30.) $\chi^2 = 10.37396$ df 1
 $p > .01 < .001$

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexander, F., and French T. Psycho-Analytic Therapy, New York, Ronald Press, 1946.
- Blumenthal, Louis H. Group Work in Camping, New York, Association Press, 1937.
- Chapin, F. Stuart. Experimental Designs and Sociological Research, New York, Harpers and Brothers, 1947.
- Character Education in the Summer Camp, 8 publications of the George Williams College Institutes, 1930 to 1942.
- Coyle, Grace. Group Experience and Democratic Values, The Woman's Press, New York, 1947.
- _____. Group Work with American Youth, New York, Harper's, 1948.
- Dimock H., and Trecker, H. Supervision of Group Work and Recreation, New York, Association Press, 1949.
- English, O. S., and Pearson, G. Common Neuroses of Children and Adults, New York, W. W. Norton and Company, 1937.
- _____. Emotional Problems of Living, New York, W. W. Norton and Company, 1945.
- Eubank, Earl. The Concepts of Sociology, Boston, D. C. Heath Co., 1932.
- Guilford, J. P. Psycho-Metric Methods, New York, McGraw-Hill Co., 1936.
- Haggerty, M. E., and others. Behavior Rating Schedule, World Book Company, New York, 1930.
- _____. "Clinical Use of Behavior Rating Schedules", Journal of Juvenile Research, 1931.
- Jennings, Helen. Leadership and Isolation, New York, Longmans, Green and Company, 1943.
- _____. "Sociometry in Action -- How We Get Together", Survey Mid-Monthly, February, 1948.
- Lieberman, Joshua. Creative Camping, New York Association Press, 1931.
- Hills, F. C. Statistical Method, Henry Holt and Company, New York, 1924.
- Minnesota Occupational Scale from Experimental Child Study, Goodenough F., and Anderson, J., Century Company, 1931, pp. 234-238 and 501-512.

Plant, James. Personality and the Cultural Pattern. New York, Commonwealth Fund, 1937.

Redl, Fritz. Case Worker's Manual. Detroit Group Project Summer Camp, Spring, 1945. Detroit.

Schreiber, Meyer. Group Principles and Practices in Formed Groups for the 8 to 10 Year Old Child in Three Selected Group Work Agencies. Thesis (unpublished). New York School of Social Work, Columbia University, January, 1949.

Schweinitz, Carl de. Growing Up. New York, Macmillan Company, 1928.

Slavson, S. R. An Introduction to Group Therapy. Commonwealth Fund, New York, 1943.

_____. The Practice of Group Therapy. International Universities Press, New York, 1947.

Thurstone, Louis. The Measurement of Attitude. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1929.

Trecker, Harleigh E. Social Group Work. New York, Woman's Press, 1948.

Towle, Charlotte. Common Human Needs. Federal Security Agency, Public Assistance Report #8, 1945.

Wilson, G., and Ryland, G. Social Group Work Practice. New York, Riverside Press, 1949.

Wittenberg, Rudolph. So You Want to Help People. New York, Association Press, 1947.