

1961

Criteria used by social workers in assessing movement in groups

<https://hdl.handle.net/2144/26786>

Downloaded from DSpace Repository, DSpace Institution's institutional repository

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

CRITERIA USED BY SOCIAL WORKERS IN ASSESSING
MOVEMENT IN GROUPS

A group thesis

Submitted by

Robert Alan Daniels
(B.A., Boston University, 1959)

Jadonal Earl Ford
(B.A., Virginia State College, 1956)

Mark Forman
(B.A., College of the City of New York, 1953
M.A., University of Pennsylvania, 1954)

Joel Strumph Gopen
(B.A., Boston University, 1959)

Theodore Roosevelt Parrish
(B.A., Brown University, 1957;
M.Ed., Boston University, 1959)

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

1961

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	
The Problem.....	1
Prior Research.....	2
The Present Study.....	6
II. METHOD	
Method of Gathering Data	
Selection of Respondent Group.....	10
Selection of Mail Sample.....	10
Selection of Interview Sample.....	11
Population Breakdown.....	11
Design of Questionnaire.....	12
General Part.....	12
Specific Part (Case Material).....	13
Pretest of the Questionnaire.....	13
Collection of Data.....	14
III. RESULTS	
Data About Respondents.....	15
Results of the General Part of the Questionnaire.....	20
Results of the Specific Part of the Questionnaire.....	26
Coding Responses to Questions 1 (a)-1 (c)-II & VI.....	26
Coding Responses to Question 1	30
Coding Responses to Question 111.....	34
Comparison of Results from PARTS I AND II.....	36
Discussion of Findings.....	40
Nature of Respondents.....	40
Criteria Used in Assessing Movement in a Specific and General Situation.....	41
IV. CONCLUSIONS	
Limitations.....	48
Nature of Study and Data Analysis.....	48
Case Material.....	48
Mailed Questionnaire.....	49
Nature of Categories.....	49
Future Recommendations.....	49
Implications.....	50
V. SUMMARY	
Purpose and Overview.....	51
Method and Procedure.....	51
Results.....	51
APPENDICES	

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Response Rate of the Mailed and Interview Questionnaire....	16
2. Training Received by the Respondents in Preparation to Practice Social Group Work.....	17
3. The Professional Experience of the Respondents After Receiving the M.S.W. or Equivalent.....	18
4. The Number of years of Direct Leadership Experience Acquired by Respondents Since Receiving M.S.W. or Equivalent Degree	19
5. Number of Respondents Whose Questionnaire Responses in Part I Were Coded in Each of the Defined Categories.....	23
6. The Frequency With Which Categorized Responses Occurred in the Questions in Part I.....	25
7. Number of Respondents Whose Questionnaire Responses to Questions in Part II, Dealing With Constructive Movement, Destructive Movement, Major Problems, and Major Goals of Worker, Were Coded in the Eight Categories Defined in Part I.....	27
8. The Frequency With Which Categorized Questionnaire Responses to Questions in Part II, Dealing With Constructive Movement, Destructive Movement, No Movement, Major Problems, and Major Goals of Worker.....	29
9. Number of Respondents Whose Questionnaire Responses to the Question in Part II, Dealing With Members' Contribution to Movement, Were Coded in the Eight Major Categories.....	31
10. Frequency With Which Questionnaire Responses in Part II, to the Question Dealing With the Ways Members Contributed to Movement, Were Coded Under the Eight Major Categories.....	33
11. Practitioners Whose Questionnaire Responses to the Question, Dealing With the Way the Worker in the Case Material Influenced Movement, Required a "New" Set of Categories for Coding.....	37

12. Frequencies With Which Questionnaire Responses to the Question, Dealing With the Way the Worker in the Case Material Influenced Movement, Were Coded in the "New" Categories.....	38
13. Rank Order of Criteria Most Frequently Mentioned in the General Section of the Questionnaire.....	41
14. Rank Order of Criteria Most Frequently mentioned in the Specific Section of the Questionnaire.....	44

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Problem

At some stage in its development every profession must evaluate its progress and in so doing, create the tools necessary for determining the effectiveness of its professional methods and skills.

If we cannot judge whether an action has led forward or backward, if we have no criteria for evaluating the relationship between effort and achievement, there is nothing to prevent us from making the wrong conclusions. . . .¹

Margaret Blenkner has summed this up admirably when she writes that evaluative research is essential to a profession.

... it should enable the members of the profession to determine to what extent they are achieving their objectives, to discover the reasons for their successes and failures, to point the way toward experimentation with new programs and techniques, and to provide a means of testing their effectiveness. It should also add to, and provide a scientific base for, the principles on which a profession operates and at the same time, produce a body of meaningful, scientifically defensible data with which to interpret needs and services. . . .²

The problem of evaluating the professional 'help' of social work has been of concern for many years and material bearing on it has become increasingly prominent in the literature of the field.

The ultimate objective of evaluation is increased effectiveness in service to clients and increased understanding within the profession of the use of its methods and the development of its theoretical framework. This becomes even more urgent in these days of limited funds

¹ David G. French, An Approach to Measuring Results in Social Work, p. 11.

² Margaret Blenkner, "Obstacles to Evaluative Research in Casework," Social Casework, vol. 31 (February, 1950), p. 54.

and the necessity for establishing priorities in earmarking these funds among the many possible services. Among many obstacles to evaluative research in social work, Blenkner finds that the caseworker's "economic relationship to the public is a major source of his anxiety and blocking over evaluative research."³ This feeling is manifested as concern that "a rigid science supercede a soul satisfying art."⁴ In essence the fear exists that the methodology and achievements of the profession cannot be validated in the eyes of the community. Saul Bernstein, Professor of Group Work at Boston University notes that it "would be embarrassing, however, to deal with the skeptic who asks us to prove scientifically the validity of our method,"⁵ The absence of adequate means for objective evaluation may lead to inadequate subjective evaluation. This may create what Bernstein terms a "feeling of failure"⁶ and can lead to frustrating attempts to 'interpret' the data.

This difficulty arises for social work research because of the complexity of attempting to develop standard measuring devices for dealing with human beings in their infinite variations. It is with this perspective in mind that this thesis attempts to contribute to the development of adequate measuring devices for assessing group movement.

Prior Research

In the past fifteen years many attempts have been made to develop objective, quantitative, reliable evaluative procedures in the

³Ibid., p. 58.

⁴Ibid., p. 56.

⁵Saul Bernstein, "Charting Group Progress," p. 47.

⁶Ibid., p. 48.

various social sciences. This has had beneficial results in terms of the interdisciplinary approach to research.⁷ In social casework the pioneer effort was made by John McV. Hunt and Leonard S. Kogan⁸ through their development of a 'Movement Scale' and its application to individuals and families in terms of four criteria: adaptive efficiency, disabling habits and conditions, verbalized attitudes and understanding, and environmental circumstances. After considerable testing it was judged to be a reliable and effective method of assessing agency functioning through evaluative assessment of client service. Of particular interest was the fact that significant agreement was obtained among workers with a similar length of experience in the field. Subsequent studies in casework have confirmed and gone beyond this initial effort.⁹ Of considerable import to group work is the fact that these studies and the 'Movement Scale' were less precise when dealing with families than with individuals, since different members of families

⁷Elizabeth Herzog, Some Guide Lines for Evaluative Research, pp. 96-117. This bibliography includes references to evaluative research in Psychology, Counseling, Mental Health, Psychiatry, Social Work, etc.

⁸John McV. Hunt and Leonard S. Kogan, Measuring Results in Social Casework : A Manual on Judging Movement. Also, J. McV. Hunt, L. S. Kogan and Margaret Blenkner, Testing Results in Social Casework; A Field Test of the Movement Scale.

⁹A. A. Heckman, "Measuring the Effectiveness of Agency Services," Journal of Social Casework, vol. 29 (December, 1948); Leonard S. Kogan, "Evaluative Techniques in Social Casework," Social Service Review, vol. 26 (September, 1952); Mary E. MacDonald, "Some Essentials in the Evaluation of Social Casework," Journal of Psychiatric Social Work, vol. 22 (April, 1953); Malcolm G. Preston, Emily H. Mudd and Hazel B. Frocher, "Factors Affecting Movement in Casework," Social Casework, vol. 34, (March, 1953).

move at different rates. The difficulties that these studies have encountered in assessing family movement point up the necessity for social group work to derive its own research methodology appropriate for assessing change in groups.

In recent years social group work has placed greater emphasis on evaluative research. One of the first, and perhaps the most significant effort to date, was made by Saul Bernstein.¹⁰ Professor Bernstein recognized many difficulties in applying a movement scale to groups: age, sex, educational and social differences, differences in individual movement within a group, the multitude of influences that impinge on group members outside of the group experience, various developmental levels groups may be at, etc.

As a result, he recognized that all groups could not be evaluate on the same time or movement scale. For example, the small degree of movement achieved by an anti-social street gang may be more meaningful than the more extensive movement of a sophisticated sorority. These factors could not be indicated if the same time or movement scale were used for both. Other factors which could influence the significance of the degree of movement include: length of the groups existence; what phase or 'time-lapse' during its existence was being evaluated; whether it was at the outset or the end of a program year; the extent of the 'time-lapse' used; social, cultural, economic and emotional milieu; group cohesiveness, etc.

¹⁰

Bernstein, op. cit.

Within these limits Bernstein felt that criteria which are generally applicable to all groups could be used to measure movement in specific groups. In implementing these concepts, Professor Bernstein developed group evaluation charts and selected criteria on the basis of "what seems important in the purposes of group work."¹¹ The initial concern was in terms of whether practicing group workers would be consistent in applying these dimensions to a given group experience. The ~~expectations~~ were reasonable in light of prior experience with casework studies.

Professor Bernstein's contribution stimulated further work in this area by social group workers. In subsequent years a number of theses at the Boston University School of Social Work dealt with the evaluation of group movement, and sought to test the charts prepared by Professor Bernstein.¹²

The net result of these studies was increasing faith in the reliability of the group evaluation chart as a method of assessing change in groups. In addition, there is greater awareness of the importance of ascertaining the criteria which are most meaningful to

¹¹Ibid., p. 52. Bernstein's criteria were : attendance, group organization, group standards, wider horizons, social responsibility, enriched interests, handling conflict, leadership and participation, cooperative planning, group thinking, group loyalty and morals, acceptance of differences, and decreasing need of the leader.

¹²James A Garland, "A Reliability Test of an Instrument for Measuring Group Development,"; Lawrence B. Groth, "The Formulation of a Tool for the Establishment of Norms of Group Behavior,"; Murray G. Berman, "Charts for Evaluation in a Group Work Setting,".

the group work practitioners who are assessing change clinically.¹³ Robert Chin notes that the "choice of criteria should be a practical judgement geared to the needs and requirements of the practitioner."¹⁴ In one example of the use of Bernstein's charts, the Boston Girl Scout Council found that "clarity increased roughly in proportion to the tangible quality of the criteria."¹⁵ It appears that for more objective evaluation the practitioner needs a special kind of knowledge that lies somewhere between theory derived from basic research, and clinical judgement derived from practice. From these studies it is expected that the development of a reliable evaluative tool will help practitioners improve their ability to make clinical judgements.

The Present Study

Since the concept of movement or degree of change is essential to evaluative research,¹⁶ this concept has been utilized in this study of criteria. We have used Bernstein's assumption that general criteria can be used to measure change or movement in a specific

¹³Garland, op. cit., p. 77; Groth, op. cit., pp. 3-9, 10; Berman, op. cit., pp. 70, 80-82.

¹⁴Robert Chin, Evaluation Research and Practitioner's Theory, Human Relations Center, Boston University Research Reports and Technical Notes No. 30, p. 6.

¹⁵Bernstein, op. cit., p. 52.

¹⁶French, op. cit., pp. 44, 47-48.

group, over a specific period in its developmental history. By being applicable to specific groups, and yet part of a more general conceptual framework, the criteria will have a greater potential for application in a wide variety of possible circumstances. It is apparent that if reliability cannot be tested with groups that differ in age, sex, socio-cultural background, etc., the importance of the results become severely limited.¹⁷

In the literature of social work, movement has been variously defined. In an example which applies to casework, movement is defined as "changes that take place in the clients of social casework during the period when casework services are being furnished."¹⁸ In an example which applies to group work, movement is defined as:

change which takes place in individual and group behavior in terms of certain criteria which have been more or less arbitrarily set up as indices of qualities that some group workers consider it desirable for individuals and groups to achieve.¹⁹

In essence, movement for both groups and individuals has been defined as a comparison of before and after levels of behavior and attitudes as measured against a pre-determined standard.²⁰

¹⁷Chin, op. cit., p. 8.

¹⁸French, op. cit., Appendix p. 6.

¹⁹Garland, op. cit., p. 19.

²⁰Helen L. Witmer and Elizabeth Herzog, "Evaluative Research: Some Preliminary Considerations," Casework Papers, National Conference of Social Work, 1954, p. 141.

For the purpose of the present study, movement is defined as the changes which take place in group or individual behavior in relation to criteria which professional social group workers consider significant in assessing group or individual change. The determination of these criteria is the subject of this thesis.

As noted above, the studies in the use of the group evaluation charts concluded that an understanding of the criteria being used for assessing movement is vital to the applicability of the movement scales. Bernstein suggested that until there is clinical consistency in the acceptance and application of criteria our measurements of movement can not be precise.²¹ The experience of the Boston Girl Scout Council indicated that the criteria selected must be meaningful to those who are to apply the charts. The Garland study documents the clinical disagreement about the validity of different criteria and makes it clear that the reliability and applicability of the evaluation charts was dependent on the criteria selected.²² From these studies it is clear that the degree to which practicing social group workers agree on criteria for evaluating movement must be determined. This study hopes to take that step.

To achieve this objective, we were guided by the following considerations:

a. It is desirable to develop a conceptual framework for assessing movement in groups. In order to do this it is necessary to determine the degree of agreement concerning concepts such as

²¹Bernstein, op. cit., pp. 49, 52.

²²Garland, op. cit., p. 77.

"constructive movement" and "destructive movement". We have therefore attempted to determine the meaning of this basic social work terminology, independent of specific situations, by providing an opportunity for respondents to define these terms as they normally use them. By so doing, we will be able to develop operational definitions which will then help us develop adequate measuring instruments.

b. Since these terms or concepts may be used differently in practice, it appeared helpful to view their application in specific situations. In order to increase the validity of this procedure a phase of group life was covered in the case material. Instead of a cross-section or "frozen slice"²³ of group existence, the time-lapse approach to case material covers a more extensive period of group life. The use of this method helps to broaden the range of potential application.

By dual examination of general and specific criteria used in assessing movement, we hope to derive measuring instruments for those concepts about which practitioners are generally agreed. Those areas for which there is little apparent agreement will point up the necessity for further investigation as a way to clarification and evaluation of social work concepts and terminology. The ultimate objective is the determination of a set of generally accepted criteria which can then help provide better instruments and more standardized evaluative procedures for assessing group movement.

23

Chin, op. cit., pp. 3, 11.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

The assessment of the general and specific approach was accomplished in the following ways: the first approach was to determine how practitioners conceive of group movement for middle adolescent groups without specific reference to a particular group. This would show to what extent general criteria are used by social group workers in assessing group movement for at least one age category. The second approach was to examine the extent to which practitioners agree in their view of movement for a specific group.

We assessed these two approaches by questionnaire responses from a group of practitioners in the field.

Method of Gathering Data

Selection of Respondent Group

We felt it would be most desirable to use a structured interview in gathering our data. However, the practical limitations involved in this technique would limit us to a smaller sample than we would desire. Therefore, we decided to add to the interview sample with material gathered by mailed questionnaires. This also permitted us to tap a wider variety of experience and interest in our respondents.

Selection of Mail Sample

The criteria used in the selection of the mail-sample was experience in the field and accessibility of the respondents. It was felt that field work supervisors in group work would adequately

meet these criteria. In addition, we also thought it would be desirable to add a group of respondents who were not affiliated with a university. This would permit us to see to what degree, if any, professional university affiliation influences the kinds of judgments to which we are concerned. The latter group was obtained by a sampling of group work practitioners in the National Association of Social Workers' directory.

The field work supervisor portion of the sample was obtained through correspondence with 8 schools of social work with a group work sequence. They were requested to cooperate by sending a listing of their 1960-61 field work supervisors in group work. All the schools provided a list of their group work supervisors and indicated an interest in this study.

As indicated, the second part of the mail-sample was randomly picked from the 1959-60 NASW listing of practicing social group workers. These respondents were contacted directly regarding their willingness to become respondents in this study.

Selection of Interview Sample

The interview group consisted of the entire listing of field work supervisors in group work at the Boston University School of Social Work. The same criteria used in the selection of the mail-sample were used in the selection of the interview sample.

Population Breakdown

The total respondent population used in this study was composed in the following manner:

Total Respondent Population

<u>Mail-Sample</u>	No.	%
Field Work Supervisors	97	65
Other Group Work Practitioners	37	25
 <u>Interview Sample</u>		
Field Work Supervisors (Boston University)	15	10
Total Number Respondents	<u>149</u>	<u>100%</u>

Design of Questionnaire

A face sheet preceded the questionnaire in order to obtain background information about our respondents (see Appendix). This information provided further understanding of the judgments the respondents provide in the questionnaire.

Open ended questions were used in the questionnaire, in order to obtain the views of the respondents in their customary language of evaluating group movement.

The questionnaire was essentially composed of two parts. The first was the general part. The purpose of this section was to get at general principles held by workers in regard to group movement.

General Part

The first two questions in the general part asked for working definitions. The respondents were asked to give their definition of constructive movement and destructive movement for middle adolescent groups.

Three additional questions were included in the general part, regarding common areas of concern in working with groups. The respondents were asked to give their expectations concerning major group problems and weaknesses, group strengths, and goals of worker with middle adolescent groups.

Specific Part (Case Material)

The second part of the questionnaire included case material followed by questions specifically related to this case. The following were the criteria used for the selection of case material for this study:

1. A middle adolescent boys' group. This age was chosen on the basis of amount of service given by social group workers as compared with other age groups, recorded material available, and problems related to group movement.
2. A good process record of at least two meetings.
3. Little apparent group movement between the two meetings.
4. A relatively normal group with the more common individual and group problems.

The questions which followed the case were essentially similar to the questions in the general part of the questionnaire; however, they were modified to suit this particular case study.

Pretest of the Questionnaire

The final questionnaire was refined on the basis of a pretest using 15 subjects who were local practicing social group workers and

who met the criteria for our intended respondents.

The pretest was conducted by having the subjects complete the questionnaire as though they had received it in the mail. A member of the research group then went over the questionnaire with the respondent to determine the degree to which the questionnaire was achieving its' objective. These findings were then incorporated into the final questionnaire.

Collection of Data

The revised questionnaire was sent out to the mail-sample with directions explaining how the questionnaire is to be used. Also included was a form letter describing the purpose of the study (see Appendix).

While waiting for the return of the mail responses, the study group conducted interviews with the local field work supervisors, using the same questionnaire. These subjects were contacted, given the questionnaire, and then interviewed. This interview provided us with information about the way in which the questionnaire was viewed by the actual respondents.

The mail-sample was given a deadline for the return of the questionnaires. Post card reminders were sent out a week before this deadline date.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

This chapter is divided into five sections. The first section gives data about those respondents who completed the questionnaire. The second section defines and reports the evaluative categories which were derived from responses on Part I or the general part of the questionnaire. Section three presents the same material for Part II or the specific part of the questionnaire. Basically, the same categories were used to code both parts of the questionnaire, although it was necessary to define new ones for one question in Part II. In section four, a comparison of data between the two parts of the questionnaire is presented. The fifth section will discuss the results.

Data About Respondents

Table 1 shows an analysis of the response rate. It contains the number of people receiving the questionnaire, the number and percentage of those completing and returning it, those returning it unanswered, and those who did not respond at all. One questionnaire which was completed and returned after the designated cut-off date, and which was not considered part of the data sample, was included in the last category.

TABLE 1
 RESPONSE RATE OF THE MAILED AND INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRES

Sources	Total Sample		Questionnaires Completed and Returned		Questionnaires Returned Undone		Workers Not Responding	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Mailed Questionnaires	134	100.0	28	20.7	15	11.2	91	67.9
Interviews	15	100.0	12	80.0	0	0.0	3	20.0
Totals	149	100.0	40	26.7	15	10.1	94	63.0

As can be seen, 134 questionnaires were mailed, and 28 of them were returned and completed by the designated due date. Fifteen interviews were attempted, using the same questionnaires, and 12 were completed. This means that the results are based upon 40 completed questionnaires or 26.9 per cent of the combined mailed questionnaires plus interviews.

Of the 15 questionnaires returned blank, two had not reached the social group workers to whom they were sent. The remaining 13 incomplete questionnaires were not answered because the practitioners said they did not have the time to do them. Thus 11.1 per cent of the mail sample returned questionnaires which were not completed. Another 67.9 per cent of the mail sample did not respond to the questionnaire in any form.

Table 2 indicates the graduate training of the group workers who completed the questionnaire. Thirty-seven of them have M.S.W. degrees or its equivalent. Twenty-five of them specialized in group work, ten had no specialty and two were in community organization. Two others have graduate degrees in related fields. The group worker with the M. Ed. also has completed between 20 to 30 hours toward his M.S.W. There is but one person, or 2.5 per cent of the data sample, without a graduate degree. This person lacks completion of his thesis in order to receive his M.S.W.

TABLE 2

TRAINING RECEIVED BY THE RESPONDENTS IN
PREPARATION TO PRACTICE SOCIAL GROUP WORK

Training	Total Sample		Mail Sample		Interview Sample	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Group Work	25	62.5	18	64.3	7	58.3
Group Work and Comm. Organ.	1	2.5	0	0.0	1	8.3
Comm. Organ.	1	2.5	1	3.6	0	0.0
MSW Unclassi- fied	10	25.0	7	25.0	3	25.0
M.A. Sociology	1	2.5	1	3.6	0	0.0
M. Ed in Educa- tional Social Work	1	2.5	1	3.6	0	0.0
Course Work completed	<u>1</u>	<u>2.5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>8.3</u>
Totals	40	100.0	28	100.1	12	99.9

Table 3 indicates the number of years of social group work experience the respondents have had since receiving their M.S.W. degree (or since completing other academic training). It shows that 72.5 per cent of the respondents have been in the field for 10 years or less. Only 7.5 per cent have been in the field over 15 years.

TABLE 3

THE PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE OF THE RESPONDENTS
AFTER RECEIVING THE M.S.W. DEGREE OR EQUIVALENT

Experience (years)	Total Sample		Mail Sample		Interview Sample	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
1-5	8	20.0	6	21.4	2	16.7
6-10	21	52.5	13	46.4	8	66.7
11-15	8	20.0	7	25.0	1	8.3
16+	<u>3</u>	<u>7.5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>7.1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>8.3</u>
Totals	40	100.0	28	99.9	12	100.0

The purpose of Table 4 is to indicate the number of years in the direct leadership of groups respondents have spent since receiving their training. This data is of concern because it has been common practice for group workers to go directly into administration upon receiving their M.S.W. degree.¹ The assumption underlying this concern is that in general, the group worker who has been involved

¹Clara A. Kaiser, "The Advances of Social Group Work," The Social Welfare Forum, 1955, pp. 41-42.

directly in group leadership is in a better position to have had first hand experience with criteria to assess movement in groups than the person who has not had such direct leadership involvement. From Table 4, it can be seen that all of the respondents have had at least a year's experience in direct leadership of groups, and 80.0 per cent have had four or more years in such direct leadership.

TABLE 4

THE NUMBER OF YEARS OF DIRECT GROUP LEADERSHIP EXPERIENCE ACQUIRED BY RESPONDENTS SINCE RECEIVING M.S.W. OR EQUIVALENT DEGREE

No. of Years of Direct Group Leadership Experience	Total Sample		Mail Sample		Interview Sample	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
1-3	8	20.0	6	21.4	2	16.7
4-7	22	55.0	14	50.0	8	66.7
8-10	5	12.5	4	14.3	1	8.3
11+	<u>5</u>	<u>12.5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>14.3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>8.3</u>
Totals	40	100.0	28	100.0	12	100.0

Since the questionnaire focused upon a male middle-adolescent age group, there was an attempt to learn whether practitioners had had experience in leading groups of males between the ages of 14 and 18. Only 2 of the 40 respondents had not led groups of this particular age range. Both of them, however, had led groups whose age range was quite close. In addition, just 7.5 per cent (3) of the respondents had

not had experience working with male or co-ed groups.

It should be noted that 62.5 per cent (25) of the respondents are now directly leading groups.

In summary, when the mail sample was compared with the interview sample, no major differences were found in professional experience, training, or direct leadership involvement.

Results of the General Part of the Questionnaire

In order to compare the responses of the various practitioners, a coding system was developed in the following way. Questionnaire responses on Part I were grouped according to their inherent similarities of content. From this resulted eight categories which were applicable to all five questions. In addition, the question concerning major group strengths (see Appendix) required three other categories to account for all relevant responses. The responses were made to five questions (see Appendix). These questions had to do with constructive movement, destructive movement, major problems and weaknesses, major group strengths, and major goals of the group worker for the age group under discussion. The eleven categories used to code responses to the five questions on Part I of the questionnaire are defined below:

Adaptation to reality - "The ability of an individual to envisage and respond to the actual situations of life, without falsifying to himself either the environmental conditions or his own relations thereto by imagination, day dreaming, rationalization, or other forms of self-deception."²

²Howard Warren, Dictionary of Psychology, p. 224.

Forming and maintaining relationships - The ability of a person and/or group to move out from the self (group); to have consideration and respect for others, particularly those different from the self; and to get along with others, including one's peers (of both sexes), parents, and other adults.

Identification - "When an individual, by incorporating within himself a mental picture of an object, thinks feels, and acts as he conceives the object to think, feel and act. . ."³

Sublimation of impulses - "During . . . growth the instincts are conditioned to altered forms of expression, conforming in their manifestations with the standards for given age periods. There is . . . a constant process of refinement . . . and a particular kind of modification of aim and change of object, with regard to which our social values came into the picture."⁴

Independence - "An attitude of self-reliance or refusal to be dominated by others."⁵ This would apply, for example, when a group begins to rely less on the worker to take responsibility for its negative actions or when individuals in a group are able to take advantage of available adult leadership and resources in the community.

Group Maintenance - The roles individual members in the group play in order "to alter or maintain the group way of working, to strengthen, regulate and perpetuate the group as a group."⁶

Group Task - "The facilitation and coordination of group effort in the selection and definition of a common problem and the solution of that problem."⁷ This would include the responsibility taken by the group in an effort to achieve its goals and aims.

³Leland E. Hinsie and Jacob Shatsky, Psychiatric Dictionary, p. 277.

⁴Ibid., p. 509.

⁵Warren, op. cit., p. 135.

⁶Kenneth Benne and Paul Sheats, "Functional Roles of Group Members," Journal of Social Issues, vol. 4 (Spring, 1948) pp. 41-49

⁷Ibid., p. 42.

Social Maturity - The nature of program content where variety and the development of new skills and interests were the focus; concern with and planning for the fulfillment of the roles expected of one by our larger society; and the achievement of norms and standards by the individual and/or the group which are in balance with the norms and standards of greater society.

The following categories were used only in the question having to do with major strengths.

Energy, Drive and Strength - "The capacity for doing work," "The degree of activity displayed in behavior."⁸

Characterized by Religiosity and High Ideals - "A belief in and devotion to that which is most worthwhile in life."⁹
An emotionally colored inclination towards behavior that is most desirable.¹⁰

Interest, Curiosity and Enthusiasm - A tendency to focus attention on partly known events or situations and to seek information or knowledge regarding them.¹¹

Table 5 shows the respondents whose questionnaire responses to Part I were coded under the eleven categories. In addition, this table indicates the degree to which the respondents were consistent in referring to each category when answering each question. This was determined by obtaining an average percentage of respondents whose responses to each question in Part I were coded under each category. Table 5 ranks these average percentages in order of their decreasing magnitude as follows: forming and maintaining relationships -- 62 per cent, social maturity -- 42 per cent, group maintenance -- 41

⁸ Warren, op. cit., p. 93.

⁹ Ibid., p. 129.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 129.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 141.

TABLE 5

23

NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHOSE QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES IN PART I WERE CODED IN EACH OF THE DEFINED CATEGORIES

Questions	Categories										
	Relation- ships	Social Maturity	Group Mainten- ance	Independ- ence	Group Task	Identi- fication	Subli- mation	Adapta- tion to Reality	Interest (C) Cur- iosity Enthusi- asm	Drive(C) Energy Strength	Ideal- ism (C)
(a) Constructive (No.R.	25	24	15	18	24	15	11	8			
Move- ment ((b) (% R	63	60	38	45	60	38	28	20			
Destruct- ive (No. R	23	16	19	11	14	14	11	5			
Movement (% R	58	40	48	28	35	35	28	13			
Major Prob- lems and (No.R	32	11	9	18	10	28	11	14			
Weaknesses (% R	80	28	23	45	25	45	28	35			
Major Group Strengths (No.R	17	5	24	10	11	11	1	0	22	9	9
(% R	43	12	60	25	28	28	3	0	55	23	23
Major Goals of Group (No.R	26	29	14	21	16	17	8	11			
Worker (% R	25	73	35	53	40	43	20	28			
Ave % R	62	42	41	39	38	38	21	19			
Range in % R	43-80	12-73	23-60	25-45	25-60	28-45	3-28	0-35			

(a)

"No. R" represents the number of practitioners whose responses were coded in the respective categories.

(b)

"% R" represents the percentage of the 40 respondents that No. R. is. "Ave % R" represents the average percentage of respondents per question in each category.

(c)

Categories used only for the question on major group strengths.

per cent, independence -- 39 per cent, group task and identification -- 38 per cent each, sublimation of impulses-- 21 per cent, and adaptation to reality -- 19 per cent. (Three additional categories were used to code responses to only one question, and were therefore included here.) In evaluating these average percentages, they should be considered in light of the range of values which were found in each category. The ranges of percentages are shown in the last row of Table 5 for each of the categories. Though the ranges are somewhat broad, the average percentages may still serve as a rough indicator of the consistency of referral to each category in each question.

Table 5 has a limitation in that although it tells the number of practitioners making reference to a given category, it does not tell how frequently each categorized response was made. Knowledge about frequency of response becomes important when a higher frequency of a response indicates a more valued criterion in assessing movement.

Table 6 shows the frequency with which questionnaire responses to Part I were coded in each category. The total frequencies are ranked in the order of decreasing magnitude, and indicate the degree to which each category was used relative to other categories. The frequency distribution was as follows: relationship -- 182, social maturity -- 174, group maintenance -- 140, independence -- 104, group task -- 102, identification -- 91, adaptation to reality -- 54, sublimation of impulses -- 50. Total frequencies were not indicated for the additional three categories; for they were only used to code

TABLE 6

THE FREQUENCY* WITH WHICH CATEGORIZED QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES OCCURRED IN THE
QUESTIONS IN PART I

25

Questions	Category Frequencies										
	Relation- ship	Social Maturity	Group Main- tenance	Indepen- dence	Group Task	Identifi- cation	Adapta- tion to Reality	Sublima- tion	Interest Curiosity Enthusi- asm	Ideal- ism	Drive Energy Strength
Construc- tive movement	36	48	25	23	36	15	11	14			
Destruc- tive movement	34	37	46	17	21	14	5	12			
Major Prob- lems and weaknesses	49	17	12	24	11	24	20	14			
Major Group strengths	18	15	36	12	12	13	0	1	23	11	10
Major Goals of the group worker	<u>48</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>9</u>			
Totals	182	174	140	104	102	91	54	50			

*Frequency represents the number of times a response was coded in a category. This permits a single person's responses to appear more than once in a given category.

responses to the question having to do with major group strengths.

When comparing the rank order of categories derived from the total frequencies in Table 6 and the average percentages of respondents in Table 5, there is almost complete agreement; that is, forming and maintaining relationships, social maturity, and group maintenance rank 1, 2 and 3 in both tables. Independence, group task, and identification appear to form a middle cluster in Table 6; and this is somewhat supported in Table 5. Adaptation to reality and sublimation stand towards the bottom end of the rank order in both tables.

Results of the Specific Part of the Questionnaire

This section is divided into three sub-sections. The questions which were similar to the ones asked in Part I are coded in the first sub-section. These questions concern constructive movement, destructive movement, no movement, major problems, and major goals. The next sub-section deals with responses to the question about the boys in the case material who contributed most to constructive and destructive movement. The last sub-section concerns the question about the ways in which the worker in the case material facilitated or impeded constructive movement. It is the only question which initially required a "new" set of categories.

Coding of Responses to Questions I (a) - I (c), II and VI

Table 7 shows the respondents whose questionnaire responses to questions having to do with constructive movement, destructive movement, no movement, major problems and major goals underlying the

TABLE 7

NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHOSE QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS IN PART II, DEALING WITH CONSTRUCTIVE MOVEMENT, DESTRUCTIVE MOVEMENT, NO MOVEMENT, MAJOR PROBLEMS, AND MAJOR GOALS OF WORKER, WERE CODED IN THE EIGHT MAJOR CATEGORIES DEFINED IN PART I

Questions		Categories														
		Relationship	Group Main- tenance	Social Maturity	Group Task	Independence	Adaptation To Reality	Identification	Sublima- tion							
Constructive movement	(a) (No.R	26														
	(%R)(b)	65	32	80	45	15	38	7	18	6	15	7	18	1	3	
Destructive movement	(No.R	24														
	(%R	60	10	25	13	6	15	3	8	3	8	0	0	3	8	
No movement	(No.R	18														
	(%R	45	17	43	18	4	10	2	5	4	10	2	5	1	3	
Major problems	(No.R	19														
	(%R	48	27	68	23	11	28	8	20	7	18	4	10	0	0	
Major goals underlying the group	(No.R	15														
	(%R	37	10	25	30	11	28	6	15	6	15	7	18	4	10	
Average %R		53	27	27	24	13	13	10	13	10	5					
Range in %R		37-65	25-80	13-45	10-38	5-20	8-18	0-18	0-10							

(a) See Table 5.

(b) See Table 5.

group were coded under the eight main categories discussed earlier. In addition, the average percentages of respondents, as described in the preceding section, were used to indicate the degree to which the respondents were consistent in referring to each category. The average percentages in order of decreasing magnitude are: forming and maintaining relationships -- 53 per cent, group maintenance -- 48 per cent, social maturity -- 27 per cent, group task -- 24 per cent, independence and adaptation to reality -- 13 per cent, identification -- 10 per cent and sublimation - 5 per cent. The ranges in percentages of respondents are indicated in the bottom row of the table. As in Part I the ranges are broad, but are considered rough indicators of consistency of referral to each category.

Table 8 shows the frequencies with which practitioners' responses to the questions in this subsection were coded in the eight original categories. However, there is a difference between this material and its counterpart in Table 6. Because of the limitations posed here by the specificity of case material, the quantity of responses is restricted in a way that was not true of the general material. As a result of this limitation, it is theoretically possible that not only material relating to various categories will appear with less frequency, but also material relating to some categories might not appear at all.

With the above limitation in mind, the frequency with which questionnaire responses to the three questions occurred will be listed as a rough indicator of response distribution. They are: group

TABLE 8.

THE FREQUENCY WITH WHICH CATEGORIZED QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES OCCURRED TO QUESTIONS IN PART II DEALING WITH CONSTRUCTIVE MOVEMENT, DESTRUCTIVE MOVEMENT, NO MOVEMENT, MAJOR PROBLEMS, AND MAJOR GOALS OF WORKER^a

Questions	Category Frequencies							
	Group Maintenance	Relationship	Social Maturity	Group Task	Independence	Adaptation to Reality	Identification	Sublimation
Constructive Movement	57	44	22	17	10	6	9	1
Destructive Movement	13	38	8	6	3	3	0	3
No Movement	29	26	9	6	2	5	2	1
Major Problems	40	25	10	11	10	7	6	0
Major Goals Underlying the Group	14	18	18	12	6	6	7	4
Totals	153	151	67	52	31	27	24	9

^a

See Table 6

maintenance -- 153, forming and maintaining relationships -- 151, social maturity -- 67, group task -- 52 independence -- 31, adaptation to reality -- 27, identification -- 24, and sublimation of impulses -- 9.

In the preceding section, it was noted that the rank order of categories between the total frequency of responses and the average percentage of respondents was practically the same. In this section, a similar pattern develops, despite greater limitations insofar as extraneous variables are concerned. More specifically, in Table 7 the relative frequencies in the order of decreasing magnitude were as follows: relationship, group maintenance, social maturity, group task, independence, adaptation to reality, identification, and sublimation. The only change in Table 8 compared to Table 7 is a reversal of the first two categories. The clusters between the two tables are roughly the same. Group maintenance and relationship form the first category. Social maturity and group task form another category. Independence, adaptation to reality and identification form a third, and sublimation stands off by itself.

Coding Responses to Question I

In Question V respondents were asked to point out which members in the case material contributed most to constructive movement, and to give the material upon which they based their judgments. A similar question was asked with respect to negative movement. Table 9 shows the respondents whose responses to this question concerned material which was coded under the eight categories defined above. Group maintenance, and forming and maintaining relationship again rank in the

TABLE 9

31

NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHOSE QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION IN PART II DEALING WITH MEMBERS' CONTRIBUTION TO MOVEMENT, WERE CODED IN THE EIGHT MAJOR CATEGORIES

Questions	Categories								
	Group Maintenance	Relation-ship	Group Task	Social Maturity	Independence	Adaptation to Reality	Sublimation	Identifi- cation	
Ways in Which Members Contributed to Constructive Movement	(a) No. R	27	22	16	8	11	6	5	0
	(b) % R	68	55	40	20	28	15	13	0
Ways in Which Members Contributed to Destructive Movement	No. R	16	20	1	6	1	1	1	4
	% R	40	50	3	16	3	3	3	10

(a) See Table 5

(b) See Table 5

first two places in terms of the percentage of respondents making reference to them. Group task, social maturity and independence cluster in a second grouping. Adaptation to reality, sublimation and identification form a cluster which was used less frequently to code practitioner responses.

An interesting phenomenon in Table 9 is how frequently it shows that more practitioners' responses were coded in the original eight categories on the question regarding constructive movement than on the question regarding destructive movement. (Hopefully, there were, in fact, more ways in which group members contributed to constructive movement than to destructive.) Only in the identification category was this trend not so.

Table 10 is included to give some indication about the frequency distribution of the responses in each category. Again, group maintenance and forming and maintaining relationship categories stand in a class by themselves with frequencies of 86 and 68 respectively. Group task follows with 23, social maturity with 15, independence with 12, adaptation to reality with 8, and sublimation and identification were both coded 5 times each. Again it is interesting to note that in general, there were more responses recorded in answer to the question having to do with constructive movement than the one having to do with destructive movement.

TABLE 10

FREQUENCY* WITH WHICH QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES IN PART II, TO THE QUESTION DEALING WITH THE WAYS MEMBERS CONTRIBUTED TO MOVEMENT, WERE CODED UNDER THE EIGHT MAJOR CATEGORIES

Questions	Category Frequencies							
	Group Main- tenance	Relationship	Group Task	Social Maturity	Independence	Adaptation to Reality	Sublima- tion	Identifica- tion
Ways in which mem- bers contributed to constructive move- ment	51	31	22	9	11	7	0	5
Ways in which mem- bers contributed to destructive move- ment	<u>35</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>1</u>
Totals	86	68	23	15	12	8	6	6

*

See Table 6

Coding Responses to Question III

Question III had to do with the ways in which the worker facilitated or impeded constructive group movement. The questionnaire responses necessitated what at first appeared to be a "new" set of categories for coding. These "new" categories, which had to do with the workers skills, were obtained in the same manner as that described in section two. Definitions of the "new" categories are as follows:¹²

I. Analysis of Group Situation

- A. The group worker must be skillful in judging the developmental level of the group to determine what the level is, what the group needs and how quickly the group can be expected to move. This calls for skill in direct observation.
- B. The group worker must be skillful in helping the group to express ideas, wait out objectives, **clarify** immediate goals, and see both its potentialities and limitations as a group.

II. Group Feeling

- A. The group worker must be skillful in controlling his own feelings about the group and must study each new situation with a high degree of **objectivity**.
- B. The group worker must be skillful in helping groups to release their own feeling, both positive and negative. He must be skillful in helping group to analyze situation as a part of the working through of group or inter group conflict.

III. Use of Program

- A. The group worker must be skillful in helping groups to develop programs which they want as a means through which their needs may be met.
- B. The group worker must be skillful in guiding group

¹²All "new" categories numbering I to VI are taken from Harliegh B. Trecker, Group Work Principles and Practice, pp. 35-37.

thinking so that interests and needs will be revealed and understood.

IV. Establishing Purposeful Relationships

- A. The group worker must be skillful in gaining acceptance of the group and in relating himself to the group on a positive professional basis.
- B. The group worker must be skillful in helping individuals in the group to accept one another, relate to one another more positively and help individuals in the group to accept one another and to join with the group in common pursuits.

V. Participation In Group

- A. The group worker must be skillful in determining, interpreting, assuming, and modifying his own role with the group.
- B. The group worker must be skillful in helping group members to participation, to locate leadership among themselves, and to take responsibility for their own activities.

VI. Using Outside and Agency Resources

- A. The group worker must be skillful in locating and then acquainting the group with various helpful resources which can be utilized by them for program purposes.
- B. The group worker must be skillful in helping certain individual members to make use of specialized services by means of referral when they have needs which cannot be met with the group.

VII. Use of Limits

- A. Group worker must be able to make effective use of and work within limitations imposed by materials, roles, structures, resources and facilities.¹³

Although these preceding categories were originally thought to be different from the original categories, further analysis shows they are probably similar to the original eight categories; for example,

¹³ Gertrude Wilson, and Gladys Ryland, Social Group Work Practice, pp. 168-169.

the worker's skills in developing intragroup relationship and developing program are related to categories having to do with members' ability to form and **maintain relationships and social maturity respectively.**

Table 11 shows the respondents whose questionnaire responses to Question III, Part II were coded under the seven "new" categories. Fifty-eight per cent of the respondents gave answers which suggested, according to the "new" categories, that skills in participating in the group facilitated constructive movement. The same proportion considered that skills in developing intragroup relationships helped foster constructive movement. Developing program -- 48 per cent, analyzing the group -- 38 per cent, handling group feelings and locating and using outside resources for group purposes -- both 20 per cent, and setting limits -- 8 per cent, were other skills which were employed to facilitate constructive movement, according to the "new" dimensions. The respective percentages for impeding constructive movement were: 63, 40, 35, 35, 28, 5, and 0.

Table 11 shows the way the questionnaire responses to question III were coded in the seven "new" categories. It again happens that generally more responses were made when respondents were asked a positive question than a negative one. At any rate, the rank order in Table 12 agrees with the rank order in Table 11.

Comparison of Results From Parts I and II

Basically, the same categories were used to code responses to the general and specific parts of the questionnaire. These were **forming and maintaining relationships, social maturity, group maintenance,**

TABLE 11

PRACTITIONERS WHOSE QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION, DEALING WITH THE WAY THE WORKER IN THE CASE MATERIAL INFLUENCED MOVEMENT, REQUIRED A "NEW" SET OF CATEGORIES FOR CODING

Questions	Categories													
	Participating in the Group	Developing Intra- Group Relation- ships	Developing Program	Analyzing the Group	Handling Group Feelings	Locating and Using Outside Resources for Group Purposes	Setting Limits							
Ways in which worker facilitated con- structive movement	(No. 23 %R 58)	23 58	19 48	15 38	8 20	8 20	3 8							
Ways in which worker impeded construc- tive movement	(No. 25 %R 63)	16 40	14 35	14 35	11 28	2 5	0 0							

TABLE 12

FREQUENCIES* WITH WHICH QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION, DEALING WITH THE WAY THE WORKER IN THE CASE MATERIAL INFLUENCED MOVEMENT, WERE CODED IN THE "NEW" CATEGORIES

Questions	Category Frequencies						
	Participating In the Group	Developing Intra- Group Relation- ships	Developing Program	Analyzing the Group	Handling Group Feeling	Locating and Using Resources for Group Purposes	Setting Limits
Ways in which worker facili- tated construc- tive movement	43	37	24	20	13	8	3
Ways in which worker impeded constructive movement	<u>52</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	95	67	43	35	30	9	3

*See Table 6.

independence, group task, identification, sublimation and adaptation to reality. One question in the specific part necessitated a "new" set of categories, but in a way these appear to be related to the original categories rather than completely different ones.

Insofar as the percentages of respondents whose answers were coded under various categories are concerned, the same ranking orders were seen between the two parts; that is, forming and maintaining relationships; group maintenance; and social maturity were categories in which most practitioners' responses were coded. Adaptation to reality, sublimation, and identification usually clustered at the end. The other two usually ranged some place between these two. The frequencies with which these responses were made roughly paralleled the percentages of respondents using them in both parts of the questionnaire.

There was a decrease from Part I to Part II in both the degree to which the categories were consistently referred by respondents and in the frequency with which they were referred.

Discussion of Findings

The first section of the discussion will be concerned with characteristics of the respondents in this study, and the second section will discuss the results derived from questionnaire responses.

Nature of Respondents

The results of this study have to be considered in the perspective of the limited response of 26.7 per cent of the total persons contacted in the study. Two apparent reasons for the small response rate may have been the complexity of the questionnaire, and the time pressures of professional practice. This judgment is based on comments received from respondents.

As we have no firm basis for assuming that the response sample is different from the non-response sample in the way they practice group work, we anticipate that the results of this study may be generalized to field work supervisors in general. We also anticipate that these results would apply to group work practitioners in general.

As noted earlier in the chapter, the respondents did not differ greatly in training and experience. This is evidenced by the fact that of the total sample, 37 have Masters Degrees in social work and two-thirds have specializations in group work.

Criteria Used in Assessing Movement in a Specific and General Situation

The findings from the general section of the questionnaire can be summarized in the following way:

†
TABLE 13

RANK ORDER OF CRITERIA MOST FREQUENTLY MENTIONED IN THE
GENERAL SECTION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Questions	1	2	3	4
Constructive Movement	Forming and Maintaining Relationships 63%*	Social Maturity 60%	Group Task 60%	Independence 45%
Destructive Movement	Forming and Maintaining Relationships 58%	Group Maintenance 48%	Social Maturity 40%	Group Task 35%
Major Problems and Weaknesses	Forming and Maintaining Relationships 80%	Identification 45%	Independence 45%	Social Maturity 28%
Major Group Strengths	Forming and Maintaining Relationships 43%	Group Maintenance 40%	Identification 28%	Group Task 28%
Major Goals of the Worker	Social Maturity 73%	Forming and Maintaining Relationships 65%	Independence 53%	Identification 43%

* (The percentages in each cell of the table indicate the proportion of 40 respondents who mentioned the indicated criteria on a given question).

Table 13 shows that the respondent group work practitioners apparently consider "social maturity," "forming and maintaining relationships" and "group task" equally important in evaluating constructive movement. However, "group maintenance," which received 48 per cent of the responses, was considered above "group task" in the question dealing with destructive movement. The apparent absence of "group maintenance" in the definition of constructive movement suggests that "group maintenance" is apparently not important for constructive movement to take place. Conversely, the lack of "group maintenance" is viewed as relatively more vital in destructive movement.

In judging the frequency and response in constructive movement as contrasted to destructive movement, it must be noted that practitioners are clearer in their conception of what is involved in constructive movement than in destructive movement. We might speculate that practitioners are more apt to look for constructive qualities rather than destructive ones.

The criteria of "forming and maintaining relationships" received a response of 80 per cent in answer to the question having to do with major problems and weaknesses. Forty-three per cent of the respondents referred to it as a strength. We may assume here that 20 per cent must have considered it in both questions.

From the low percentage of response to "social maturity" in regard to major problems, it may be assumed that this does not present as great a problem as "forming and maintaining relationships."

Seventy-three per cent of the response was given to "social maturity" as the major goal of the worker in middle adolescent groups, while only 28 per cent referred to it as a problem. We may assume here that practitioners are more concerned with helping groups to grow and to develop in such a way that they can assume responsibility in affairs within their communities. It is interesting that although this is one of the major goals, group work practitioners do not conceive the lack of it as a problem.

In addition, we note that the rank order of responses to the question dealing with major goals of the worker gives some indication of how these goals are reflected in defining constructive and destructive movement, major problems and major strengths. Implicit in this is the fact that many things contribute to the assessment of movement. In regard to goals, there is behavior that can be termed goals in one instance and termed criteria in another.

TABLE 14

RANK ORDER OF CRITERIA MOST FREQUENTLY MENTIONED IN THE
SPECIFIC SECTION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Questions	1	2	3	4
Constructive Movement	Group Maintenance 80%*	Forming and Maintaining Relationships 65%	Social Maturity 45%	Group Task 38%
Destructive Movement	Forming and Maintaining Relationships 60%	Group Maintenance 25%	Social Maturity 13%	Group Task 15%
Major Problems and Weaknesses	Group Maintenance 48%	Forming and Maintaining Relationships 68%	Group Task 28%	Social Maturity 23%
No Movement	Forming and Maintaining Relationships 45%	Group Maintenance 43%	Social Maturity 18%	Group Task 10%
Major Goals Underlying the Group	Forming and Maintaining Relationships 37%	Social Maturity 30%	Group Task 28%	Group Maintenance 25%

* (The percentages in each cell of the table indicate the proportion of 40 respondents who mentioned the indicated criteria on a given question.)

It is noted that the criteria given in the general section (Table 13) also hold for the specific section. In addition there are some interesting variations. "Group maintenance" received 80 per cent of the responses for constructive movement in the specific section, while its percentage was less than 40 per cent in the general section.

It appears that when assessing movement for a specific group, "group maintenance" is more important than "forming and maintaining relationships" and "social maturity," as referred to for groups in general. However, the nature of the specific case recording could have lent itself more to "group maintenance" than the other criteria.

Although "forming and maintaining relationships," "group maintenance" and "social maturity" were ranked highest for destructive movement, there was a decline in the percentage of response in the specific section. We may assume that although the criteria were ranked the same in both parts, the possible lack of the criteria in the group recording may be attributed to the decline in the percentage response. A similar type of distinction is seen in the ranking of the "social maturity" criteria with reference to major goals of the worker. It received 73 per cent of the responses in the general section, while it received 30 per cent in the specific section. However, we may also assume that the difference in the response rate in the specific section might indicate that although "social maturity" is an ultimate goal of practitioners in relation to groups, "forming and maintaining relationships" must be accomplished before "social maturity" can be achieved.

In judging the response rate for both sections of the questionnaire, we see that there is close agreement among the criteria: "forming and maintaining relationships," "social maturity," and "group maintenance." However, the overall agreement does not denote overwhelming consistency. Percentage wise, it is noted that the agreement

was less than 60 per cent, which may indicate the difference in view points of the practitioners as to what they consider to be criteria for assessing movement. This apparent lack of clarity may be attributed to the low percentage rate of the criteria. Taking these factors into account, the question may arise as to whether or not there are still other criteria to be derived.

The reader may recall earlier in the chapter references to the way in which an individual member contributes most to constructive or destructive movement in a specific group. The respondents felt that contributions to "group maintenance" were most important, followed by "forming and maintaining relationships" and "group task." The implication here may be that practitioners tend to look for those things in an individual which add to continuing group life, growth, and development.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS

Eight criteria, "forming and maintaining relationships," "group maintenance," "group task," "identification," "independence," "adaptation to reality," and "sublimation" were found to be useful in assessing group movement. These criteria are interpreted to show those aspects of behavior which group work practitioners in our sample consider an indication of progress in groups.

Although group work practitioners see "forming and maintaining relationships" as the most important criteria in assessing constructive movement for groups in general, they tend to see "group maintenance" as the most vital criteria in practice.

In examining the meaning of these criteria, we not only need to consider what criteria are used, but also the relative importance among these criteria. In addition, we need to consider criteria which are not included in this group but which we might expect should be important.

The frequency of the cluster of group-orientated variables "forming and maintaining relationships," "social maturity," and "group maintenance" raises the question as to what kinds of instruments should be used to measure the criteria considered most important. For example, an instrument might be devised to measure relationships in reference to what effect it has upon the growth and development of a group.

Although there was close agreement between the two sections, the response rate was not exceptionally high in regard to any given

criteria. In looking at the low and high frequency rate, there is the same lack of meaning in regard to what group movement means to the practitioners in the field. This lack of agreement may point to the need for the development of objective instruments as a way of clarifying better definitions of concepts, and additional ways of assessing group behavior. This does not propose replacement of present clinical assessment techniques, but rather the use of instruments to complement these clinical judgments.

We might conclude that group work practitioners tend to show some agreement about movement, but are far from having a clear definition which is generally accepted.

Limitations

Nature of Study and Data Analysis

The use of the open-ended questions provides the respondents an opportunity to present the way in which they conceive of movement in their own terms. One of the obstacles in coding open-ended questions is the possible loss of content material.

Case Material

The use of case material was another limitation in the study. It was felt by the majority of the respondents that the two process recordings used were too brief for them to determine more accurately criteria for assessing movement in the specific group. In addition we were limited because criteria may have been mentioned in the general section of the questionnaire that could not be seen in the specific section. Although we were aware of the inadequacy of the

case material our choice was determined by the limited amount of appropriate case records available.

Mailed Questionnaires

Once the questionnaire was mailed, we had no control over the way in which the questionnaire was filled out, nor any way of correcting any misunderstanding on the part of the respondents.

Nature of Categories

We recognize that the categories selected may not have the breadth necessary to cover all responses. But due to the nature of the responses, it was the only feasible method of analyzing the data.

Future Recommendations

The importance given to the criteria, "forming and maintaining relationships" in the assessment of movement, raises the question as to how this may be measured. Perhaps an instrument could be devised to measure the kinds of behavior involved. The same technique may be applied to other criteria derived in the study. The low response rate of some criteria in the study, as well as the absence of criteria, might be factors which will help social group work develop different kinds of instruments for measuring movement.

Some important questions should be clarified: What is the best way to assess group movement? What is the way to assess the relative importance of the criteria used in assessing movement? What is the relative importance of these criteria?

Implications

The scope of this study serves to reflect the important need for research in social work. If the completed sample is representative of practitioners, it shows some of the practical difficulties of conducting research with a large group of practitioners. From this we gather, one issue is that people are too busy to be part of research, or that there may be a lack of interest on the part of practitioners. If these are the problems, it may mean that the professional's job demands that allowances should be made for time to be devoted to research. Moreover, if there is a lack of interest in general then perhaps it requires more work in developing research in time schedules, or working on ideas of what research means to people. Such implications are also applicable for social work students, who hopefully will transfer their learning in research at school of social work, to their professional responsibilities as practicing social workers.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

Purpose and Overview

The primary purpose of this study was to determine a set of generally acceptable criteria which group work practitioners use in assessing movement in groups.

Method and Procedure

In this study, two levels of approach were used: to determine how group work practitioners conceive of group movement for middle adolescent groups in general; and the extent to which these practitioners use similar criteria in their assessment of movement in a specific group.

The questionnaires were initially mailed to 149 group workers, of whom 112 are also affiliated as field work instructors with eight schools of social work. The data in this survey was collected by the use of a questionnaire, which contained two sections: a general section to determine the criteria involved in a generic definition of group movement, and a specific section to assess judgment of movement with respect to a specific group.

Results

The major criteria for assessing movement found in this study were: "forming and maintaining relationships," "social maturity," "group maintenance," "group task," "identification," "independence," "adaptation to reality" and "sublimation." There were two groupings. In the first group, the criteria were "forming and maintaining

relationships," "social maturity", "group maintenance," and "group task", which are apparently more group oriented than the other criteria, ~~These were~~ responded to most frequently at the average of 50 per cent of the responses. The other criteria (identification, sublimation, independence and adaptation to reality), which may be considered as those from individual dynamics, were used considerably less frequently than the group-oriented variables.

Although there was agreement between the general and specific sections only one criteria was used by more than 80 per cent of the respondents, while two others were used by 65 per cent.

Because of this, we see that group movement means many different things to different people. To meaningfully discuss movement, it should be qualified in terms of the criteria to which it is referred. Through such clarification, the professional use and assessment of movement will be enhanced and practice improved.

Accepted
Harmon S. Judd
May 23, 1941

APPENDIX

BOSTON UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK
264 Bay State Road Boston, Massachusetts

January 10, 1961

Dear Field Work Instructor:

A Group Work Faculty Member of the School of Social Work with which you are associated has recommended that we contact you regarding research being done at the Boston University School of Social Work.

As part of our research program on the assessment of movement in groups, five of our second-year group work students are conducting a descriptive thesis of the criteria currently being used in practice by social group workers in assessing change and movement in groups. Marvin Snider, who is both a social scientist and a social worker, is the thesis advisor. He and I have frequent discussions of this project.

To accomplish this formidable task we have asked and received cooperation from schools of social work across the country (New York School, Western Reserve, University of Michigan, University of Illinois, Wayne State University, University of Minnesota, University of Pittsburgh and the University of Southern California). These schools have submitted lists of their supervisors who we felt would make important contributions to this work.

As a result, we are writing to you on their recommendation to ask your cooperation in furthering this needed group work research. We would appreciate your completing the enclosed questionnaire as fully as possible. If you do not find ample space on the questionnaire do not hesitate to use the backs of pages or to add additional sheets. Because of thesis deadlines it is important that we receive the completed questionnaire by February 10, 1961. (See enclosed sheet for detailed instructions regarding the questionnaire.)

We realize that the questionnaire will add another burden to the usually already full schedule. But we hope that the inconvenience will more than be compensated for by the contribution you will be making to needed research.

Thank you for any cooperation you can extend. If you would like to receive the results of this study we will be happy to furnish them on your request.

Sincerely yours,

Saul Bernstein
Professor

BOSTON UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK
264 Bay State Road, Boston, Massachusetts

January 16, 1961

Dear Colleague:

Your name was selected from the 1960 NASW Directory because we would like you to be part of a research project being done at the Boston University School of Social Work.

As part of our research program on the assessment of movement in groups, five of our group work students are conducting a descriptive thesis of the criteria currently being used in practice by social group workers in assessing change and movement in groups. Marvin Snider, who is both a social scientist and a social worker, is the thesis advisor. He and I have frequent discussions of this project.

To accomplish this formidable task we have asked and received cooperation from schools of social work across the country (New York School, Western Reserve, University of Michigan, University of Illinois, Wayne State University, University of Minnesota, University of Pittsburgh, and the University of Southern California). These schools have submitted lists of their supervisors whom we felt would make important contributions to this work. We would also like a second sample of social group workers in the field and we have used the NASW listing to accomplish this purpose.

We are also writing to you to ask your cooperation in furthering this needed group work research. We would appreciate your completing the enclosed questionnaire as fully as possible. If you do not find ample space on the questionnaire do not hesitate to use the backs of pages or to add additional sheets. Because of this thesis deadline it is important that we receive the completed questionnaire by February 10, 1961. (See enclosed sheet for detailed instructions regarding the questionnaire.)

We realize that the questionnaire will add another burden to the usually already full schedule. But we hope that the inconvenience will more than be compensated for by the contribution you will be making to needed research.

Thank you for any cooperation you may extend. If you would like to receive the results of this study we would be happy to furnish them on your request.

Sincerely yours,

Saul Bernstein
Professor

SUGGESTIONS FOR COMPLETING QUESTIONNAIRE ON ASSESSING CHANGE AND
MOVEMENT IN GROUPS

Pretests of this questionnaire have shown that the questionnaire takes approximately 1 to 1 1/2 hours to complete.

The questionnaire contains three sections:

- Section I - Background information of respondent
- Section II - General questions about movement in groups
- Section III - Discussion of excerpts of a case history that is enclosed

In completing this questionnaire we suggest that you proceed as follows:

1. Complete page on background information
2. Read all questions in Part I
3. Answer questions in Part I
4. Read questions at end of Part II
5. Read case excerpts
6. Answer questions at the end of case excerpt

Please Note: Deadlines for completion of the thesis based on this data make it very important that we receive the completed questionnaire by February 10.

Thank you for your generous cooperation.

1/10/61

QUESTIONNAIRE

Background Information

I. Training

A. Educational Background

	College Attended	Major Field	Date Graduated	Degree
Undergraduate				
Graduate				

- B. If you have not received an M.S.W. degree, indicate
number of credit hours to date _____

II. Experience

- A. How many years of experience do you have as a social worker since receiving your Master's Degree? Count as a year's experience any year in which you were employed as a social worker full or part-time for any part of the year.
- _____

- B. In how many of these years did you not directly lead at least one group? _____
- C. If you are not now engaged in direct leadership of a group, when was the last time you served in this capacity?
_____ years ago.
- D. With which of the following age and sex groups have you had direct experience as a worker during your professional career?

Age Group	Male	Female	Co-ed
6-10			
11-14			
14-18			
18-21			
Young Adult			
Adult			
Older Adult			

Part I

Instructions:

Our purpose in this section is to assess the characteristics of middle adolescent groups which practitioners believe are likely to be important in working with these groups. Our interest is in determining those characteristics which appear to hold across groups of this age independent of the factors which may be unique in working with a particular group. While we understand the difficulties you may encounter in generalizing about this age range, we feel that there are certain basic similarities applicable to this age group. To accomplish this we would like you to answer the following questions from the point of view of what you would expect if you were assigned to work with a male or female adolescent group, before you have ever met with the group.

Note: We have intentionally omitted defining the terms in this section since part of our objective is to determine what these terms mean to you.

- I. In general, how would you define constructive movement for this age group?
- II. In general, how would you define destructive movement for this age group?
- III. In general, what are the major problems and weaknesses you expect to find in working with this age group?
- IV. In general, what are the major group strengths that you would expect to find in working with this age group?
- V. What do you consider are likely to be the major goals of the group worker in middle adolescent groups?

Part II

CASE MATERIAL

Instructions: The following is a case illustration of a middle adolescent group. At the end of the case you will find a number of questions which pertain to this case material. It may be advisable to look over the questions before reading the case.

Introduction:

This was a formed friendship group composed of eleven members, coming from two natural friendship groups. These lower middle class, fifteen and sixteen year old boys met in a community center for this their second year. Living in an area of middle class residence slightly speckled with light industry, such as small shops and businesses, these boys as a whole felt cut off from richer children in this fairly wealthy suburban town. With the exception of Jenks, these boys were all rather bright, but were not performing up to their capacities in school. All Caucasian, the boys come from a variety of Christian backgrounds. For the most part, they have been on the periphery of delinquent activities. However, they were not hardened delinquents but rather the type of youngsters who wouldn't resist adult authority to any great degree. The boys were all interested in mechanical things, particularly automobiles. The Worker is a professionally trained social group worker.

<u>Members</u>	<u>Ages</u>	<u>School Grade</u>
Ben)	16	11
Sonny) twin brothers	16	10
Jimmy	16	10
Ronny	15	9
Fred	16	10
Frank	16	10
Curly	16	10
Johnny	16	10
Cris	16	10
Hal	15	9
Jenks	16	9

Session II

10/13/55

Worker arrived a few minutes late. Sonny, Curly and Johnny were waiting outside the community center. Worker showed the boys where the oil was leaking from the car motor. Worker said it was a good idea to try to call Jenks, and he went into the Center. Worker telephoned and reached Jenks' mother who said that Jenks was out practicing football. Worker told Jenks' mother that he was glad to hear that the boy was enjoying football, and that he would be glad to see him again this year. He left his regards for Jenks.

Sonny asked if he could get in front (no one else asked). Worker said, "Surely". Sonny sat next to Worker, Curly on the outside and Hal and Johnny in the back. Johnny said he would not be bowling because he had sprained his hand (his right forefinger and thumb were swollen and blue). He indicated in an embarrassed manner that he had done this hitting his brother. He then indicated that he owed him one since his brother had hit him first.

Much of the conversation in the bowling alley centered around cars, with Sonny taking the lead in answering or initiating. He remarked that the Worker's engine was quiet and Worker explained that it had a new muffler and tail pipe. Sonny asked if Worker had put it on himself or had it done somewhere. Worker said he had done it himself. No comment was made. Sonny said he had gotten a good mark in a test on current events and mentioned the great amount of homework he had been doing lately. Worker asked the other boys individually about which schools they were attending and if they liked school better

this year. All were attending Townville High, with the exception of Fred who was going to the parochial school. The boys remarked that Townville High was one of the best high schools in the country. Worker mentioned the circus and Johnny said that he had been to one, but there was no general response that indicated the boys wanted to go. Worker inquired about the parties that had been held with girls last year. The boys said that they were lots of fun. This subject was discussed a little, but no plans were made. Worker asked what the boys did evenings. Sonny said that he and Johnny went to the movies occasionally. Sonny spoke several times of himself and Johnny doing things together. Worker asked if the boys had any ideas for next week's meeting. They did not have anything in particular. Horseback riding was mentioned, but Sonny said this was quite expensive and the idea was dropped. Sonny asked Johnny if he wanted to tell the Worker about his sprained back, or was that confidential information? Johnny said that his back was taped up from a car accident he had been in last week. Worker did not ask any questions and no more was said on the subject. Sonny said he had a relative who could get free passes to a drive-in movie and asked if the Worker could be around evenings. Worker said that as a rule this was quite difficult to do, and explained where he lived.

At the alleys, Worker secured an alley and teams were made up of Worker and Curly vs. Hal and Sonny, with Johnny watching. The bowling was not spirited or competitive. There was no wide disparity in scores, although Worker was about 10 points ahead in both strings.

Curly was very self-conscious and unable to control his ball at first, but later improved and got one spare. Worker at first took an interest in the number of pins Curly was getting, but later only gave him occasional "boosts", remarking when he threw a good ball. Hal discussed his erratic curve in an embarrassed manner with Worker. There was no squabbling over scoring, except for one dispute over how a strike, etc. should be marked, and there were no pointed jibes at bad performances.

While the bowling was going on, Worker was able to talk individually to the boys. There was also group discussion about school and college. Worker was able to furnish information concerning college board exams, what sort of marks were required; and what subjects to concentrate on. Sonny said he wanted to bring his marks up and go to college. He wondered if his past low marks would be a detriment. Worker pointed out that the colleges are more interested in latest marks. Sonny said he still had three years to go. He talked about his mother's ability (field hockey) and spent a lot of time discussing his father's many abilities. He had never seen a man who could do so many things. Worker made no comment to this. Sonny mentioned that his brother was very smart, and was a grade ahead of him and read many books. Worker said that it showed that everyone is different and has his own abilities, pointing out that Ben probably did not have the mechanical skills as Sonny has. Sonny responded to this eagerly, saying that his brother probably did not know the difference between a piston ring and a valve guide. Worker laughed

and said that as a matter of fact neither did he. Worker asked Sonny if he were driving the car when the accident occurred. He said "no" and told of the extensive damage to the car.

There was some more talk of school. Hal said that Curly was the math expert in the club, and Curly seemed to enjoy this recognition, although he did not say much. Worker gave some more information on what types of math are needed for the college board exams. Sonny ate considerable cake, candy, etc., which he bought at the snack bar. The other boys ran a close second. Worker accepted a cookie.

On the way out of the place, Worker said that maybe they should have left their addresses so that the manager could send them a trophy. The boys laughed heartily in response to this. The seating arrangement in the car was the same as before. Worker once more brought up the subject of next week's program. Sonny initiated the idea of target-shooting in the village. The others agreed and Sonny, Johnny and Worker said that they could bring rifles. Sonny agreed to buy 3 boxes of cartridges. The cost would be split among the boys. Worker said that he would contribute a box. There was some mild protest that the worker should not have to pay for a whole box. Worker minimized the point and it was dropped.

It is about four months and twelve meetings later. An average of eight fellows have been coming to meetings. For the most part, they were: Sonny, Ben, Curly, Johnny, Hal, Cris, Jenks and Fred. Jenks, however, had been missing a good deal lately.

Session 14

The meeting was spent considering Jenks' position in the group, "talking", checking food prices, and making final plans for the trip. Ben was the only member not present.

Worker arrived just as Jenks and Hal were approaching the community center. Worker greeted them and said he was glad to see them again. All the boys, with the exception of Jimmy, were seated in the meeting room. They said, "Hello," to worker and then silently cast glances at each other. Cris grinned and said, "Well, shall we start the meeting?" A couple of false starts were made in this way. Then Johnny said they should start "discussion of the liquidation". Jenks looked intently at a comic book, not raising his eyes. Worker felt very uneasy and asked the boys to continue.

Johnny took the lead, saying that Jenks had missed so many meetings that he wasn't in the club any longer. There was a pause. Worker said that perhaps Jenks would like to say something. Jenks pretended not to hear. Then to Worker restating the question, he answered by saying that he had been sick for three days two weeks ago and had to stay after school last week. Cris reminded him that he had gone home, and gone out again. Jenks said he had to report back. This was not received well by the group. Worker said that the fact Jenks had come today, was facing the ordeal, seemed to indicate that he was interested in the club. Cris stood up and said, "let's vote!" Jenks said he would wait outside and went into the hallway.

Cris began passing out slips of paper. Worker refused one and said, "The decision whether to vote and whether to kick Jenks out is up to the group, but I guess you know how I feel about it. I don't think it's a good idea!" Johnny retorted that Jenks did not even care since he had his nose shoved in a funnybook all the while he was being discussed. Worker said he wondered what anyone of us would have done in the same position and that it takes a lot of guts to sit and hear yourself discussed in this way. Johnny said that this was true. Cris took the ballots and read them, particularly noting who had given him each ballot. The score was tied 3 to 3. Sonny looked at everyone and made motions and guarded comments implying that he was going to change his vote. The result was again 3 to 3. A third vote was taken and again there was a tie. Then Sonny and a couple of others said they would make sure that the deadlock was broken. Worker said it was ridiculous to change one's vote just to break a tie, because the outcome would have no meaning. There was agreement with this and Worker said that this process wasn't doing anyone any good and feelings would only get higher. If the group were willing, he would check the attendance records which he keeps weekly and see if Jenks had missed enough meetings to make him technically eligible for expulsion. They agreed with this.

Cris then asked, "What about the trip?" Johnny said that since Jenks was not back in the club yet he could not go. Sonny said, "What if he does get re-elected?" The response to this comment indicated general agreement, and when a secret ballot was taken, it appeared from Cris's expression, as he counted, that the vote was almost

unanimously in favor of letting Jenks go. He was called in and informed of this decision. For the rest of the time spent at the center, Jenks sat quietly in a corner and looked mostly at the Worker with an expression of gratitude on his face. Jimmy, a good looking boy with blonde hair cut, came in. He was very neat and quite serious appearing. Johnny introduced Worker to Jimmy (Worker had sent him a "welcome to the club - be glad to meet you" postal card).

The trip was discussed and Worker's suggestion of dividing work up into committees was put off in favor of deciding this at camp. Hal said he could bring an electric broiler after Worker mentioned that the gas at camp had been shut off. There was some conflict over when money should be collected. Sonny asserted, angrily, that he could not get enough to buy all the food before hand and that the boys would have to have their money ready on Friday afternoon. They agreed to this with some grumbling. Worker paid his three dollars.

Everyone, with the exception of Hal (there was not enough room in the car, so he got out since he lived nearby), went in Worker's car to a supermarket in order to check food prices. Sonny wanted to drive, but Worker refused, saying that it was a question of insurance coverage. At the store, Worker, Cris, Johnny, Jenks and Jimmy stayed in the car and waited while the others went into the store. Jenks quickly joined the price checkers and Worker asked Jimmy what he did afternoons for work. He worked at a market. While Jimmy was filling in a community center card, Johnny and Cris began talking about work. Johnny said he was going to quit school in February. He cited all the

jobs he could get: truck driver, filing clerk, etc. He said he knew guys who could get him a good job. Cris pooh-poohed this, and Johnny countered with, "What do you know, you never had a job." Cris rather embarrassed, tried unsuccessfully to expand the importance of a couple of small jobs he had had. Then, he said he would be glad when Johnny went to work so he could pay back all the money he owed him. There was an argument over this point and the comment was made that Cris got money from his father. Jimmy sneered at Cris, "You mean you take money from your father?" Cris said, "Sure, why not, he gives it to me." This wrangling went on in a very immature way for several minutes, and Worker commented that money certainly could be a big problem.

On the way home, Worker asked if anyone had heard from Ben yet, Cris had. He said Ben hated the army. Sonny asked Worker if the Army were really tough. Worker said it depended on the individual. There were many things that were quite irksome - standing in line, etc., but if one could get used to it, it was not too bad. Some things could even be enjoyable. Curley said they made you do the crazy stuff so you learn to respond quickly to battle conditions. The boys decided to leave at 9:00 a.m. Saturday. Sonny said, "Let's be sure we leave at that time!"

Driving Sonny and Curly home, Worker commented that since the incident at the start of the meeting, he had heard people on three or four occasions threaten others with "liquidation". He said that he had seen this process start in some clubs and saw everyone trying to kick everyone else out. Everyone would wonder who was next. Sonny paused for a moment and then said, "You know, that's right."

Instructions:

Our purpose in this section is to consider movement as seen in a specific situation. All of the following questions should be answered with respect to the preceding case material.

- I. What behavior in the above records do you feel represent movement for this group?
 - (a). Indications of constructive movement in the above records are as follows:

 - (b). Indications of destructive movement in the above records are as follows:

 - (c). No movement is seen in the following areas in which one should generally expect movement for this kind of group:

- II. What do you see as the major problems of the group at the end of the records?

- III. Indicate the ways in which the worker facilitated or interfered with constructive group movement:
 - (a). The group worker facilitated constructive movement by:

 - (b). The group worker impeded constructive movement by:

- IV. What member(s) in the group contributed most to constructive group movement? On what do you base your judgement?

- V. What member(s) in the group contributed most to negative group movement? On what do you base your judgement?
- VI. What do you consider to be the major underlying goals of this group?
- VII. Are there any additional comments you have about the material in this questionnaire, that has not been otherwise discussed, but which you feel should be included?
- VIII. Do you have any comments or criticisms about the questionnaire in general?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books and Articles

- Benne, Kenneth and Sheats, Paul. "Functional Roles of Group Members," Journal of Social Issues, vol. 4 (Spring, 1948).
- Bernstein, Saul. "Charting Group Progress," in Readings in Group Work, Dorothea Sullivan (ed.). New York: Associated Press, 1953.
- Blenkner, Margaret. "Obstacles to Evaluative Research in Casework," Journal of Social Casework, vol. 31 (February and March, 1950).
- Chin, Robert. Evaluation Research and Practitioner's Theory, Research Report and Technical Notes No. 30. Boston University, Human Relations Center.
- French, David G. An Approach to Measuring Results in Social Work, A report on the Michigan Reconnaissance Study of Evaluative Research in Social Work. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952.
- Heckman, A. A. "Measuring the Effectiveness of Agency Services," Journal of Social Casework, vol. 29 (December, 1948).
- Herzog, Elizabeth. Some Guide Lines for Evaluative Research, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Social Security Administration Children's Bureau, 1959.
- Hinsie, Leland E., and Shatzky, Jacob. Psychiatric Dictionary, New York: Oxford University Press, 1940.
- Hunt, J. McV., and Kogan, Leonard S. Measuring Results in Social Casework: a Manual on Judging Movement. New York: Family Service Association of America, 1950.
- _____, and Blenkner, Margaret. Testing Results in Social Casework: a Field Test of the Movement Scale. New York: Family Service Association of America, 1950.
- Kaiser, Clara L. "The Advances of Social Group Work," The Social Welfare Forum, 1955.
- Kogan, Leonard S. "Evaluative Techniques in Social Casework," Social Service Review, vol. 26 (September, 1952).
- MacDonald, Mary E. "Some Essentials in the Evaluation of Social Casework," Journal of Psychiatric Social Work, vol. 22 (April, 1953).

- Preston, Malcolm G., Mudd, Emily H. and Froscher, Hazel B.
"Factors Affecting Movement in Casework," Social Casework,
vol. 34 (March, 1953).
- Trecker, Harliegh B. Social Group Work Methods and Principles,
New York: Association Press, 1955.
- Warren, Howard (ed). Dictionary of Psychology, Cambridge,
Massachusetts: The Riverside Press, 1934.
- Wilson, Gertrude, and Ryland, Gladys. Social Group Work Practice,
Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Riverside Press, 1949.

UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

- Brown, Alfred, Freeman, Leonard S., Glotfelty, Jo Ann, Jenkinson,
Carol A., and Moore, Ted L., "Development of an Observational
Instrument for Measuring Role Behavior in Social Work Groups."
Unpublished Master's thesis, Boston University School of Social
Work, Boston, 1959.
- Berman, Murray G. "Charts for Evaluation in a Group Work Setting."
Unpublished Master's thesis, Boston University School of
Social Work, Boston, 1950.
- Garland, James A. "A Reliability Test of an Instrument for Measuring
Development Group." Unpublished Master's thesis, Boston
University School of Social Work, Boston, 1956.
- Groth, Lawrence B. "The Formulation of a Tool for the Establishment
of Norms of Group Behavior." Unpublished Master's thesis,
Boston University School of Social Work, Boston, 1952.