

1950

# Charts for evaluation in a group work setting

---

<https://hdl.handle.net/2144/5678>

*"Downloaded from OpenBU. Boston University's institutional repository."*

MS  
SS  
1950  
be  
C.2

BOSTON UNIVERSITY  
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

CHARTS FOR EVALUATION IN A GROUP WORK SETTING

A Thesis

Submitted by

Murray George Berman

(B.S., College of City of New York, 1948)

In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for  
the Degree of Master of Science in Social Service

1950

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
LIST OF TABLES. . . . .	iv
PREFACE . . . . .	v
CHAPTER	
I. THE STUDY. . . . .	1
Introduction . . . . .	1
Purpose. . . . .	2
Method . . . . .	3
Scope. . . . .	4
Value of Study . . . . .	5
Limitations. . . . .	5
Review of Literature . . . . .	9
Summary. . . . .	13
II. THE CHARTS . . . . .	14
Purpose and Function . . . . .	14
Method of Use. . . . .	14
The Individual Evaluation Chart. . . . .	17
The Group Evaluation Chart . . . . .	21
Summary. . . . .	23
III. THE QUESTIONNAIRE. . . . .	25
Introduction . . . . .	25
Findings . . . . .	25
Limitations. . . . .	36
Interpretations. . . . .	36
Summary. . . . .	43
IV. CHECK ON GROUP EVALUATION CHART RATINGS. . . . .	46
Method . . . . .	46
Findings and Interpretation. . . . .	49
Summary. . . . .	57
V. INTERVIEWS WITH PARENTS. . . . .	60

CHAPTER	PAGE
Method . . . . .	60
Findings, Limitations, and Interpretations .	63
Summary. . . . .	67
VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS. .	69
Introduction . . . . .	69
Summary of Findings and Interpretations. . .	69
Conclusions. . . . .	71
Recommendations. . . . .	72
Summary. . . . .	87
BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .	90
APPENDIX. . . . .	93

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. RATINGS OF HOW MUCH HELP CHARTS WERE TO LEADERS. . . . .	27
II. LEADERS' REPLIES ON AMOUNT OF ATTENTION GIVEN TO "NON-CHARTED MEMBERS" . . . . .	28
III. LEADERS' RANKINGS, IN ORDER OF HELPFULNESS, OF FACTORS THEY CAME IN CONTACT WITH AT DAY CAMP . . . . .	29
IV. LEADERS' RANKINGS OF FACTORS: BY NUMBER OF TIMES RANKED 3 AND OVER: AND 5 AND OVER. . .	29
V. CORRELATIONS DERIVED FROM CHECK ON GROUP EVALUATION CHART RATINGS . . . . .	48
VI. BREAKDOWN OF RATINGS INVOLVED IN CHECK ON GROUP EVALUATION CHART RATINGS . . . . .	56
VII. BREAKDOWN OF RATINGS INVOLVED IN CHECK ON INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION CHART RATINGS. . . . .	65
VIII. AGE AND SEX OF CAMPERS EVALUATED ON INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION CHARTS . . . . .	100
IX. AGE DISTRIBUTION OF GROUPS EVALUATED . . . . .	100

## PREFACE

The writer strongly recommends that "Charting Group Progress" (see bibliography) be read in conjunction with this thesis.

The writer wishes to acknowledge the cooperation of Hecht House in making available agency records for parts of this study.

Sincere thanks are extended to the ten leaders, and the campers' parents, who gave the time to answer questions, attend a meeting and furnish other information when requested.

## CHAPTER I - THE STUDY

## A. Introduction:

In every group worker's life there probably comes a time when he wonders whether the multitude of motions through which he goes in the course of his job are much ado about nothing or really significant contributions to the development of the community.<sup>1</sup>

Evaluation in group work is the measurement of the quality of a group's experience. This measurement is made in relation to the objectives and functions of the agency. Evaluation involves the formulation of criteria upon which judgments of growth and development may be based. When individuals and groups are studied for the purpose of determining their growth and development, subsequent experiences can be better provided to meet newly recognized needs. The improvement of program; modification of objectives, and the altering of the group situation, are considerations that would enter into the meeting of needs.

There are several ways in which group workers may know the extent to which they are accomplishing their objectives. Periodic evaluations, based upon observation of developments; based upon a reading of group records, or a combination of both, are the most commonly used methods.

---

1 Dorothea Sullivan, editor, The Practice of Group Work, "Criteria for Group Work.", p. 215.

B. Purpose:

This thesis is concerned with investigating the most recently developed means, charts, with which group workers may check upon the effectiveness of their efforts. The charts that this thesis will specifically deal with are those prepared by Professor Saul Bernstein.<sup>2</sup> They consist of an Individual Evaluation Chart, a Group Evaluation Chart, and a Member's Group Contribution Chart.

The investigation will include an examination of the manner in which these charts were used in a summer day camp program. An attempt will be made to determine the way in which the charts helped the leaders in their work with individuals and the group. The study should reveal how much help the leaders felt the charts were as well as some of their attitudes towards the instruments. Among the questions posed for the study is, how may the charts be improved so as best to fulfill their purpose? Part of this improvement will include the problem of the method of use whereby the charts will be of most value.

Other phases that the study will deal with include a check upon the consistency of each leader's Group Chart ratings with his group records. Similarly, there will be a check upon the consistency between the Individual Chart ratings and the evaluations made by parents.

---

<sup>2</sup> Saul Bernstein, Charting Group Progress, pp. 1-23.

### C. Method:

Questionnaires were submitted to those leaders who participated in filling out the charts. The questionnaire was constructed so as to obtain the information, relating to use of the charts, in line with what has been noted in the preceding "Purposes" section of this chapter. Information concerning the manner in which the charts were used was also obtained through special meetings and individual conferences with day camp unit heads and staff members of the agency.

A check upon the consistency between the leader's ratings on the group evaluation chart, and his group record was made as follows. Using the interpretations of the group chart criteria items which were furnished by each leader, his group record was read. Ratings were then made on a group evaluation chart based on the leader's interpretations. These ratings were then compared, for identical time periods, with the original group evaluation chart ratings made by the leader. The results of this comparison were then considered to be an indication of the consistency between the leader's ratings on the group evaluation chart and his group record.

A check upon the consistency between the leader's individual evaluation chart ratings and the parents' conception of the camper's development was made as follows. An arbitrary four point check scale, corresponding to the Individual Evaluation Chart scale, was

set up. The ratings of parents, derived from interviews with them, were entered on this scale. These ratings could then be directly compared with the ratings made by the leader.

D. Scope:

The study will deal with the Individual Evaluation Charts, Group Evaluation Charts, and Member's Group Contribution Charts filled out by ten leaders at a group work agency summer day camp during the 1949 season. One-third of the total number of leaders at the camp filled out the charts. Included in the category of "leader" were three specialists who did not have groups of their own. The ten leaders filled out a total of ten group charts for nine different groups. In one instance, two specialists each filled out a Group Evaluation Chart for the same group.

In the course of the season, the seven leaders and three specialists filled out a total of 169 Individual Evaluation Charts for twenty-seven campers. The mode was seven Individual Evaluation Charts per child. Twenty-three Member's Group Contribution Charts were filled out. Of the twenty-three campers charted on the Group Contribution Chart, all but two belonged to the group that was charted on the Individual Evaluation Charts.

The study also included interviews with parents of ten campers; comprising over one-third of those campers who were charted.

The scope, then, involves the questionnaire returns of ten leaders and a consideration of the charts they filled out, including a check upon the consistency between the leaders' records and their Group Evaluation Chart ratings. Interviews were held with a selected number of parents of campers and their ratings on the camper's development were compared with the Individual Evaluation Chart ratings made by the leaders. The scope is finally encompassed with conferences and meetings held with staff members and others connected with the summer day camp.

E. Value of Study:

It is hoped that the study will give some indication of the contribution that charts may have to offer as instruments for evaluation and for staff development in a group work setting. Recommendations, concerning the manner of using the charts will be offered on the basis of the research done. Suggestions for improvements in the structure of the charts will also be offered. An effort will be made to learn something about the best procedures for interpreting the charts to those who use them. The study will also reveal something about what may be expected in using the charts in a certain type of setting and with certain age groups.

F. Limitations:

The degree to which the results of the study can be applied in other group work agencies may be affected by the conditions

peculiar to the setting for which this research was done. One of the immediate factors which bears upon this point is that of how representative of leaders generally, were those leaders whose charts were used? The leaders whose charts were used were generally of a higher caliber as compared with the leaders that many agencies usually have.

The leaders ranged in age from 18 to 26 years old. Three of the leaders were college graduates. The remaining seven leaders were college students ranging from Freshman to Senior. Nine leaders had previous leadership experience ranging from a summer experience to several years of experience. Half of the leaders had previously taken a leadership training course. A brief sketch of each leader's background is given on pages 93-94.

The fact that they were employed, and higher standards could be applied to their selection, enters into the matter. The manner in which they may have viewed and handled everything connected with, and including, the charts probably differed from the way in which an average volunteer leader would have reacted. In this connection, their answers to the questionnaire may have been influenced by the desire of many of them to be hired again or to use their work as a reference.

The use of the charts was voluntary. However, as employees, some leaders may have felt a responsibility for doing the charts. It is also possible that since two-thirds of the leaders at the

camp did not volunteer, in addition to the feeling of responsibility just mentioned, those leaders that did volunteer did so because they had a particular interest in their work. The leaders who did volunteer were noted, by their supervisors, as being among the best leaders at the camp. This further decreased the probability of their being representative of leaders that are generally to be found in agencies.

In spite of the relatively high level of the leaders, the quality and quantity of their recording was low, in most instances. This presented itself as a limiting factor in the check between the leaders' records and their G r o u p Evaluation Chart ratings. Two additional factors were the leaders' lack of a clear understanding of the criteria items, and the method for using the charts. A limitation in this connection is the fact that Professor Bernstein's pamphlet, "Charting Group Progress," was not available to the leaders at the time.

The validity of the parents' answers, in some instances, is questionable in three respects. For one thing, the change, if any, in their child, that they were required to recall may have taken place over six months ago. Secondly, the parents' attitudes towards the camp would affect their impressions and memory. As regards impressions, if a mother was happy that the camp took her child "off her hands," in projecting, she might view the experience in a very positive light. On the other hand, if she

had some disagreeable experience, like being forced to send the child because he insisted, she might have been left with a negative impression that would transfer to her evaluation of the camp experience for her child. Similarly with memory, we tend to repress disagreeable memories so that a mother having had an unpleasant contact with camp might remember very little of the entire camp period.

Finally, the understanding that parents had of their child and of child behavior would also affect their impressions and retention. A leader, for example, may indicate progress when a "little Lord Fauntleroy" displays some normal aggression. Uninformed parents, however, may consider that the camp had made a "ruffian" out of their "little angel." On the other hand, parents may not remember incidents which indicated a development of normal aggression simply because they did not understand the implications in the first place.

Some positive answers of parents may have resulted from a desire to have their child admitted to the day camp again this year and, in spite of being told otherwise, assumed that their answers would bear upon the child's possibilities of being accepted.

G. Review of Literature in the Field:

As far back as 1927 we find articles<sup>3</sup> typical of that written by Richard K. Conant, in which the need for qualitative measurement in social work is expressed. An attempt was made to develop "cards that will score results and not merely record services."<sup>4</sup> A standardized list of questions was composed and the hope expressed that further study would "in the long run lead to better standardized and more complete measurement of results."<sup>5</sup>

In 1931, Richard C. Cabot notes that "the main value of evaluation is to insure better service to clients."<sup>6</sup> He points out that the "objection that the agency's work can't be measured because whole community influences enter is not valid if the agency expects public support."<sup>7</sup>

---

3 H. Emerson, "A Plea for the Measurement of Social Reconstruction," Survey, 55:465-466, 1926  
 Ellen F. Wilcox, "The Measurement of Achievement in Family Case Work," The Family, 8:46-49, April, 1927

4 Richard K. Conant, "How Shall We Measure the Results of Our Poor Law Administration?," Proceedings of the National Conference Of Social Work, 1931, p. 21.

5 Ibid., p. 488.

6 Richard C. Cabot, "Treatment in Social Case Work and the Need of Criteria of Its Success or Failure," Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work, 1931, p. 21.

7 Ibid., pp. 18-19.

Four years later, Eleanor Glueck urges that "the time is more than ripe for the development of evaluative criteria, crude as they necessarily must be."<sup>8</sup> About the same time, Arthur Swift warns that "unless we know how good a job we are doing, how can we intelligently plan to do a better one?"<sup>9</sup>

The literature during this decade (1926-1936) is replete with requests for studies dealing with evaluation and of accounts of small scattered instances of attempts made in this direction.<sup>10</sup>

There is a lack of literature dealing with evaluation in the years 1936 to 1939. At the beginning of this period, Glueck stated that "...criteria cannot be established unless the goals of social case work and social treatment can be clearly defined and broken down into their component elements..."<sup>11</sup> The economic factor, noted by Blenkner as one of the four major obstacles to research,<sup>12</sup> may have applied during this period.

---

8 Eleanor Glueck, Evaluative Research in Social Work, p. 19.

9 Arthur L. Swift, "Research and Methods of Evaluation in Group Work," Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work, 1936, p. 254.

10 Mary E. N. Ford, "An Evaluation of Parent Education Program," The Family, 17:230-236, Nov., 1936.

E.F. Reed, "A Scoring System for the Evaluation of Social Case Work," Social Service Review, 2:214-236, 1931.

11 Eleanor Glueck, op. cit., p. 19.

12 Margaret Blenkner, "Obstacles to Evaluative Research in Case Work: Part I," Social Casework, February, 1950, p. 57.

In the period 1939 to 1942, there is a renewed expression of interest in evaluation. Pray stresses the desirability of a "measurement and evaluation of social work needs and services."<sup>13</sup> He indicates that such an evaluation, when made, should help the community in defining its collective goals. During this interval, the Family Welfare Association of Evanston, Illinois, conducted and completed a study<sup>14</sup> of ninety-nine cases, but did not come to grips with the problem of reliability of judgment.

In 1947, the results of the long term Community Service Society study revealed an attempt made to deal with the reliability aspect of evaluation.<sup>15</sup> The Distress-Relief Quotient<sup>16</sup> was set up as a measuring instrument which would reflect the complexity of case work. The scale for judging movement in cases was designed to categorize this complexity and so improve the

---

✓ 13 K.L.M. Pray "In search of a Yardstick," Survey Midmonthly, September, 1940, p. 257.

14 T. Shiffman and Elma Olson, A Study In Family Case Work (An Attempt to Evaluate Service) pp. 1-32.

15 J. McV. Hunt, "Measuring the Effects of Social Case Work," Transactions of the New York Academy of Sciences, January, 1947, pp. 78-88.

16 John Dollard and Hobart Mowrer, "A Method of Measuring Tension in Written Documents," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, January, 1947, pp. 3-28.

various weaknesses found in uncultivated case worker judgments.<sup>17</sup> Research projects,<sup>18</sup> similar to the C.S.S. studies are indicative of the current interest in evaluation. The classification of "research method" as a field for basic research is a development that should result in aiding the study of evaluation in social work.<sup>19</sup>

Literature dealing with evaluation in group work is meager. Group work is in the stage of developing instruments for evaluation and here there is a minimum of research recorded as having been conducted with the instruments that are available. "Charting Group Progress" appears to be the pioneer literature dealing with charts as instruments for evaluation.

---

17 J. McV. Hunt, "Measuring Movement in Casework," Journal of Social Casework, November, 1948, pp. 343-351.

18 A.A. Heckman, "Measuring the Effectiveness of Agency Services," Journal of Social Casework, December, 1948, pp. 394-399.

A.A. Heckman and Allan Stone, "Forging New Tools," Survey Midmonthly, October, 1947, pp. 267-270.

19 "A Report of the Workshop on Research in Social Work," Research in Social Work, January, 1948, p. 9.

#### H. Summary:

Evaluation is an important aspect of the group work process for aiding in the development of improved service. This thesis will study the use of charts prepared for evaluative purposes by Professor Saul Bernstein. These charts are an Individual Evaluation Chart, a Group Evaluation Chart, and a Member's Group Contribution Chart.

Questionnaires were submitted to the ten leaders who used the charts as part of a summer day camp assignment. A check upon the consistency between the leader's ratings on the Group Evaluation Chart and his group record was made. A check upon the consistency between the leader's Individual Evaluation Chart ratings and the parent's conception of the camper's developments was made.

One-third of the total number of leaders at the day camp filled out the charts. A limitation may be present in the point of how representative of leaders generally were those leaders whose charts were used? The validity of parents' answers may be questionable in some instances.

There has been considerable literature on the topic of evaluation in the case work field, going as far back as 1926. There has been a meagerness of evaluative research in group work up to the present time.

## CHAPTER II - THE CHARTS

### A. Purpose and Function:

The charts (pages 18, 20, 22) were devised to serve as a simplified system for checking upon the degree to which objectives are being fulfilled. As a result, special attention can be given in those areas where negative trends appear.

Besides serving as an aid in the supervision of leaders, the charts provide a spot-check means for administrators wishing to know how agency services are meeting particular needs of the membership, in particular situations.

Providing evidence of general positive trends is often effective material for budget committees that are concerned with the value of agency service. Effectiveness of different programs and of different methods may also be approximated from the trends indicated by the charts.

The criteria items can help in developing a sharper focus for the leader's thinking as well as bringing an awareness of significant factors concerning individuals and the group, that should be observed and recorded. In this instance, the direct affect of the charts as instruments for staff development is apparent.

### B. Method of Use:

The criteria that were selected for the charts were based on what were considered significant factors in group work. The items may have been worded many ways. Each criterion item was

meant to be representative of certain important elements in the group work process.

The evaluators check the box intersected by the item and that column of the four point scale that they feel the movement of the group or individual justifies. The checking of the columns should be done relative to the previous week's ratings. With the previous rating used as the basis for comparison the trends of movement should appear clearly.

The intended usage of the rating columns, then, is to indicate the trends of the individual or group which the column heading most accurately portrays. The checking of the "Static" column means that the member (or group) is maintaining the same level of one of the other three columns in which he was rated on the previous chart.

For example, if a member or group is rated "Great Progress" one week and then makes no further progress, the rating for this second week should be made in the "Static" column. Only if the member or group has made further "Great Progress," relative to the first week's rating of "Great Progress," should the rating for the second week be entered again in the "Great Progress" column. "Slight Progress" would be checked on the second period chart only if the second week's movement indicated "Slight Progress" over the first period's "Great Progress" rating. As long as the member or group does not make any further progress, the rating for the item will remain in the "Static" column.

If there should be some progress at a later time this would be rated according to degree in the "Slight Progress" or "Great Progress" column. If the member's or group's level of development should fall, this would be noted by a check in the "Regression" column.

The suggested time interval for using the charts in a camp setting was every other week for the Individual and Group Evaluation Charts and every two days for the Member's Group Contribution Chart. The ratings on the charts that this study is concerned with were made according to the suggested time interval.

Leaders at the day camp were given an orientation to the use of the charts during a pre-season training course at the day camp. Use of the charts was initiated at the beginning of the camp season.

Several months after the camp season the following points were brought out in a meeting of leaders and unit heads (supervisors) who participated in the use of the charts. The unit heads present at the meeting agreed that the purpose of the charts was clear to the leaders using them. There was little agreement as to the basis upon which ratings were made. Some noted that ratings were made in relation to the first ratings made at the beginning of the season. Others believed that ratings were made according to some absolute standards the leader had in mind. Still others felt that ratings were made in relation to the previous week's ratings, as should have been done according to the orientation given at the time the charts were distributed.

The unit heads expressed the feeling that, having had no previous orientation to the use of the charts, they did not feel in a position to offer assistance to leaders, let alone use the charts as part of supervision. They were also under the impression that since the day camp director was in charge of the chart project and the charts were submitted to him, he would be taking the responsibility for any follow-up connected with the project. As a result the use of the chart was reduced to a matter of the group leader filling out the charts and submitting them regularly to the unit head. Once submitted, the charts were not available to the leader.

It was noted that the orientation given the leaders was limited. A brief explanation was given of the criteria items but the leaders were left to work out their own understanding of each item.

It was said to have been understood from the orientation that leaders were to omit filling out ratings for those criteria items that they felt did not apply. Actually, the criteria items were intended to be general enough to apply, with further interpretation, to almost every instance.

#### The Individual Evaluation Chart:

If conditions permitted, there would be advantages in filling out a chart for every member. Since this ideal state is seldom possible some basis for selection of members must be decided upon.

Name of Member Lawrence CarrName of Group MarvelsName of Leader Trent, BarryINDIVIDUAL EVALUATION CHART

INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA	TRENDS			
	Retro- gression	Static	Slight Progress	Great Progress
1. Attendance		X		
2. New skills and interests			X	
3. New Knowledge				X
4. Wider Loyalties			X	
5. Degree & Range of partici- pation				X
6. Leadership			X	
7. Breakdown of prejudices		X		
8. Status in group			X	
9. Symptoms of maladjustment		X		
10. Health		X		
11. Vocational developments	X			
12. Educational developments	X			

Period Evaluated  
 From: **Sept. 13**  
 To: **Sept. 27, 1900**

Prepared by:  
 Saul B. Bernstein  
 Boston University  
 School of Social Work  
 84 Exeter Street  
 Boston, Mass.

Those members for whom there is concern for special reasons may be selected. Included immediately would be those members who present serious problems and those members that are constructive forces in the group. As a check, and a fulcrum point, it would be well to select a third type of member who may be classified as an "average" member. Leaders were asked to select children of each type to use the charts for in this project, and they attempted to comply.

The leaders participating in the project charted from one to five individuals with a mode of four individuals charted per leader. Table V (page 100) shows the age and sex distribution of the campers on whom the Individual Evaluation Charts were used. It is interesting to note the approximate equality between the total number of boys and the total number of girls charted, considering that no effort at sampling was made. Also noteworthy is the heavy concentration of members charted at either age extreme. The fact that the leaders in the lowest age bracket felt that the charts might be applicable to their campers is encouraging. The eight to eleven age bracket is representative of a large proportion of "Juniors" in group work agencies and the concentration of members of this age that were charted in this project offers some good material for this study.

In the use of the charts, the most important consideration, as has been previously elaborated upon, is that it deals with trends. The basis for ratings should be made relative to the

Name of Group MarvelsName of Leader Trent, BarryGROUP EVALUATION CHART

Group Criteria	Trends			
	Retro- gression	Static	Slight Progress	Great Progress
1. Attendance		X		
2. Group organization			X	
3. Group standards		X		
4. Wider horizons			X	
5. Social responsibility				
a. To each other	X			
b. To agency		X		
c. To community		X		
6. Enriched interests			X	
7. Handling conflicts	X			
8. Leadership and Participation		X		
9. Cooperative Planning				X
10. Group thinking				X
11. Group loyalty & morale			X	
12. Acceptance of differences	X			
13. Decreasing need of leader		X		

Pre  
 Period Evaluated  
 From: **Sept. 13**  
 To: **Sept. 20, 1900**

Prepared by:  
 Saul B. Bernstein  
 Boston University  
 School of Social Work  
 84 Exeter Street  
 Boston, Mass.

previous period. With the Individual Evaluation Chart, the emphasis should always be comparative for the same person.

#### The Group Evaluation Chart:

As with the Individual Evaluation Chart, it is important that ratings from one period to the next be a comparison for the same group and not a comparison between groups.

Since a group is composed of many individuals, the criteria for individuals apply to an extent to the group so that there are some criteria items on the Group Chart that are similar to those on the Individual Evaluation Chart. Table VI (page 100) shows the age distribution of the groups that were charted. As with the Individual Evaluation Charts, it is interesting that on a volunteer basis the distribution worked out so that with one exception there were two groups charted in each age bracket at the camp.

#### The Member's Group Contribution Chart:

The horizontal lines on the Member's Group Contribution Chart represent a scale from minus five to plus five. Vertical lines are to be used for indicating dates upon which ratings are made. An "X" should be placed at that point which the behavior of the member merits. It may have to be an average of particular points on the minus five to plus five range when variable behavior is displayed by a member during the time of any one rating.



As the title implies, the focus of the Member's Group Contribution Chart is on what the member contributes to the development of the group and not on his total personality. There is also a greater frequency of rating on this chart, preferably for each meeting of the group. As indicated previously, the practice in this project was to make a rating every other day.

The assessments made are more on an absolute basis than is true of the other charts. That is, ratings were made on the basis of the member's behavior at the particular meeting, and not in relation to his behavior at the last meeting.

C. Summary:

The charts may serve as a check upon the degree to which objectives are being fulfilled and allow for making necessary adjustments in this connection. The charts can serve in staff training by sharpening the leader's focus and indicating factors to observe and record upon. The charts can also serve in supervision, administration, and as material for budget committees.

Ratings on the charts are to be made relative to the previous week's ratings. The movement thus noted would indicate the trends for the individual or group.

Unit heads agreed that the purpose of the charts was clear to the leaders using them. There was little agreement as to the basis upon which ratings were made. Use of the charts was a matter of the group leader filling them out and submitting them

each week. The charts were not discussed and once submitted they were not available to the leader.

The orientation given the leaders was limited. The leaders understood that they were to omit filling out ratings for those criteria items that they felt did not apply.

Twelve girls and fifteen boys, ranging in age from five and a half to eleven years of age, were rated on the Individual Evaluation Chart. There was a concentration of members charted at each end of the age range.

Nine groups were rated on the Group Evaluation Chart; (with one exception) two groups from each age bracket at camp.

Twenty-three campers were rated on the Member's Group Contribution Chart.

### CHAPTER III - THE QUESTIONNAIRE

#### A. Introduction:

In November, 1949, the letter and questionnaire (pages 95-99 ) were mailed out to the leaders who filled out the charts this study is concerned with. All those solicited responded promptly, probably indicating their interest in the project.

The questionnaire was constructed with the aim of learning whether the charts were helpful to the leaders in their work, and if so, in what way and how much. It was also the goal of the questionnaire to determine the way in which the leaders used the charts; their understanding of the purpose and methods for using the charts, and how they felt these points might have been improved. The questionnaire also sought to discover the effects that use of the Individual Evaluation Chart had upon charted members and members who weren't charted.

#### B. Findings:

All ten leaders questioned replied that they found the charts helpful to them in their work at the day camp. In the breakdown of this question, as to whether each specific chart was helpful, the leaders answered eight times in the affirmative for the Individual Evaluation Chart; seven times in the affirmative for the Group Evaluation Chart and six times in the affirmative for the Member's Group Contribution Chart.

Excerpts are given on page 101 from the leaders' statements as to the ways in which they found the charts to have been helpful.

The variety of reasons offered may be summarized as follows:

Ways in which charts were helpful in work at day camp:

1. Presented specific criteria that could be observed and applied in working with individuals and groups.
2. Criteria could serve as goals to be achieved; as a guide in programming; and as an aid in writing records.
3. Offered a composite picture with trends that pointed up areas requiring attention. Allowed for greater objectivity on leader's part.
4. Served as a means for evaluating the day camp experience and as a stimulus for rethinking certain objectives.

The summarized breakdown for each of the three types of charts, gave the reasons above and in addition:

Ways in which the Individual Evaluation Chart was helpful in work at day camp: (Excerpts on Page 102)

1. Gave leader a better understanding of camper's personality so that his attitude towards the child was improved and his relation with the child was better.
2. Allowed for helping the child make a better adjustment in the group.
3. Provided a means for noting the child's development.
4. Noted traits to be looked for and gave direction to remedial work.

Ways in which the Group Evaluation Chart was helpful in work at day camp: (Excerpts on Page 103)

1. Showed how individual improvement affects the group's behavior, but still kept leader's focus on the group.

Ways in which the Member's Group Contribution Chart was helpful in work at day camp: (Excerpts on Page 104)

1. Child's pattern of behavior, indicated by chart, prepared leader in dealing with camper accordingly.

Table I below shows how much help leaders felt they got from the charts. The increasing number of the total ratings in the "None" to "Much" range is immediately striking. The Group Evaluation Chart received the greatest number of ratings in the

TABLE I

RATINGS OF HOW MUCH HELP CHARTS WERE TO LEADERS IN DAY CAMP, 1949

Chart	Ratings				
	None	Little	Moderate	Much	Moderate plus Much
Individual Evaluation Chart		2	5	3	8
Group Evaluation Chart	1	2	2	5	7
Member's Group Contribution Chart	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>
Total Ratings	3	7	9	11	20

"Much" column but the combined totals of the "Moderate" and "Much" columns reveals that the Individual Evaluation Chart received the greatest number of ratings. Only the Member's Group Contribution Chart did not receive a majority of its ratings above the "Little" point of the scale.

Eight leaders found they were stimulated to give more attention to "charted members" in comparison to those members who were not charted. The remaining two leaders in the study

found that they gave the same amount of attention to charted and non-charted members. This did not mean, however, that non-charted members were necessarily neglected because of the greater attention given to charted members. Table II below shows that sixty per cent of the leaders polled noted that they did not give less attention to non-charted members. Twenty per cent of the leaders even gave greater attention to non-charted

TABLE II.

LEADERS' REPLIES AS TO WHETHER THEY WERE STIMULATED TO GIVE GREATER OR LESS ATTENTION TO NON-CHARTED MEMBERS

Question	Reply	
	Yes	No
Less attention to non-charted members?	4	6
Greater attention to non-charted members?	2	8

members as a result of their contact with the Individual Evaluation Chart.

When the leaders were asked to rank, in order of helpfulness, (Table III) the various factors they came in contact with at day camp, it is found that the Individual Evaluation Chart is one of the two receiving the most ratings for rank three or higher, and for rank five and over (Table IV.)

TABLE III

LEADERS' RANKINGS, IN ORDER OF HELPFULNESS, OF FACTORS  
THEY CAME IN CONTACT WITH AT DAY CAMP, 1949

Factors	Rank										No Help	No Contact	Total Across
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10			
Group Evaluation Chart	1	2	1	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	1	0	10
Agency check-off list for campers	2	2	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	11
Individual Evaluation Chart	1	1	3	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	9
Member's Group Contri- bution Chart	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	0	10
Pre-Season Trng. Course	2	1	0	1	0	3	0	1	1	0	1	0	10
Reading literature related to work	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	10
Day camp unit conferences	3	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	10
Day camp staff conferences	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	3	0	10
Supervisory conferences	1	3	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	10
Writing of records	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>10</u>
Total rankings	14	11	10	9	8	8	6	4	3	1	15	11	100

TABLE IV.

LEADERS' RANKINGS, IN ORDER OF HELPFULNESS, OF FACTORS  
THEY CAME IN CONTACT WITH AT DAY CAMP, 1949

Factors	Number of Times Ranked	
	Rank 3 and Over	Rank 5 and Over
Group Evaluation Chart	4	5
Agency check-off list for campers	4	7
Individual Evaluation Chart	5	7
Member's Group Evaluation Chart	3	5
Pre-Season Training Course	3	4
Reading literature related to work	2	4
Day camp unit conferences	4	6
Day camp staff conferences	2	3
Supervisory conferences	5	6
Writing of records	3	5

The Group Evaluation Chart with forty per cent of its ratings above the third ranking position is found among the three runners-up for second place. The Member's Group Contribution Chart, with a score of three (for rank three and over) is tied for third place. It is noteworthy, however, that while the heaviest concentration of ratings is in the one to six ranking positions, the Member's Group Contribution Chart is one of the two factors receiving the most ratings in the "No Help" column. The Group Evaluation, and Individual Evaluation Charts were each ranked but once in the "No Help" column and the lowest ranking for both was seventh.

The consensus of answers to the "Leaders' understanding of the purpose for using the charts" (question seven) follows:

1. Participation in a research project.
2. Help them in their understanding of the children and the group, while providing a means for noting progress and evaluating camp experience.

Listed on page 105 are the complete responses given by leaders as to their understanding of the purpose for using the charts. In certain instances, excerpts of their responses are given for the sake of brevity.

In making up a composite of the "meaning of criteria items," as offered by leaders, (question eight) an effort was made to have the composite stated, as well as possible, in the leader's own words. Pages 106 - 109 list excerpts from, and the complete responses to, meanings of criteria items as furnished by the

leaders. Following below are the composite criteria meanings of group criteria items:

1. Attendance - Overall attendance of group including implications of interest and health and reasons for absences.
2. Group Organization - Capability of working together in a cooperative and effective manner, including arrangements for functioning as an organized group.
3. Group Standards - The interest of the group, working efficiently, and operating under a code of moral values established by themselves.
4. Wider Horizons - New and enlarging interests, skills and knowledge, with a development of self-realization and a vision above the immediate situation. The informal learning aspect of this criteria and the similarity of this criteria item with "Enriched Interests" was noted.
5. Social Responsibility:
  - a. To each other - Consideration and respect for other's rights, feelings, and well-being, with a willingness to help towards these ends.
  - b. To agency - Care and non-destruction of agency property and a loyalty to, and recognition of agency.
  - c. To community - Recognition of relation to the community and consideration of public property was cited. This item was not answered in most cases.
6. Enriched Interests - Deeper interests, with an expansion of curiosity, a desire to learn new activities, and looking forward to future events. These things may sometimes have a carry-over effect to other areas.
7. Handling Conflicts - Frequency and intensity of conflicts, and manner and judgment in handling them are among the factors which show the emotional development of the group.
8. Leadership and Participation - Noting and developing abilities of campers to organize activities, lead the group, as well as full participation shown by

interest in group activities and a willingness to give of one's self.

9. Cooperative Planning - All members share in deciding what to do and in planning good naturedly on one goal for the group; postponing satisfaction and thinking for the future.
10. Group Thinking - Group shows initiative in thinking and planning and acting in terms of the group and its welfare. The level of thought would include such factors as accepting the solutions made by the majority according to the group standards and organization.
11. Group Loyalty and Morale - Loyalty to the group as a whole as seen by an increase in the number of individual loyalties. An appreciation for the group leading to increasing morale and spirit including ability to get along and an awareness of one another.
12. Acceptance of Differences - A broadmindedness characterized by a lessening of superior feelings, an absence of "cliques," decreasing prejudices, acceptance of physical differences and negative behavior of other children.
13. Decreasing Need of Leader - Efficiency with which group could function, in an orderly manner, for any length of time, independent of censorship of leader.

Note has previously been made of the existence of similarities between several criteria items on the Group Evaluation Chart and those on the Individual Evaluation Chart. These similarities in criteria items resulted in similar meanings given by leaders for such items. A composite of meanings of criteria items, as offered by leaders, has only been made, therefore, for those criteria items on the Individual Evaluation Chart that did not have similar criteria items on the Group Evaluation Chart.

In practical terms, this reduced itself to the two criteria items which follow. This can also be accounted for in the

similarity found between certain criteria items on the Individual Evaluation Chart itself. The meanings of criteria items given by the leaders (page 106) revealed the great similarity that they felt existed between criteria items two, three, eleven and twelve (New skills and interests, New knowledge, Vocational developments, Educational developments.) The composite meanings of criteria items below, again have been put as much as possible in the words which the leaders used:

8. Status in group - Popularity and relative position in the group on a hierarchy scale, as illustrated in his acceptance by the group, affect of his attitude on other members and whether his role was an active or passive one.
9. Symptoms of maladjustment - Mental and physical symptoms of emotional instability such as passivity, isolation, belligerency, thumb-sucking, masturbation, ties. Criteria helped in determining reasons for member's behavior.

When questioned (question 8-b, page 98) as to whether they used the same meanings of criteria items during the entire season, two-thirds of the leaders who answered indicated that they did. One leader did not answer this question. Of the three leaders who answered in the negative, two of them said they were not clear about criteria items eleven and twelve (Vocational developments, Educational developments) on the Individual Evaluation Chart. One of them also thought that item seven (Breakdown of Prejudices) on this chart was not clear. The criteria items that were noted as "not clear" on the Group Evaluation Chart were items three, five and ten (Group standards, Social responsibility,

Group thinking.)

Eighty per cent of the leaders in the study claimed that they used the previous week's ratings as a basis for comparison in filling out the Individual and Group Evaluation Charts. One of the leaders stated that he used his own standards as a basis; his sense of where the group (or individual) should be in its development. Another leader said that at different times during the season he used different methods.

When asked to pass judgment upon the degree of their understanding of the purposes and methods for using the charts, eighty per cent of the leaders noted that they did not feel their understanding was good enough for them to have done as adequate a job as they were capable of doing. The twenty per cent who answered in the affirmative added that they would still have liked some additional help.

The additional help that all ten leaders expressed a desire for was voted by them as follows. Eight checks were cast for a more thorough orientation and follow up, and eight more for the provision of definite anchor points for the scale on the Member's Group Contribution Chart. Following closely behind, with seven checks, was the desire to have the charts discussed in supervisory conferences. Trailing further behind, with but fifty per cent of the possible maximum of checks, is the request for a printed sheet of explanations of the criteria items.

Several interesting points were brought out by the leaders under the "General Comments" section of the questionnaire. The specialist leaders did not have as frequent contact with the children as the group leaders had. This prompted one of the specialists to remark that the charts would have been more helpful if she met with the group more frequently. Another specialist also felt that the charts could have been more helpful if she met with the group more frequently and had more material to base her ratings on. One group leader felt that the charts could have been more valuable if they were clearer in meaning.

Several leaders commented that it was difficult for them to make ratings because the charts were collected each week. One of these leaders admitted that he didn't understand whether progress was to be noted on the basis of all preceding charts. In answer to an earlier question this leader had stated that his ratings were made in comparison to the previous week's ratings.

One leader felt that in some items (group standards, new interests) it might have been fairer to evaluate monthly rather than for shorter periods. This leader also found that it was hard to rate anything but striking differences on the Individual Evaluation Chart. A similar problem was encountered in making ratings on the Member's Group Contribution Chart because it was "hard to decide upon the values to be given to various acts of the children."

One leader related that he had no information concerning the basis for comparison in making ratings and as a result his "evaluations were almost meaningless."

A very hopeful leader went as far as expressing a wish for the charts to include something about remedial work that could be done on the basis of findings from use of the charts.

C. Limitations:

Some of the limitations of the questionnaire have been discussed in chapter one in relation to the effect these limitations had upon the entire study. The point about the leaders who used the charts being generally above the average of leaders that are usually found in group work agencies, was noted. This had its positive side in that many significant points were brought out in the answers that the leaders gave to the questionnaire. It also had its limitation inasmuch as it may be expected that the "average" leader would not have had as good an understanding of the purpose and use of the charts and so would have offered different points to take into consideration in attempting better to adapt the charts for general use. There is also present the possibility that the leaders' answers may have been influenced by a feeling that certain responses should be made in a certain way if they were to be a good reflection upon the leader's capabilities.

D. Interpretations:

The fact that all ten leaders found the charts helpful

to them in their work at the day camp is a good indication of the possible values that may be looked for in the use of evaluation charts. This is further substantiated by the results that show an increasing number of ratings for the ranking order from "None" to "Much" as to the amount of help these charts were (question three.) The reasons for the particular answers given for each of the charts, as concerns "helpfulness," may be attributed to several factors.

The Member's Group Contribution Chart probably was ranked lowest of the three charts (in questions two and three) because leaders must have found it the most difficult one upon which to make ratings. Its low rating is further borne out in question six where it is one of the two items out of ten to receive the highest number of "No Help" checks. Judging from the difficulty with criteria items as expressed in other answers to the questionnaire (eight, nine and ten) it would seem that the absence of criteria items for the Member's Group Contribution Chart made it most difficult to use. This interpretation seems further borne out when it is noted that "Definite anchor points on graph" is one of the most requested items.

It is significant that the Individual Evaluation Chart received the highest number of "Yes" answers as to whether it was helpful; received the highest combined score of ratings in the "Moderate" and "Much" columns for amount of helpfulness, and was the only one of the three charts not to receive a rating in the

"None" column. Furthermore, the Individual Evaluation Chart was rated first, together with the agency check-off list, for rank five and over and took first place with supervisory conferences for rank three and over. The reason for these high ratings for the Individual Evaluation Chart may be attributed to the factor of the importance of criteria. This factor which caused the low rating for the Member's Group Contribution Chart, which had no criteria, may have operated favorably for the Individual Evaluation Chart.

Another instance is seen in the lower number of "Not Clear" comments for the Individual Evaluation Chart criteria items, as compared with the number of such comments about the Group Evaluation Chart criteria. Part of this is, no doubt, due to a failure to adapt the criteria items for the age group the chart was being used for. Failure to adapt criteria items, however, further indicates the lack of clarity of the criteria items.

Another point that may be considered as entering into the higher rating of the Individual Evaluation Chart is that a similar check-off list for individuals (page 110) was used concurrently as part of the agency supervisory process. The clearer understanding of individual criteria items coming from supervision with the agency chart probably had a carry-over to the Individual Evaluation Chart.

It is also possible that the leaders had found it easier to think of the criteria items in the rating of one individual than

in the rating of an entire group of individuals with the additional elements resulting from member-interplay. Part of this probably comes from being accustomed to thinking about individuals as part of a general living experience more so than one thinks about groups. Similarly, one might not develop any set of criteria with which to judge groups as readily as they might do in the case of individuals.

When the leaders' statements of the ways in which the charts were helpful are examined, the following points seem to emerge: Two out of the four major summarized reasons<sup>1</sup> speak about the value of the charts in relation to the uses that can be made of the criteria items.

The third and fourth summaries of leaders' statements on the ways in which the charts were helpful represent the major reasons for which the charts were prepared. The use of the chart for evaluative purposes often became a secondary rather than a primary purpose. This interpretation seems justified after examining summaries of the ways in which each of the three charts were individually rated for their helpfulness. These summaries (page 101) show the weight given to the criteria aspect of the chart in relation to its use as a means of evaluation.

The fact that the Individual Evaluation Chart tied for first place with supervisory conferences, for the combined ratings for

---

<sup>1</sup> supra p. 26,27.

the first three ranks can be interpreted as evidence of the high regard the chart was held in. Further than this, the prospects of the value to come out of the joint use of the chart with supervision seems even more promising, especially inasmuch as seventy per cent of the leaders requested this.

It may be expected that the leaders exercised a certain amount of care in the use of the charts and in the filling out of the questionnaire because they indicated an understanding of the purpose for using the charts to be "participation in a research project." Other indications of interest, such as prompt response, has been previously noted. That the leaders looked to the charts as an aid may be construed as an indication of a positive attitude on their parts.

The composite of the meanings of criteria items (pages 31-36) favorably compare with the explanations of criteria given by the person who prepared the charts for all but two items. For "Cooperative Planning" and "Group Thinking" the explanations given by Professor Bernstein place the major focus on the structural processes involved. The leaders viewed these items primarily in terms of the functioning of the members and the group. This appears as further substantiation of a previously given interpretation as to the greater familiarity and ease with which leaders focus on individuals rather than the group and the processes connected with its operation as a unit.

A comparison of the explanations of Professor Bernstein<sup>2</sup> with each of the leaders' statements on criteria items reveals that, individually taken, each one of the leaders' explanations is but a part of the total number of ways in which the criteria should be considered. The need for some method of giving leaders a better understanding of criteria items seems indicated. The fact that thirty per cent of the leaders did not consistently use the same meanings for criteria is pertinent.

The criteria items on both evaluation charts indicated as not being clear appear to be among those (criteria items) which need more specific illustrations (than the other items) of how they could have been applied to younger age groups. "Group Thinking" one of the criteria items for which the leaders and Professor Bernstein gave different explanations, was among the criteria items noted by the leaders as not being clear. Apparently it cannot be assumed that if leaders give explanations of criteria and believe they understand the criteria that their understanding will fit in with the way in which it is hoped the criteria will be used. It is here that supervision would come into play.

Several factors seem to cast doubt upon the claim by eighty per cent of the leaders that they used the previous week's ratings as a basis for comparison in filling out the Individual and

---

<sup>2</sup> Bernstein, op. cit., pp. 9-14, 18, 19.

Group Evaluation Charts. The lack of higher correlations between ratings by leaders and ratings based on their records<sup>3</sup> is among the factors. If the questionnaire had included a request for a statement on the manner in which ratings were made, it might well have been found that what actually happened was as follows. The then current ratings were made in relation to the ratings of the previous week but then were not entered on the charts as such. For example, the leader might have found that in relation to the previous week's ratings of "Great Progress" the member or group had done the same things for the then current period. Instead of entering this as "Static," however, the leader the leader rated it directly as "Great Progress" on the basis that if doing these things one week deserved a rating of "Great Progress" then doing these same things the following week deserved a rating of "Great Progress."

That eighty per cent of the leaders directly and twenty per cent indirectly noted a lack of adequate understanding of the purposes and methods for using the charts may also mean that the leaders did not make ratings as prescribed. One final point that raises the question as to the basis used for making ratings comes from the fact that the leaders had to turn in the charts each week. Unless they could remember over twenty-five ratings they had no

---

<sup>3</sup> infra, Chapter IV.

basis upon which to make ratings that were relative to ratings of the previous week.

That all the leaders in the project requested help with the charts is a clear commandment for the development of means by which this need can be met. The majority of responses to three of the four possibilities for help suggested in the questionnaire (question ten) gives some indication of the lines along which to work. Again caution should be exercised in not minimizing the need for clarification of criteria items even though only fifty per cent of the leaders asked for it. As already noted, the fragmentary comparison of each leader's criteria item understanding with the fuller explanation offered by Professor Bernstein is one of the danger signals to be heeded.

E. Summary:

All ten leaders found the charts helpful to them in their work at the day camp. The Individual Evaluation Chart was most helpful and the Member's Group Contribution Chart least helpful.

The leaders found that both evaluation charts were helpful in relation the uses that could be made of the criteria items as goals, as points for emphasis and as a guide in programming. The charts served as an aid in observing and understanding the group and its members and in writing records. The leaders also found the charts helpful for evaluative purposes although this often became a secondary rather than a primary purpose.

Use of the Individual Evaluation Chart stimulated the leaders to give greater attention to "charted members" without necessarily giving less attention to "non-charted members;" sometimes even giving greater attention to "non-charted members" as a result of having contact with the Individual Evaluation Chart.

The leaders understood the purpose for using the charts to be for research and as an aid to them in their work at the day camp.

Meanings of criteria items furnished by each leader were individually very limited in comparison with the total number of ways in which the explanation of Professor Bernstein indicated that the criteria should be considered. One-third of the leaders did not consistently use the same meanings for criteria.

Eighty per cent of the leaders claimed that they used the previous week's ratings as a basis for comparison in filling out the Individual and Group Evaluation Charts.

Eighty per cent of the leaders noted that they did not feel that their understanding of the methods for using the charts was good enough for them to have done as adequate a job as they were capable of doing. All ten leaders requested additional help in the use of the charts.

Among the difficulties connected with the use of the charts was the lack of an adequate orientation including the providing of explanations of criteria. These factors may account for the failure of some leaders to adapt criteria to their particular age group. The factors may also account for the leaders being unclear

about some of the criteria.

"Vocational developments," "Educational developments," and "Breakdown of prejudices" were criteria items (on the Individual Evaluation Chart) that were noted by leaders as being unclear. The first two of these items were noted as "not applicable" in addition to "Health," "Group Standards," "Social Responsibility" and "Group Thinking" were the Group Evaluation Chart criteria that were noted as being unclear. "Social responsibility to community" was noted as "not applicable."

There is some question as to the basis upon which ratings were made. The weekly collection of charts and the actual manner in which ratings may have been made are among the factors raising this question.

## CHAPTER IV - CHECK BETWEEN RATINGS

## A. Method:

Each leader submitted a sheet with his understanding of each group criteria item written out. Using the leader's understanding of the criteria item, each item was taken separately and the leader's group record was read with his understanding of the item kept in mind by the reader. A rating would then be made for the period covered by the group record. This rating was based upon all the material in the record that would enter into making a rating for the particular criteria item under consideration; all this being done in relation to the leader's understanding of the item. This process was repeated for each of the thirteen group criteria items submitted by each of the ten leaders. Ratings made on this basis were then compared for identical time periods with the original group evaluation ratings of the leader.

Since leaders wrote group records every other week, there were only four records available for the eight week period. The charts chosen for comparison were therefore those that were rated for the same weeks that records were written for. The writer made a total of 480 "Evaluation Chart" ratings from reading the leaders' records. An equal number of computations for correlations were made.

The results of these comparisons between ratings were tabulated in the following ways:

1. Each rating made by the leader was checked against the rating, for the same time period, based upon the reading of the leader's record. Since four such comparisons were made for each criteria item, if each of the comparisons were identical there would be a perfect correlation of 1.00 for that particular criteria item. If only three out of the four comparisons were the same then the correlation would be .75, and so forth. A correlation of this type was made for each of the twelve criteria items on the ten sets of Group Evaluation Charts that leaders filled out. This correlation then is the comparison for individual criteria items between the leader's ratings and the ratings based on the leader's records. The criteria item "Attendance" was not dealt with because the concern was with primarily qualitative criteria. (Table VII p. 48)
2. On each of the ten sets, the correlations for individual criteria items were statistically treated to find a mean average of these correlations. The mean average of criteria item correlations is the general correlation. This general correlation is the overall comparison between all of the leader's original ratings and the ratings based on the leader's records. Each general correlation is for one group or one individual. (Table VII p. 48)
3. The general correlations for each of the ten sets of Group Evaluation Charts were statistically treated to obtain a mean average for general correlations. The median was also obtained. The mean average for general correlations is the mean for all of the groups in this study.
4. The correlations for each of the individual criteria items on each of the ten sets were statistically treated to also obtain a mean average of the correlations for each of the twelve criteria items. (Table VII p. 48)
5. Ratings made in each of the four chart gradations were divided into three types and totals were taken for each type. (Table VIII p. 56) These types were:
  - a. Number of ratings the leader originally made in the column for the total of the four chart periods.
  - b. Number of ratings made in the gradation for the four periods on the basis of a reading of the leader's records.
  - c. Number of times ratings made on the basis of reading the group records were identical with the original ratings made by the leader.

TABLE V  
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN LEADER'S RATINGS  
AND RATINGS BASED ON READING LEADER'S GROUP RECORDS

Group Criteria	Correlations for Individual Criteria Items Leader #										Mean Average of Cor- relations for 10 leaders
	Leader No. →	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
2. Group organization	.75	.25	.66	.25	.75	.75	.25	.25	.50	.00	.441
3. Group standards	.50	.50	.66	.50	.50	1.00	.50	.00	.50	.00	.466
4. Wider horizons	.50	.25	.33	.75	.50	.75	.50	.50	.25	.00	.433
5. Social responsibility											
a. To each other	.50	.50	.33	.75	.00	.75	.00	.25	1.00	.50	.433
b. To agency	.75	.25	.33	.50	1.00	.25	.25	.50	1.00	.50	.533
c. To community	.50	.25	.00	.75	1.00	1.00	1.00	.75		.50	.639
6. Enriched interests	.75	.75	.66	1.00	.50	.50	.75	.50	.25	.00	.566
7. Handling conflicts	.25	.25	.00	.50	.50	.75	.00	.25	.25	.50	.325
8. Leadership and Participation	.50	.75	.33	.75	.25	.50	.25	.75	.25	.00	.433
9. Cooperative Planning	.50	.25	.33	.50	.25	.50	.00	.50	.50	.50	.383
10. Group thinking	.50	.50	.33	.50	.75	.50	.50	.25	.25	.00	.408
11. Group loyalty and morale	.75	.50	.33	.00	.50	.50	.00	.00	.25	.50	.333
12. Acceptance of differences	.50	.00	.66	.50	.50	.50	.75	.75	.50	.50	.516
13. Decreasing need of leader	.50	.50	.66	.25	.50	.50	.75	.00	.50	.00	.416
General Correlations	.554	.393	.400	.536	.536	.554	.393	.375	.442	.270	.445

B. Findings and Interpretation:

The "general correlations" ranged from .270 to .554. The "mean average for general correlations" was .445 and the median was .421. The lowest "general correlation" (.270) was based upon comparisons for only two periods; the leader having written group records for only two periods. The two records that this leader did write were very brief and lacked enough information upon which valid ratings might be made. The recording was also poor with a minimum of material dealing with the processes and functioning of the group and just an outline of the activities that the group participated in. The "recording" factor appears to be the major element contributing to this lowest "general correlation."

Several factors seem to enter into accounting for the lack of higher "general correlations" than the results reveal.

These may be itemized as follows:

1. As already noted, a major factor was lack of sufficient material concerned with criteria items in the group records. This often reduced the basis of ratings made on the group records to well-intended guesses based upon other distantly and not necessarily related information in the record.

The correlations which were highest were those where ratings were made from the most well written and informing group records. The two highest correlations were those with

the charts whose ratings were made by the leaders at the camp whose applications indicated that they had the best background in group work practice.

2. The agreement as to the meanings of the criteria items would directly affect ratings. As noted, the meanings of criteria items offered by the leaders were used in making ratings based upon reading the group records. Nevertheless, it may be assumed from the problems with criteria items (indicated in Chapter Three) that in many instances the criteria meaning stated by the leader was not the same one by which he made his ratings. The lack of common understanding of criteria can be a very significant factor influencing ratings.

3. In accordance with the prescribed use of the chart, ratings based upon reading the record were made in relation to the previous week's ratings. As has been noted in the preceding chapter, there is some question as to whether the leaders rated on this basis although the majority of them indicated that they did. A difference of this type in the use of the charts would greatly affect the degree of correlation. It is noteworthy that the lowest correlation was with the ratings made by a leader who stated that she did not use the prescribed basis for making ratings. A few trial ratings were made that were not entered as relative to the previous week's ratings. A rating was made, and if the development was on the same level as the previous week which was, for example, "Slight Progress," then it was entered as such rather than as

"Static" which would be in accordance with the prescribed use. In the few trials that were thus made, the correlation between the leader's ratings and those based on reading the group record were higher than if the ratings based on the group record were made relative to the previous week's rating.

4. The applicability of the criteria for young children is another factor that may affect ratings. In some few instances the criteria cannot validly be applied without a great deal of adaptation. In most cases, however, it is a question of explanation of the criteria and pointing out how they can be made applicable. "Social responsibility to community" for an adult might involve such aspects as social action. The same criteria applied to a young child might mean care of public property; for example, not tearing down branches of trees in the park, and so forth.

There were a few leaders who omitted ratings for criteria items that they could not apply. Most of the leaders rated all the items and several of them indicated that while they were entering ratings for some criteria items, they did not feel that the criteria items were applicable.

5. Sixty per cent of the leaders said that they used the same meanings of criteria items for the entire camp season. There is some question as to whether even these 60 per cent had any standard formalized understanding of each criteria item upon which they made their ratings. It is likely that they had an idea in

their minds and this could have changed with their own development. One of the leaders was asked to make ratings based upon a reading of his own group record. It is noteworthy that the correlation between this leader's original and later ratings was lower than the correlation between his original ratings and those ratings made (by the writer) from a reading of the leader's records.

6. Excluding the lowest correlation accounted for in the third factor in this series, (page 50 ) 75 per cent of the next group of lowest correlations were with those charts filled out by specialist leaders. The specialists met with the groups for comparatively short periods of the entire camping time. The ratings that they made might have had little relation, then, to changes that took place in the group generally in other activities. The ratings might be reduced to the element of the group's response to the particular leadership of the specialist rather than any inherent changes in the group itself. The ratings might also be a simple reflection of how the group happened to feel at that particular session, as influenced by a previous or prospective event, rather than typical of the group generally. For example, if the group had a very stimulating carnival booth before meeting with the specialist, the restlessness and inattentiveness that the specialist may rate may not typify the actual general level of the group. It may well have been that the group was exception-

ally attentive and interested during the preparation and conducting of the booth. If it were possible to exclude other factors, it would be interesting to compare ratings on the same group as made by the specialist, with the ratings made by the group's regular leader. The bearing that this sixth factor may have upon the rating of groups that only meet with a leader weekly, merits consideration.

The factors that affected the correlations in this study between original ratings and later ratings based on reading of group records may be aggregated as follows:

1. Quantity and quality of recording which ratings may be based on.
2. Agreement between raters as to meanings of criteria items.
3. Agreement between raters as to methods of using charts.

The breakdown of ratings involved in the correlation study, table VIII, page 56, shows in striking relief the concentration of ratings in the two middle gradations of "Static" and "Slight Progress." The small number of ratings in the "Retrogression" column raises further question as to whether the charts were used as prescribed. A "Retrogression" rating should have been made whenever there was evidence that the level of development for any week dropped below that of the previous week which may have been indicated in any one of the three other gradations. Since some retrogression is expected, at points, as part of normal development,

a lack of such ratings probably indicates improper use of the charts.

A similar question of the manner in which the charts were used applies to the small number of "Great Progress" ratings which were made. Perhaps the leaders believed that the "Great Progress" gradation should be used only in exceptional circumstance. Two other possibilities also present themselves. The standards of the leaders may have been so high that they were not realistically aligned with the amount of development that might ordinarily have been expected in the particular setting in which they were working and for the amount of time involved.

The subjective factor in rating should not be lost sight of and it can only be hoped that training and experience will reduce subjectivity to a minimum. A thorough interpretation of criteria items and an explanation of the use of the charts (including anchoring illustrations for gradations) should help in securing greater objectivity.

Another possibility is that concerning the major purpose for which the charts were prepared; evaluating the effectiveness of work with groups and individuals. Where other influences upon ratings are likely to be at a minimum, an agency would well take heed as to the level of its work when there is a lack of "Great Progress" ratings for any period of time.

An examination of the breakdown of ratings (Table VIII, page 56) reveals that ratings (made by the writer) based on the

reading of the group records far exceeded the original leaders' ratings in the "Static" column while the converse was true in the "Slight Progress" column. This may be accounted for in the difference of use of the charts as noted in chapter three.

The ratings based on the reading of the record were made in relation to the previous week's ratings. Thus, if an initial rating of "Slight Progress" seemed justified and the behavior remained the same over several periods, the ratings based on the record would be entered in the "Static" column. The leaders, however, may have continued to enter ratings in the "Slight Progress" column.

It is interesting that a higher percentage of agreements occurred in the "Static" and "Slight Progress" columns, 32 and 36 per cent of the total ratings in each column, in comparison to the 8 and 9 per cent agreement in each of the outer columns. This may be partly due to the concentration of ratings in the two middle columns.

The range of "mean averages of the correlations for individual criteria items"<sup>1</sup> (Table VII, page 48) ran from .333 to .639. The highest of these "mean averages" for the criteria "Social responsibility to community" may be accounted for in the concentration of ratings for that item in the "Static" column. The agreements

---

<sup>1</sup> supra, p. 47.

TABLE VI  
 BREAKDOWN OF RATINGS INVOLVED IN CORRELATION  
 STUDY OF GROUP EVALUATION CHART RATINGS

Group Criteria	Columns "A" - Ratings based on record. Columns "B" - Leaders' ratings. Columns "C" - Agreement between "A" & "B".												Total Number of Agree- ments for Criteria Item
	Retro- gression			Static			Slight Progress			Great Progress			
Column	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	
2. Group organization	1			5	8	3	11	8	12	5	5	1	16
3. Group standards	1			13	3	8	3	14	9	4	2	1	18
4. Wider horizons	1	1		9	6	5	9	8	12	2	5		17
5. Social responsibility													
a. To each other	2	1	1	9	2	6	4	14	9	5	4	1	17
b. To agency	1	1	1	8	7	15	6	6	2	3	3		20
c. To community		1		10	1	21	2	6			2		21
6. Enriched interests	2			8	2	3	6	9	18		3	1	22
7. Handling conflicts	3	4		11	5	6	10	11	5	3	5		11
8. Leadership and Participation	1	1		6	5	4	10	8	11	4	6	2	17
9. Cooperative Planning		2		17	4	6	4	13	8	3	4		14
10. Group thinking		1		13	8	11	5	9	6	4	2		17
11. Group loyalty & morale				11	7	5	8	13	6	6	5	1	12
12. Acceptance of differences		1		8	6	14	10	7	5	1	4		19
13. Decreasing need of leader	5	1	1	14	4	11	3	13	4		1		16
Separate Column Totals	17	14	3	142	68	118	91	139	107	40	51	7	
Gradation Column Totals	34			328			337			98			
Percent of Agreements	9%			36%			32%			8%			

in the "Static" column for the criteria item under discussion far exceeds that of the other criteria items. This may be attributed almost wholly to the use made of the "Static" column for cases of doubtful ratings. A similar situation exists in the "Social responsibility to agency" item.

On the other hand, the fact that "Enriched Interests" had the second highest "mean average" is probably due to the ample material in the records to base ratings upon for this item. Certainly, if anything were included in the group records at all, an indication of activities that the group was exposed to would be entered and this would furnish much evidence upon which to make ratings for "Enriched Interests." In the case of "Enriched Interests," the greatest concentration of agreement of ratings is in the "Slight Progress" gradation. From this it may be assumed that the camping experience generally did an adequate job of exposing and developing new interests in campers.

In spite of differences in methods of ratings the common agreements as to the fairly constant "Slight Progress" occurring seems to indicate the beneficial aspects coming from the camping experience. Whether this may be considered as a good showing or whether better results may be expected under different conditions will have to go unanswered for the present.

C. Summary:

Several factors seem to have contributed to the generally low

correlations between the leader's ratings and the ratings made from reading the leader's group record. These were:

1. The quality and quantity of relevant recording.
2. Agreement as to the meanings of criterion.
3. Degree to which criteria were adapted to the particular age group.
4. Consistency in use of meanings of criteria.
5. Agreement on methods for making ratings.
6. Amount of opportunity that leader had to observe and gather material on group or individual that was to be rated.

A number of possibilities may account for the concentration of ratings in the two middle columns of the Group Evaluation Chart.

1. The understanding that the rater may have had concerning the use of the gradation columns.
2. The degree to which the rater's expectations were consistent with the amount of development that might ordinarily have been expected under the particular conditions.
3. The possibility that the effectiveness, or ineffectiveness, of work accounts for the amount of development noted.
4. The factor of subjectivity in rating always merits consideration.

The higher correlations (relative to the other items) for "Social responsibility to community" and "to agency" does not necessarily reflect a consistency between the Group Evaluation Chart ratings for these items and the material in the group records. It may rather be that the higher correlations are due to an improper use of the charts and a lack of understanding of the items.

## CHAPTER V - INTERVIEWS WITH PARENTS

### A. Method:

The comparison of the Individual Evaluation Chart ratings with the parent's ratings of the camper's development was made as follows:

An arbitrary four point check scale corresponding to the Individual Evaluation Chart scale was set up. These check points were "No change" in the center, "Slight change" and "Much change" on the positive side and a "Negative" check point for any negative changes.

Interviews were then held with the parents of campers. Only those campers charted for the entire two month camp period were selected. The two month rule was adopted to insure greater validity in checking any changes that might have occurred over this longer period.

The parents were asked to indicate, generally, and for several specific criteria items, what effect, positive or negative, they considered the camp experience to have had, if any, upon their child's development. If each of their replies could not clearly be classified into one of the points on the scale, they were asked to definitely designate at which point they would have rated the child when he had completed his camping experience. The parent's ratings were then compared with the leader's ratings. To make this possible the leader's ratings were processed as follows.

All of the Individual Evaluation Chart ratings for the camper were assembled. An "amount of development estimate" was arrived at for each criterion by taking into consideration all of the ratings made for the particular criterion during the entire camp season. An "estimate" was obtained for each of the pertinent criteria items that the parents were asked to rate on. A composite of the "estimates," for each of the pertinent criteria, gave a "general estimate" for the time of the camper's stay at camp. Thus, the "estimate" of the leader's ratings made possible the comparison of the parent's ratings for the same criteria. Similarly, the "general estimate" served as a general rating for any overall development on the Individual Evaluation Chart and thus this could be compared with the general rating given by the parent.

The specifically chosen criteria items (listed on page 62 ) which were selected as pertinent were combined in such manner in different groupings so that it was most likely that the parents were in the best position to have been able to make valid observation for the information requested. The individual criteria items that were combined (page 62) resulted in five major categories and a general category. For each of the categories there was a question on the parents' interviewing schedule which was phrased so as to be most similar to, and get the most appropriate answer for, the particular category. The criteria items in each of the

categories which correspond to the question on the schedule (pages 111-12) are as follows:

Question and Category:	Individual Criteria Items:
2	2. New skills and interests 3. New knowledge 11. Vocational Developments 12. Educational Developments
3	4. Wider Loyalties. 7. Breakdown of Prejudices.
4	9. Symptoms of maladjustment.
5	5. Degree and range of participation. 6. Leadership
6	8. Status in group.
1	Composite of all ratings made for categories 2 to 6 above.

The liberty of combining the four criteria items for the second category was taken because of the young age of the campers and the expressed opinions of leaders as to the similarity of the four criteria items.

The similarity of the criteria joined to form the third category and those joined to form the fifth category was also noted by Professor Bernstein.<sup>1</sup> It seemed most advisable to place the ninth individual criteria item as an individual category because it was unique. One of the major considerations in all instances of combining criteria was the attempt to form the

---

<sup>1</sup> Bernstein, op. cit., p. 17.

categories in such a manner that would allow for the schedule questions to be constructed for easiest and most accurate answering by the camper's parents.

No weighting was given to any of the categories when they were all combined to give the "composite" general rating of the child's development. The weighting that did result because of the different number of criteria included in each of the various categories seems to have been as good a result as might be hoped for.

#### B. Findings, Limitations, and Interpretations:

Some of the limitations expected to be met in this aspect of the study have been noted in chapter one. During the time of interviewing parents, several other possibilities for error presented themselves. The combined list of factors affecting the parent-leader correlation on ratings for campers appears below:

1. How much parent could remember about developments that may have occurred over six months ago. The parent may also have been influenced by the current behavior of the child.
2. Manner in which parent's attitude towards camp may have affected their answers to the schedule questions.
3. Degree of understanding of their child and child behavior which would affect their evaluations of child development.
4. Relationship which parent may have imagined existed between study and their child's chances of being admitted to summer camp this year.

5. Opportunities that parents may have had or taken to observe directly or indirectly any changes in their child.
6. The consideration of how much a change of behavior in a particular group situation may be reflected in other situations.
7. The same limitations would apply to correlations with parent's ratings as those limitations, relating to the leader, applied in the correlations between leader's ratings and ratings based on reading his records.<sup>2</sup>

The third and fifth limitations came up most frequently and with adequate interpretation to the parents was handled in most instances so that their ratings were as valid as possible. It may be noted that in several instances parents attempted to evaluate the child's general development on the basis of any weight the child may have gained during the camp season.

The "mean" average was found for the ten sets of correlations between the parent's ratings and the Individual Evaluation Chart ratings for the camper. The "mean" average supplied a more substantial basis upon which to make interpretations than the correlations for each child alone would have done. The "mean" average was found for each of the five categories and the "composed" general category, (Table IX, page 65 ).

The lowest "mean" average correlation of .10 for category three can probably be attributed to the lack of opportunity which the parents may have had to observe their child in the particular

---

<sup>2</sup> supra. pp. 49-53.

TABLE VII

BREAKDOWN OF RATINGS INVOLVED IN CORRELATION  
STUDY OF INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION CHART RATINGS

No.	Question & Category	Trends *												"Mean" Average Correlation between Parent's Rat- ings & Lead- er's Ratings
		Retro- gression			Static			Slight Progress			Great Progress			
		A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	
2	2. New skills and interests				1	2	0	6	1	3	0	4	0	.30
2	3. New Knowledge													
2	11. Vocational developments													
2	12. Educational developments													
3	4. Wider loyalties				1	2	0	7	2	1	0	5	0	.10
3	7. Breakdown of prejudices													
5	5. Degree & Range of participation													
5	6. Leadership				1	1	1	4	0	3	0	4	1	.50
6	8. Status in Group				2	0	3	2	1	1	0	3	2	.60
4	9. Symptoms of mal-adjustment				4	0	3	0	2	2	0	2	1	.60
1	10. "Composited" General Rating				1	2	1	5	1	2	0	3	1	.40
Separate Column Totals					10	7	8	24	7	12	0	2	5	
Gradation Column Totals					25			43			26			
Percent of Agreements					32%			28%			19%			

\* Column "A" - Leader's Individual Evaluation Chart Rating.  
Column "B" - Parent's Rating.  
Column "C" - Agreement between Columns "A" and "B".

criteria item area. In most instances children have their regular group of friends in the neighborhood with whom they always play so that there would be little occasion for judgment on a "wider loyalty" basis. The breakdown of parent's and leader's ratings (Table IX, page 65) shows that the parents made five ratings to none for the leaders (for category three) in the "Great Progress" column while the leaders made seven ratings in the "Slight Progress" column to only two ratings made there by the parents. The higher ratings by parents may be accounted for in that they probably inferred that the child's very contact with other children in the day camp constituted wider loyalties. A similar thought process probably occurred with the ratings parents made for category two.

Again, as occurred in the correlations between leader's ratings and ratings on records, the greatest concentration of ratings was in the "Static" and "Slight Progress" columns. The greatest percentage of agreements was also in these two middle columns (Table IX, page 65). In most instances, where the leader's rating did not agree with the parent's rating, the ratings were in adjoining columns.

The parent's greater optimism than the leaders as to the camper's general development stands out quite evidently, with twenty-one ratings by the parents in "Great Progress" to only five ratings by the leaders. It is a question, again, as to

whether the parents were too generous in their ratings, whether the leaders expected too much, and how much any of the limitations previously noted operated in the situation. It is likely that something from each of the possible limitations entered into the resulting low "general" correlation.

That the majority of ratings, made by both parents and leaders, were "Slight Progress" or "Great Progress" and that no "Retgression" ratings were made is indicative of the value of the summer day camping experience for the children charted.

C. Summary:

Certain criteria items on the Individual Evaluation Chart were combined to form categories (page 62.) The combining of items into categories was done so that the parents of campers would have been in the best position to have made valid observations for the information requested. The criteria items combined were categorized according to the expressions of similarity noted by leaders and in consideration of the age of the campers.

A number of factors seem to enter into the parent-leader correlations on ratings for campers. The memory of parents as concerns possible development in their child; the parents' degree of understanding of child behavior, and their attitudes towards the camp are among the factors.

The greater number of "Great Progress" ratings by parents in comparison to the number of such ratings by leaders is noteworthy.

The majority of favorable ratings made by parents and by leaders seem to indicate the positive value of the day camping experience for the children charted.

## CHAPTER VI - SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### A. Introduction:

As a pioneer study in the pioneer field of evaluating group work by charts this investigation has met at least as many obstacles as might be expected. If this study has indicated anything, it must surely have called attention to how sorely needed is research in this area.

The comparative newness of group work as a profession is one of the contributing factors to the lack of research and the difficulties involved in evaluative research.

On the positive side, the recent vogue of surveys should serve to strengthen the desire for evaluative studies to prove the worth of the agency's services. This may vary, however, depending upon the conviction that the agency may have of its own value.

With the processes and goals of group work still in the throes of formulative turmoil it is to be expected that evaluative research cannot at the present stage look to a structured situation for hypothesizing and testing. Evaluative research is a necessary and vital work not only in terms of the development of these much needed tools themselves but as a clarifying force in this formulative process.

### B. Summary of Findings and Interpretations:

Listed below are abstracts of the major findings and inter-

pretations coming out of this study.

The suggested time interval for ratings was used; bi-monthly for the Individual, and Group Evaluation Charts and every two days for the Member's Group Contribution Chart.

Leaders were left to determine, for the most part, their own interpretations for criteria items and their own verbal anchor points for the numerical scale on the Member's Group Contribution Chart.

Although the individuals and groups selected for charting depended upon which leaders volunteered, at least one group and (with one exception) one individual was charted for each age bracket and for both sexes at the day camp.

All ten leaders found the charts helpful in their work. The Individual Evaluation Chart and the Group Evaluation Chart were chosen as most helpful while the Member's Group Contribution Chart was the least well received.

Meanings of criteria items furnished by each leader were very limited, individually.

Two-thirds of the leaders purported to have consistently used the same meaning for criteria.

While 80 per cent of the leaders claimed to have made weekly ratings relative to the previous week's ratings, accumulated evidence does not seem to support this.

Eighty per cent of the leaders specifically noted a lack of

understanding of methods for using the charts. All the leaders requested further help along this line.

The factors affecting the correlations between the original ratings of leaders and those based on a reading of the group record are:

1. The relevant quantity and quality of recording upon which ratings had to be based.
2. The agreement between raters as to the methods of using the charts.
3. The agreement between raters as to the meanings of criteria items.

The great amount of disparity existing in the above factors probably contributed to the generally low correlations between the leader's ratings and the ratings made from reading the leader's group record.

The leaders gave a great deal of weight to the value of the charts for the uses that could be made of the criteria items. The use of the charts for evaluative purposes often became a secondary rather than a primary purpose.

The amount of understanding of child behavior and the amount of contact with the child seem to have been major factors influencing the validity with which parents could make ratings on their child's development.

#### C. Conclusion:

There appears to be a place for the use of charts as

instruments for evaluation and staff development in a group work setting. The charts that this study was concerned with, and the study itself, only scratch the surface of the work that remains to be done in this area.

As noted, the present stage of development of the group work field itself will be one of the obstacles encountered in evaluative research. The need for common agreement as to the goals and objectives, so as to formulate criteria accordingly, is strikingly conspicuous.<sup>1</sup>

In a very small way, this study indicated the relationship between group work skill (recording, meaning of criteria) and correlations for ratings. This further points out the need of research to provide means for better common agreement in terms of use of the charts and the criteria therein.

Further understanding of their child's behavior, among other factors, is a necessary prerequisite for obtaining valid ratings from parents on their child's development. This indicates a need for interpretation on the part of researchers wishing to use this source as a check upon leader's ratings. It also indicates an area in which much work must be done by social agencies like group work agencies.

#### D. Recommendations:

Some of the recommendations that emerge from this study may

---

<sup>1</sup> Margaret Blenkner, "Obstacles to Evaluative Research: Part II," Social Case work, March, 1950, p. 97.

be considered as self-evident.

Such help that was indicated as desired in the questionnaire returns should be provided. This includes the orientation to leaders, explanations of criteria, anchor points for Member's Group Contribution Chart, and discussion of charts with supervisor. The latter point suggests the necessity for supervisors to be thoroughly familiar with the use of the charts as well as how the charts should be used as part of the supervisory process.

It would be well if use of the charts is discussed at the time that leaders are informed as to what is expected of them. This would eliminate any possibilities of leaders feeling pressured into volunteering for it at a later date. The use of the charts as an aid to leaders in their work; as an integral part of supervision, and as means of research should be made clear.

If the basis for making ratings is to be relative to the ratings made for the immediately preceding period the charts filled out for the period should most certainly be kept available to the leader.

In view of the difficulties encountered in the use of the charts certain major revisions of the structure and use of the Individual Evaluation and Group Evaluation Charts are recommended.

The present scale of gradations is intended for ratings made on a relative basis. As such, this does not allow for an initial "absolute" rating to be made unless it is interpreted

in terms of the "relative" oriented gradations. The validity of such a procedure is open to serious question. For example, could a rating of "Slight Progress" validly be made for an initial rating which was translated from, say, "above average" on the absolute basis that the initial rating necessarily had to be made on?

If this were done, however, in effect it would mean that later ratings are relative, not only to the last ratings for the group or individual, but are also relative to the initial "absolute" rating upon which the future "relative" ratings have been based. For example, an initial rating is made for "Social responsibility to community." At the period for the rating the group had been visiting public museums and parks and had displayed a good deal of consideration in caring for the property, for example, not finger-marking museum objects; not destroying trees and grass. On this basis they are given an initial rating of "Slight Progress."

The group then makes no further progress for this criterion. They continue visiting public places and continue to respect property but do nothing more than this that would merit a higher rating for the criteria. The second rating is entered, then, as "Static." This "Static" is intended to mean that the group has not progressed any further relative to the "Slight Progress" rating for the first period. The trend of the group for this criterion is "Static."

It also means, however, that the group has remained "Static"

relative to the "absolute" standard upon which the initial rating had to be based. The "absolute" standard in this case was that "consideration for public property" was the equivalent of what could be translated into "Slight Progress" on a scale constructed for making ratings relative to the group's own development.

Future ratings for this criterion would have the same dual relation of being directly relative to a previous week's rating and indirectly relative to the initial "absolute" rating. This mixing of an initial first rating necessarily made in relation to an "absolute" standard, with later "relative" ratings can result in much complication. What is the process involved in this entire procedure?

By making a rating of "Slight Progress" for the first period, the leader is actually going through the thought process and saying in effect "this group is at such a level at the time of this first period." This "such" level has been described in terms of the group having consideration for public property. But what is this "absolute" rating, concerning "such" level, based upon? It may be based upon some conception which the leader has of where the "average" group should be. It may also be based upon where this group should be as related to its own particular potentialities, limitations, and the like. A third basis could be that of a definite level the leader has set up for the group to reach, this level being a standard one that the leader applies to all groups

irrespective of their present level or their possibilities for future development.

In any case, each time a rating is made, though it be relative to the previous week's rating, it is ultimately relative to an "absolute" standard of where the group should be. It appears advisable then, to have all ratings made in relation to an "absolute" standard. Of the three standards last noted, drawing up criteria in terms of what is the "norm" for the group or individual seems to have certain advantages.

Establishing a "norm" for groups or individuals upon which ratings can be based:

1. Gives leaders something definite to base their ratings upon. Ratings of all leaders are "standardized" and "comparable" in the same milieu.
2. Provides leaders with their requested information as to what "normal" behavior is for their group and members. This should promote a better understanding of the group and individual and consequently improve the quality of work.
3. Assures that ratings will consistently be made on the same basis, eliminating any danger of changing interpretations of criteria. Where no set basis is provided the leader has to make evaluations based upon some vague conception he may keep in his mind. "Consideration of public property" may mean "Slight Progress" or an arbitrary numerical quantity of plus

five. Several weeks later the leader consciously or unconsciously may change his standards so that "consideration of public property" is equated with "Static" or zero, and "organizing to reduce the price of lollipops" is assigned a "Slight Progress" or plus five value. Any validity that the entire sequence of charts may have had is destroyed.

4. Eliminates many of the difficulties that were described as being connected with gradations prepared for trends. The problems of the use of "Static" and "Retgression" would no longer be present on a scale prepared for "absolute" ratings.
5. Allows for observation of the development of the group or individual in a more direct fashion. Where ratings are made in relation to the previous week an entire set of charts would have to be gone over to see if the group or individual was making progress. This would be necessary because each single chart indicates the development for only one short time period. "Adding" the progress ratings from each of the single charts would give the total amount of progress made.

Where ratings are made in relation to a "norm," however, a check between the initial rating and the current rating would immediately reveal any progress that the group or individual may have had.

6. Allows for judgment as to the importance and significance of particular developments in the group or individual. For example, in a particular instance it may be a more striking showing if a group that was "average" in some criteria develops "above average," than if a group "below average" reaches the "average."

The problem of determining "norms" is always regarded with the greatest reservation, and this is rightly so. Whether or not an "average" arrived at is absolutely typical or not is not a serious matter for the purpose here. The absolute standard might just as well be that of the particular level we would idealistically like to see the group or individual approach. Here too, however, if we retain some realism, in many instances it probably should not be too distant from the "average." The major factor in all this is that a constant standard is provided upon which ratings can be based.

A second problem is the fear of the use, or rather misuse, of "norms." If charts based upon "norms" were to be indiscriminately used, some violations of good group work principles might well be expected. The use of "norm" for purposes of analysis should always be tempered with the greatest concern for the differences in the particular situation. As a standard for rating, the advantages enumerated for "norms" still stand soundly.

How then can these "norms" be arrived at and how should they

be set up? The "norms" should be as nearly typical of the behavior found in the various agencies and settings where the charts would be used. It follows then that samples of what is considered "average" should be derived from these sources. The samples thus obtained should be gone through to find those points of common agreement from which will emerge the final composite of the "norm."

The gradation columns may be numerically or verbally headed and the choice of the best can be determined by trial. Numbers may allow for greater objectivity and words may allow for greater clarity. Both systems have their assets and liabilities. A numerical scale seems to allow for a wider range of ratings than a verbal scale on which a limited number of column headings can be checked. On the other hand, a verbal check-off scale would facilitate computation of correlations more so than a numerical scale having a large diversity of ratings.

A suggestion for a numerical scale would be a mid-point of zero for the "average" and a plus and minus range for above and below "average" respectively. A verbal scale might be constructed with "norm" as the mid-point and "above norm" and "below norm" as the other rating possibilities. The "above norm" and "below norm" gradations might be further broken down by "slightly" and "greatly." It would be well to have anchoring illustrations, for a point below and for a point above the norm, in whichever system is used.

It may be expected that it will be found again, in checking the use of the charts, that there is a correlation between group work skill and the quality of rating. This does not mean that the charts can necessarily be used only by high calibre leaders, but that better results may be expected with them, for time expended, than with less skilled leaders. Possibly a simple scale of "movement" may prove desirable for less able leaders. This scale might have three gradations of movement; "none," "negative," and "positive." It would not be a measuring device of any degree of movement but would serve to call the leader's attention to manifestations of the criteria and would fulfill many of the purposes enumerated as desired by the leaders in this study.

The degree of value derived from the use of the charts for leaders at all levels will vary with the degree to which it is used as an integral part of supervision, closely linked with recording. Such procedure can prove to be a valuable staff training technique.

A reconsideration of the criteria items would be well taken. This can be done in the light of the indications from this study and in the same manner in which the "norm" standards for criteria items (upon which ratings can be based) would be obtained. Certain combining, restating, and possibly adding of new criteria items seem necessary. The use that leaders made of the criteria items, and the notations made by leaders in this connection, suggests the

revisions of criteria items indicated on the "comparison charts" on pages 84 and 85. It should be borne in mind that the recommendations are based on the small sampling of the ten leaders involved in this study. It is also important to remember that the leaders' views on criteria were expressed without benefit of the explanations of criteria offered in Professor Bernstein's pamphlet.<sup>2</sup>

The overlapping of "Wider Horizons" and "Enriched Interests" on the Group Evaluation Chart was also noted by Professor Bernstein.<sup>3</sup> A similar relationship was noted by him in the case of "Group Thinking" and "Cooperative Planning."<sup>4</sup> "Decreasing Need of Leader" is omitted because even as Professor Bernstein noted,<sup>5</sup> it seems to be reflected in all of the criteria that come before it.

On the Individual Evaluation Chart a few leaders noted the similarity between "New Skills and Interests," "New Knowledge," "Vocational Developments," and "Educational Developments." The writer believes that the inclusion, in this grouping, of the last

---

2 Bernstein, op. cit., pp. 9-20.

3 Ibid., p. 10, 11.

4 Ibid., p. 12-13.

5 Ibid., p. 14.

two criteria is due to the age of the campers. The first two criteria, and the last two criteria were each combined, therefore, to form two separate criterion for the criteria revision on page 84. "Breakdown of Prejudices" was eliminated without adding it to "Wider Loyalties" which seemed to be a more inclusive term. "Health was omitted on the grounds that this was a matter of concern and interest for leaders rather than a part of the group work process.

This final set of criteria can probably be arrived at best by compositing suggestions for criteria from a number of the agencies where they may be used.

The "norm" for rating of criteria items will have to be broken down for the various age groups. This can probably be done along the lines of the arbitrary age brackets set up by the agencies; for example, Juniors, Teen Agers, Seniors, and the like. If obstacles are to be looked for, this process can result in a "reductio ad absurdum" type of operation. "Norms" for each sex, for different sections of the country, and so forth, may be requested. Enough common elements can be found in the major age divisions to arrive as "norms" for them that will be typical for most of the groups or individuals in the particular age division. It should be borne in mind that even in those cases where the "norm" is not typical it still offers the important advantages derived from a standard basis upon which ratings can be made.

It is clear then, that with proper adaptation, the charts should be usable for all ages.

There are some adjustments that have to be made when using sets of standards for different age groups. Where standards for different age brackets exist, adjustments are necessary when the basis for making ratings changes from one standard to another. This adjustment can be minimized if the standards are so set up that they resemble as closely as possible, the actual development that occurs. For illustration, a portion of what might be included in an "average" standard for "Social responsibility to community" will be viewed. A part of the "expected norm" set up for this criterion, for children of junior age, might be "consideration of public property." For "teen agers" this standard might partially be composed of a reference to "community service - like collecting for the community fund."

The criterion for "Social responsibility to community," in the next age bracket is not a separate set of standards, however, but is rather composed of additional criteria to those in the lower age brackets. Normal development occurs in this way and it would be unrealistic to have the standards set up otherwise. Thus, the taking on of responsibility for "community service" does not mean that "respect for public property" is no longer part of "Social responsibility to the community." In this manner, the best continuity is achieved when the basis for ratings is changed from

## COMPARISON CHART FOR INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA

Present CriteriaRevised Criteria

## INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA

- |                                    |   |
|------------------------------------|---|
| 1. Attendance                      | 1. Attendance                               |
| 2. New skills and interests        | 2. New skills, interests and knowledge      |
| 3. New Knowledge                   |   |
| 4. Wider Loyalties                 | 3. Wider loyalties                          |
| 5. Degree & Range of participation | 4. Degree and range of participation        |
| 6. Leadership                      | 5. Leadership                               |
| 7. Breakdown of prejudices         |   |
| 8. Status in group                 | 6. Status in group                          |
| 9. Symptoms of maladjustment       | 7. Symptoms of maladjustment                |
| 10. Health                         |   |
| 11. Vocational developments        | 8. Educational and Vocational developments. |
| 12. Educational developments       |   |

## COMPARISON CHART FOR GROUP CRITERIA

<u>Present Criteria</u>	<u>Revised Criteria</u>
GROUP CRITERIA	
1. Attendance	1. Attendance
2. Group Organization	2. Group organization and standards
3. Group Standards	
4. Wider horizons	3. Enriched interests and wider horizons
5. Social responsibility:	4. Social responsibility:
a. To each other	a. To each other
b. To agency	b. To agency
c. To community	c. To community
6. Enriched interests	
7. Handling conflicts	→ 5. Handling conflicts
8. Leadership and participation	→ 6. Leadership and participation
9. Cooperative planning	
10. Group thinking	→ 7. Group thinking
11. Group loyalty and morale	8. Group loyalty and morale
12. Acceptance of differences	9. Acceptance of differences.
13. Decreasing need of leader	

the standards of one age bracket to those of another. The problem of changing of standards will be further minimized when judgment is exercised as to how sharp and inflexible the line between age brackets should be.

The problem just discussed would not be present in the system measuring the group's or individual's development relative to itself, since starting with a definite base, "progress" from that point could be rated ad infinitum. It would be most difficult, however, to determine on this relative basis at what point the group or individual was in relation to where it might be expected to be. For example, a good deal of "Great Progress" rated during a particular period might lead to the assumption that the group or individual was a well advanced one. A balancing out of "progress" and "lack of progress" may reveal that the "Great Progress" is a compensation for lack of progress in the past and the group or individual is no further advanced than might be expected.

The recommendations are submitted with a most humble appreciation of their limitations, some of which have been noted, others of which can be thought of, and still further ones that would probably appear if they were adopted.

The assets and limitations of the "norm" standard method of rating have been compared with the assets and limitations of a basis of rating relative to the group (or individual) itself.

It remains in the province of further research to determine which of the methods proves best; under which conditions, and how the best features of each method may be incorporated in the final form.

In summary, then, it is recommended that:

1. A scale of gradations should be developed that would allow for ratings to be made in relation to a set standard of "norms." These "norms" can be arrived at through a composite of what is offered for the "norms" by the agencies where the charts may be used. The type of scale to use, numerical or verbal, may also be determined in this manner.
2. A reconsideration of the criteria items appears to be essential. It is suggested that a set of criteria be arrived at by compositing the suggestions for criteria solicited from a number of agencies where the charts may be used.

On the basis of the use made of the criteria by leaders in this study, and other material in this study bearing on criteria a revised list of criteria was offered on pages 84 and 85.


3. A thorough orientation should be given to leaders and supervisors using the charts. The assignment of the use of the charts should be included in the initial discussion of job responsibilities. The orientation should include a thorough explanation of criteria items, of the use of the scale, and

of the use of "norms." Anchoring illustrations for making ratings should be provided.

4. Leaders should be oriented as to how the charts should be used in conjunction with recording in the way that the criteria can serve as a basis for observation and recording.
5. The role that supervision will play in the discussion of developments in the group (and of individuals) according to the criteria, should be explained.
6. Under the conditions thus far noted, it would seem that the charts can be used with all types of leaders. The particular scale to use would probably have to be adapted to the skill of the leader. A scale that simply indicates movement, or the lack of it, may prove workable for the least skilled leaders. The degree of validity and reliability coming from the use of the charts may be expected to vary (increasingly positive) with the skill of the leader.

With an eye to the future, research should aim at developing charts that will help in determining what is being accomplished, the significance in each case, and finally what can be predicted on the basis of all the factors involved.

Approved,

  
Richard K. Conant, Dean

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## Books:

Bernstein, Saul, Charting Group Progress, New York; Association Press, 1949.

Glueck, Eleanor, Evaluative Research in Social Work. New York; Columbia University Press, 1936.

Shiffman, F. and Olson, Emma, A Study in Family Case Work (An Attempt to Evaluate Service.) Evanston, Illinois; Family Welfare Association, 1939.

Sullivan, Dorothea, editor, The Practice of Group Work. New York; Association Press, 1941.

## Periodicals:

Blenkner, Margaret, "Obstacles to Evaluative Research in Case Work: Part I," Social Casework, 30: February, 1950.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Obstacles to Evaluative Research in Case Work: Part II," Social Casework, 31:97-105 March, 1950.

Cabot, Richard C., "Treatment in Social Case Work and the Need of Criteria of Its Success or Failure," Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work, Chicago: University Chicago Press, 1931. Pp. 3-24.

Conant, Richard K., "How Shall We Measure the Results of Our Poor Law Administration?," Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work, 1927, Pp. 482-488.

Dollard, John and Hobart, Mowrer, "A Method of Measuring Tension in Written Documents," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 42:3-32, January, 1947.

Emerson, H., "A Plea for the Measurement of Social Reconstruction," Survey, 55:465-466, 1926.

Ford, Mary E.N., "An Evaluation of Parent Education Program," The Family, 17:230-236, 1936.

Heckman, A. A., "Measuring the Effectiveness of Agency Services," Journal of Social Casework, 29:394-399, December, 1948.

- Heckman, A. A. and Stone, Allan, "Forging New Tools,"  
Survey Midmonthly, 83:267-270, October, 1947.
- Hunt, J. McV., "Measuring the Effects of Social Case Work,"  
Transactions of the New York Academy of Sciences,  
9:78-88, January, 1947.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Measuring Movement in Casework," Journal of  
Social Casework, 29:343-351, November, 1948.
- Miller, Irving, "Book Review of 'Charting Group Progress',"  
Program Aids, 10:3-5, January, 1950.
- Reed, E. F., "A Scoring System For the Evaluation of Social  
Case Work," Social Service Review, 2:214-236, 1931.
- Pray, K. L. M., "In Search of a Yardstick," Survey Midmonthly,  
256-259, September, 1940.
- Solender, Sanford, "Book Review of 'Charting Group Progress',"  
The Group, 12:11-13, March, 1950.
- Swift, Arthur L., "Research and Methods of Evaluation in  
Group Work," Proceedings of the National Conference  
of Social Work, 1936, Pp. 254-260.
- Wilcox, Ellen F., "The Measurement of Achievement in Family  
Case Work," The Family, 8:46-49, April, 1927.
- "A Report of the Workshop on Research in Social Work,"  
Research in Social Work, American Association  
of Social Workers, January, 1948.

APPENDIX

BACKGROUND OF LEADERS INVOLVED IN THIS STUDY ACCORDING  
TO THEIR AGE, OCCUPATION, EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE

- Leader One:      20 years      Student      Female  
Three years college - elementary education.  
Day camp counselor one summer. Sunday  
School teacher for one year. Practice  
teaching one term. Belonged to two clubs.  
Took leadership training course.
- Leader Two:      18 years      Student      Female  
One year college - speech and drama.  
Taught Sunday School. Junior counselor in  
day camp. Belonged to dramatic club.
- Leader Three:    19 years      Student      Female  
One year college.  
Junior counselor in overnight camp.  
Took leadership training course.
- Leader Four:     25 years      Physical Education Instructor      Female  
B.S. in Physical Education.  
Physical Education instructor for 7 to 9th  
graders for one year. One year and two summers  
physical education instructor for college girls.  
Took leadership training course.
- Leader Five:     20 years      Student      Female  
Three years college - education course.  
Taught Sunday School for three years.  
Leader in public day playground for one summer.  
Took leadership training course.
- Leader Six:      20 years      Student      Male  
Three years college - pre-medical.  
Belonged to a friendship group.
- Leader Seven:    20 years      Student      Female  
Three years college - elementary education.  
Counselor in day camp for two summers.  
Belonged to a friendship group.  
Took leadership training course.

Leader Eight: 18 years Student Female  
Entering college.  
Junior counselor for one summer.  
Club member and president for two years.

Leader Nine: 26 years Student Male  
Bachelor of Science.  
Group leader and part-time group worker,  
for one year.

Leader Ten: 23 years Graduate Male  
B.S. in Education.  
Junior Counselor for one summer.  
One semester student teaching.  
Belonged to several school societies.

Dear (Leader's Name):

Do you remember the Charts (see enclosed A, B, C) that you filled out last summer when you worked at the Hecht House Summer Day Camp?

These charts are now the subject of study for a thesis at the Boston University School of Social Work. Your cooperation in filling out the enclosed questionnaire is earnestly requested.

If any question is not clear please answer it to the best of your ability and make a notation of the difficulty, along with any other comments, under question 11 - General Comments. You can use the blank sides of the Questionnaire if more space is needed. In answering question 8, the reverse sides of Charts A and B can be used for more writing space if the criteria item that you are writing about is noted.

When you complete the Questionnaire please mail it with Charts A and B in the enclosed envelope. Please do not mail back Chart (C) and Chart (D.) It will be sincerely appreciated if you would have your reply in the mail no later than December 8.

I hope that filling out this Questionnaire will be as interesting and enjoyable to you as it was to those who have already done so. The important contribution you are making to research through taking part in this study should not be underestimated. Thanks for your participation.

Sincerely yours,



Note: Hereafter, "Chartered member" will mean that member on whom you used the Individual Evaluation Charts.

"non-chartered member" will mean that member whom you did not rate on the Individual Evaluation Charts.

4. Please check whether using the Individual Evaluation Chart stimulated you to give less     , the same amount     , or more     , attention to "chartered members" in comparison to "non-chartered members."

5. Was it your experience that in filling out the Individual Evaluation Charts that you were stimulated to give:

	YES	NO
a. less attention to the "non-chartered members"	_____	_____
b. greater attention to the "non-chartered members"	_____	_____

6. Rank in order of helpfulness with your group, the following items: (Use number 1 for the most helpful, and so on down. Omit ranking any item that was of no help.) Also omit ranking and encircle any item with which you were not in frequent enough contact to give it your fair consideration. For example, you may not have had any time to do reading.

\_\_\_\_\_ Group Evaluation Chart (enclosed B)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Hecht House check-off list for individual members (enclosed D)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Individual Evaluation Chart (enclosed A)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Member's Group Contribution Chart (enclosed C)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Pre-Season Training Course at Hecht House  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Reading of literature related to the work you were doing  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Summer Day Camp weekly unit conferences  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Summer Day Camp weekly staff conferences  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Supervisory Conferences  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Writing of records

7. In a few sentences, indicate what was your understanding of the purpose for using the charts (A, B, C.) Please write clearly.

8. a. In a few words, indicate what each of the criteria items meant to you. Use enclosed charts A and B, writing in the space for ratings alongside each criteria item. Indicate which criteria items were not clear to you.

b. Did you use throughout the camp season the same interpretations of the criteria given in answer to question 8-a above? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

If No, write on enclosed charts A and B, next to items whose meanings changed what your other understanding of the criteria item was. Indicate when this change took place. For example, on item 8.- Status in the Group you might find "In the 4th Week of the season this came to mean what the over-all status of the member was in all group activities rather than rating "Great Progress" because of high status in one or two activities without taking into consideration "Retgression" in other activities of the group.)

9. When filling out the charts did you have in mind as a basis for comparison:

\_\_\_ the previous week's ratings?  
 \_\_\_ the ratings given on the first chart  
 CHECK filled out at the beginning of the summer?  
 ONE: \_\_\_ your sense of where the group or individual  
 should be in their development?

10. Do you feel that you had a good enough understanding of the purpose and methods for using the charts to do as adequate a job as you could do?

Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

If No, check those items below which you feel would have helped you:

- Discussion of charts in supervisory conferences.
- More thorough orientation and follow up.
- Definite anchor points (verbal explanation) for numbers on Member's Group Contribution Chart.
- Printed sheet of explanations of criteria items on the charts.

11. General Comments:

TABLE VIII.

AGE AND SEX DISTRIBUTION OF CAMPERS CHARTED ON INDIVIDUAL  
EVALUATION CHARTS, DAY CAMP, 1949

Age of Camper (Years Old)	Sex		Total
	Male	Female	
5½	5	3	8
6	0	1	1
7	2	2	4
8 and 9	6	0	6
10 to 11	<u>2</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>8</u>
Total	15	12	27

TABLE IX.

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF GROUPS EVALUATED ON  
GROUP EVALUATION CHARTS

Age Bracket of Group (Years Old)	Number of Groups Charted
5½	2
6	1
7	2
8 and 9	2
10 to 11	2

LEADERS' STATEMENTS ON "THE WAYS IN WHICH THEY FOUND THE CHARTS TO  
HAVE BEEN HELPFUL TO THEM IN THEIR WORK"

"They enabled me to see either progress or retrogression in the charted and non-charted." If there was great retrogression it questioned the adequacy of my program."

"The charts were definitely helpful in recording trends. I was thinking more clearly and was able to obtain a more composite picture. With this I felt better able to cope rationally with problems which arose."

"I could more easily recognize reasons for behavior and could clearly see whether they profited by the summer's experience."

"They helped me to see definitely on paper the progress I was making. They showed me the criteria on which to concentrate where needed. Charts guided my planning since my activities were based on the needs of the children and of the group."

"They enabled me to establish criteria to evaluate the benefit that a child derived from his group experience, and to establish some basis to evaluate my ability to aid the child in profiting from that experience. They aided in giving an overall picture from the onset to the end. Some of the categories were insufficient since one had no basis as a starting point."

"Charts were helpful as a record to refer to the general attitudes of the child during his camp season. Helped me be more understanding of the children and more objective in my counselling."

"Charts showed me traits to look for which I would otherwise have overlooked."

"They aided me in seeing in what direction a member of the group was going."

"I had a written report to refer to, rather than only my accustomed mental note on children."

"They brought out specific criteria to look for. These criteria could be goals to be achieved. These criteria served to guide selection of certain activities. Chart served to re-think certain objectives and evaluate them. Charts helped to write group record."

LEADERS' STATEMENTS ON "THE WAYS IN WHICH THEY FOUND THE INDIVIDUAL  
EVALUATION CHARTS HELPFUL TO THEM"

"Chart enabled me to refer more clearly to the previous accomplishments, behavior, etc., of the child."

"Same reason as for question one and also it gave direction to remedial work."

"It was interesting to note the child's development but it was hard to evaluate anything but striking differences in several of the topics."

"One could note progress or retrogression and catch the situation before it had developed too far."

"It helped me to see the development of the individual child on definite criteria and to understand the personality of the child."

"Helped me to understand the type of child I was dealing with-- shy, gregarious, etc. From this source I could have a closer relationship with the child."

"I was able to obtain an understanding of the child's personality which helped me in my attitude towards her, and integrate it into the personality of the group."

"Helped state objectives, select activities, evaluate both and development of individual. I could look for certain traits and see whether the individual moved along to a better personal adjustment."

Note: Two leaders did not make any comments on this question.

LEADERS STATEMENTS ON THE WAYS IN WHICH THEY FOUND THE GROUP EVALUATION  
CHARTS HELPFUL TO THEM

"Enabled me to see great progress in a very negative group."

"It was only natural for me to consider the members of my group separately, they're being individual persons. The Group Evaluation Chart made me able to regard the group as the important whole and to subordinate when necessary the position of some of its members."

"It helped me to see progress of my group and understand reasons for success or failure on certain criteria."

"It was helpful to show the way the individual improvement affected the group behavior, etc."

"The chart was of most help in evaluating my work."

"The chart helped me to see the progress of the group. It pointed attention to places in the program which should be emphasized, etc."

"The same as question 2-a with reference to group. Helpful on its specific criteria to look for certain objectives to be attained."

Note: Three leaders did not make any comments on the question.

LEADERS' STATEMENTS ON THE WAYS IN WHICH THEY FOUND THE MEMBER'S  
GROUP CONTRIBUTION CHART HELPFUL

"Same reasons as 1 and 2, (questions)."

"From the pattern of behavior which the child I charted followed, I could recognize certain reasons and periods when she was most destructive and therefore could be prepared to deal with her accordingly."

"I could point out the stage of development of a group member."

"Again, it proved more beneficial than the memory."

"This was of little help since it was so hard to decide the values to be given to various actions."

"It was more specific than the other charts in that it gave you a basis of analysis--an established criteria to which one could compare the individual."

"It was an easy, clear method of seeing the progress of a child over a long period of time with important lines standing out."

Note: Three leaders did not make any comments on the question.

RESPONSES GIVEN BY LEADERS AS TO THEIR UNDERSTANDING OF THE PURPOSE  
FOR USING THE CHARTS

"To help with research and to better understand and deal with campers."

"Helped me understand the problems which arise in any group experience, the causes of these problems, and how to cope with them. They called my attention to individual problems and through solving these I improved the group as a unit."

"The purpose is to make the leader fully aware of the potentialities of his group and individual members so that he may be able to effect a balance between the two."

"To have a record where we could clearly see the camper's progress as the weeks went by as an individual, and in relation to the group."

"I understood the system to be in the experimental stage. I was rather hazy as to its purpose. I came to believe that the charts were meant to check behavior patterns during a specific period of time."

"To summarize the effectiveness of the camp program."

"An experiment to see how successful the charts could be in aiding the children and in aiding ourselves."

"To find out about progress and to be able to collect specific data on achievement, result of camp work."

"To see if group and individual evaluated were being helped by camp experience."

"I understood it to be a voluntary job for special research. I wanted to do it because I thought it might help me in my understanding of the children."

"MEANING OF GROUP CRITERIA ITEMS" AS FURNISHED  
BY LEADERS

ATTENDANCE:

"What word purports." "Number of times present and reasons for absence." "Percentage over a week's time." "Not very important." "Overall attendance of group." "reports-daily" (Three leaders did not answer.) "Interest and health."

GROUP ORGANIZATION:

"ability to act as a unit" "showed harmony from aiding individuals"  
"ability to get together as a group" "how acted as a team"  
"Whether the group organized" "Effectiveness of group plans"  
"ability to work together on a cooperative project" "ability of girls to behave as a group in activities" "How well group worked together" "Capability of doing together"

GROUP STANDARDS:

"What will be accepted taste" "General interest of group as campers" "moral values of the group" "Not clear, group's attitude toward lying, stealing, etc." "efficiency of work" "established by group itself" "In the eyes of the children" "ability to get along well together" "Same as 2" "Loyalty to group"

WIDER HORIZONS:

"new interests" "development of child in self-realization"  
"New interests, skills, knowledge" "accepted new activities and wanted to repeat them" "group-unit-camp-community" "vision above immediate situation" "Synonymous with Enriched Interests"  
"Enlarging interests" "looking to future"

SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY:

A. TO EACH OTHER - "personal, necessary" "willingness to help those in group that were slow to learn"  
"regard for each other's well-being" "Consideration of rights and feelings of others" "dealing with others" "do not touch what

does not belong to them" "ability to respect each other"  
"loyalty"

B. TO AGENCY - "loyalty to other groups" "no such thing in five-year-old children" "recognition of agency and willingness to be loyal" "take care of toys" "dealings with agency" "little or no chance to judge" "consideration of property of agency" "non-destruction of property" "spirit identification"

C. TO COMMUNITY - "family-selfless" "dealings with community" "keep grass clean" "attention in public places" "recognition of relation to community" "no such thing in five-year-old children" "loyalty to group"

#### ENRICHED INTERESTS:

"similar to wider horizons" "showed benefits of group experience" "deeper interests in hobbies, games" "in activities with carry over" "group looked forward more to future events" "not clear" "knowledge gained in such way that group did not consider it as learning" "same as wider horizons" "wanting to learn new activities" "curiosity expansion."

#### HANDLING CONFLICTS:

"good judgement" "ability to overcome conflicts without disturbance to entire group" "ability to act as a group in dealing with problems, without dissent" "frequency and intensity of conflicts" "Does always resort to physical adjustment?" "took vote-very democratic" "arbitration versus steady fighting" "able to settle problems by themselves rather than running to me" "showed development of group emotionally" "attitudes of onlookers in disputes between others"

#### LEADERSHIP AND PARTICIPATION:

"Finding which children were leaders and in what ways they would also be followers" "able to organize game, participate-initiative of group as a whole" "whether group developed own leaders, participation of individual members" "Does take lead in camp?" "evident" "active interest in group activities" "ability of one camper to lead group and receive full participation from group" "willingness to give of oneself"

## COOPERATIVE PLANNING:

"thinking for future-satisfaction postponed" "participation of entire group in planning group activities" "planning good naturedly one goal for group" "Little distinction between this and Acceptance of differences" "all the members share in planning" "plan with two other groups" "out-cooking, etc." "ability to plan activity together after making decision on choice" "not relevant to my age group" "working as a group"

## GROUP THINKING:

"acceptance of law of majority" "not relevant to my age group" "ability to think and act as group" "what word purports" "what they thought about games, projects, etc." "level of thought" "constantly changed in my mind, at times it meant group standards, then group organization" "thinking in terms of group and its welfare" "did group show initiative" "solutions-planning"

## GROUP LOYALTY AND MORALE:

"awareness of another" "spirit, loyalty to group as a whole" "spirit" "grew to know, like and fight for their group" "appreciation for group, ability to get along" "not relevant to my age group" "overlapping of group standards"

## ACCEPTANCE OF DIFFERENCES:

"showed in problem cases" "acknowledgement of physical differences and overlooking them and making best of things" "decreasing prejudices-tolerance" "Children learned to accept fact that one child was a show-off and another a tease" "lack or lessening of superior feelings" "presence or absence of cliques" "breakdown of prejudices against individuals in group" "broadmindedness"

## DECREASING NEED OF LEADER:

"Independence, less censorship" "How well group worked along without instruction" "consolidation with a group mind, few individual problems" "ability to function themselves in an orderly manner" "can conduct own affairs" "could be left alone safely for short periods" "ability to decide by themselves sometimes-self-reliance" "ability to act with a captain chosen by themselves."

"MEANINGS OF INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA ITEMS" AS  
FURNISHED BY LEADERS

STATUS IN GROUP:

"liked by others, popularity, chosen as partner" "popular, accepted by group, etc." "if camper's attitude had any effect on other members of group" "is she looked upon as an equal by the others, looked down upon, etc." "if other children regarded him as one of the group" "helped in analyzing and finding problem children" "acceptance by others" "degree of acceptance by others in the group" "position in group-active, inactive" "personality in relation to environment"

SYMPTOMS OF MALADJUSTMENT:

"what were they-what were the effects" "definite complexes" "noticeable non-acceptance by others, linked to status in group" "adaptability into the group, symptoms such as stuttering, thumb-sucking" "not clear" "physical or mental unbalance" "emotional instability" "reasons for behavior of camper" "problems-physical, isolation" "passiveness, nervous over small matters, masturbation, belligerency"

HECHT HOUSE SUMMER DAY CAMP  
1949 SEASON  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION RECORD

NAME \_\_\_\_\_ AGE \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_  
SEX \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_

PARTICIPATION

ACTIVITY	LIKES		COMMENTS
	NO INTEREST	MILD INTEREST	
Water Activity	_____	_____	_____
Dramatics	_____	_____	_____
Arts & Crafts	_____	_____	_____
Newspaper	_____	_____	_____
Nature	_____	_____	_____
Athletics-Games	_____	_____	_____
Music	_____	_____	_____
Jewish Matters	_____	_____	_____
Story Telling	_____	_____	_____
Gardening	_____	_____	_____
Dancing	_____	_____	_____

PERSONALITY

1. ATTITUDES	PERSONALITY				COMMENTS
	SUPERIOR	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	
Cooperation	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Sportsmanship	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Sense of Humor	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Friendliness	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Leadership	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Initiative	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Neatness	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Reliability	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Adaptability	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Perseverance	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. TIMIDITY	Yes	_____	Degree	No	_____
AGGRESSIVENESS	Yes	_____	Degree	No	_____

OTHER \_\_\_\_\_  
(Describe)



## INTERVIEWING SCHEDULE FOR PARENTS OF CAMPERS

A study is being made of the effects of a day camping experience for children and it would be very much appreciated if you would help in this study by answering a few very simple questions.

This study is separate and apart from Hecht House and any information you give will be kept absolutely confidential and used only as it relates to this study.

Question 1. It is realized that it is about six months since (child's name) attended day camp but as best as you can remember do you feel that (child's name) developed as a result of attending the day camp last summer?

If "Yes" - Would you say that this development was slight or great?

If "No" - Would you say that he remained the same or got worse?

Question 2. More specifically, would you say that (child's name) learned new things, and developed new skills and interests at the day camp? (Examples were given as needed)

If "Yes" - How much? (Slight or Great Progress was arrived at in this manner)

If "No" - Did he lose interests and skills, etc., that he had without gaining new ones?

Question 3. More specifically, would you say that (child's name) made many new friends and was more willing to be with and play with different children as a result of attending day camp?

If "Yes" - How much?

If "No" - Was there a decrease?

Question 4. More specifically, would you say that (child's name) behavior improved generally as a result of attending summer day camp? (Examples were given like: eating habits, biting nails, crying or temper tantrums)

If "Yes" - How much?

If "No" - Did it become worse?

Question 5. More specifically, would you say that (child's name) took a bigger part in helping games so well, organizing games, participating in games, as a result of attending summer day camp?

If "Yes" - How much?

If "No" - A lesser part?

Question 6. More specifically, would you say that (child's name) was listened to more and desired more as a playmate by his friends, as a result of attending summer day camp?

If "Yes" - How much?

If "No" - Less?

NOTE: Criteria items were mentioned to parents first and then each question was asked so that parents had a good idea of what they were being asked to rate upon. Examples of what was being asked for were given for each question. The "If Yes" and "If No" part of the question was asked as a check upon the degree; "Slight" or "Great" which seemed indicated to the interviewer from the conversation. In some instances, there was no indication in the conversation and this part of the question determined it.