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Abstract
The purpose of this two-part study was to examine the quantitative and qualitative effects of an adventure course. The goal of the first study was to investigate whether the benefits from a one-day adventure course could be prolonged through the use of bi-weekly journaling after the course. Twenty-seven female adolescents participated in the adventure course and approximately half of the group completed journal entries for the following two weeks. All participants completed four measurement times of the Life Effectiveness Questionnaire-I. The results indicated that the intervention was not successful; the journaling did not serve to enhance the effects from an adventure course. The goal of the second study was to qualitatively examine the thoughts, meanings, and impressions of the participants from the adventure course, within a contextual understanding of the ethnic background of the participants. The results indicated that there were no ethnic differences in the experiences and meanings given to their participation. However through the qualitative data it was shown that two of the main themes from the participants’ experiences on the course centered around the notions of friendship and self-confidence. Implications of these two studies are discussed and suggestions for future research are made.
STUDY ONE

Chapter One

Introduction and Review of the Literature

Introduction to the Problem

The field of experiential education, which promotes learning through experiences, has grown tremendously within the last 30 years (Hattie, Marsh, Neill, & Richards, 1997). Outward Bound Schools, which exist throughout the United States and Australia, utilize the construct of experiential learning. In these programs, participants are in the wilderness for 20-30 days, and the emphasis is on group dynamics, pushing one’s own limits and boundaries, and learning about oneself through facilitation provided by the instructors. Over the past several decades, the increase in the number of Outward Bound type courses has been tremendous. Consequently, the energy and resources dedicated to these programs also has increased; this is reflected in the energy given to these programs from the participants and staff, as well as the financial resources used to maintain the programs (Hattie et al., 1997).

In addition to these longer programs such as Outward Bound, other types of programs exist, these are the shorter and less expensive programs which include challenge courses and adventure programs. Both of these utilize challenge initiatives which can involve games and activities, in addition to more individual elements such as rock climbing or zip lines. Paralleling the rise in the number of Outward Bound type courses, there has been a similar increase in the number of shorter programs offered such as adventure courses (Garvey, 1999). Many corporations, groups, and camps, both private and public, endorse the use of challenge initiatives as a way to increase an individual’s self esteem, team building skills, and communication skills (White, 1997). However, the research on the psychological
aspects of these courses is scarce, especially given the popularity of these courses. Of the research that exists, both on Outward Bound type courses and challenge/adventure programs, numerous studies are lacking in methodologically-sound designs (Hattie et al., 1997).

Of the research that has been properly conducted, most of the studies have been pre-and post-test designs on a variety of factors: self-esteem, locus of control, teamwork, and self-confidence (Cason & Gillis, 1994). These factors have been measured with scales and tests that have not been designed for adventure-based experiences, and thus, do not adequately address the beneficial changes that might occur due to adventure courses (Hattie et al., 1997). The results of these studies have been mixed; some show significant increases on the above factors, whereas others do not (e.g., Eagle, 1999; White, 1997).

Additionally, there has been a frighteningly small amount of research conducted on adolescents in adventure programs, specifically studies with high quality designs (Cason & Gillis, 1994). Likewise, an investigation on the effects that females might gain from adventure courses is lacking. For example, in a meta-analysis on the effects of adventure education and Outward Bound Programs, only 28% of all of the participants in the studies that were analyzed were female (Hattie et al., 1997).

White (1997) has concluded that challenge programs need to have 27-45 hours of participation in order to affect outcome measures such as locus of control and self-esteem. However, this study did not address whether the benefits could be augmented through a follow-up intervention that continues the processing of the experiences, thus decreasing the amount of time spent on the course itself. It has been stated that the transference of the lessons and experiences (using debriefing, metaphors, and reflection) is crucial for the participant to receive lasting benefits from the course (Hattie et al., 1997; Pann, 1999).
However, no studies have conducted follow-up interventions on course participants to examine if the benefits can be prolonged through methods designed to extend personal reflection. In conclusion, the research in this field has not addressed whether the benefits and transference from the course can be enhanced after a one-day (instead of a two week long) course has been completed.

I propose to address these shortcomings in previous research with an experimental investigation with female adolescents on the effects of journaling in order to prolong the benefits of increased self-confidence, increased locus of control, and higher levels of social competence which are acquired during an adventure course.

**Definition of Terms**

Adventure Education: “Experiential education applied in the outdoors with a challenging component. It is frequently referred to as outdoor education, wilderness therapy, adventure therapy, and therapeutic recreation.” (Pann, 1999, p. 3).

Adventure Course: A program that takes place outdoors which utilizes the concepts of experiential learning. Activities can include rock climbing, teambuilding games, and elements to increase trust and communication.

Challenge By Choice: A method made popular by Project Adventure, a leading organization in the field of experiential education, which emphasizes that the amount of challenge and risk that an individual takes on a course is her or his own decision.

Challenge/Ropes Courses: A ropes course is a series of activities, consisting of low elements which are built close to the ground, and high elements which are located 30-50 feet off of the ground in trees. These elements are built using the natural trees (if located in a forest), cables, ropes, cargo nets, and/or wood.
Experiential Learning: This is a very broad topic, and definitions can range depending on which field they are given from. For this study, experiential learning can be simplistically defined as “an educational philosophy that incorporates doing with learning” (Pann, 1999, p. 3-4). Experiential learning requires that participants are personally motivated and responsible for their own learning.

Kolb (1974), (as cited in Pann, 1999), presents an Experiential Learning Cycle model as a self-perpetuating process with several phases:

1) Concrete experiences that are important to the participant
2) Personal observation and reflection
3) Abstract conceptualization which forms understanding and creates meaning
4) Application of the learning in a practical setting

Outward Bound:

An action-oriented program for personal growth, service to others, and physical preparedness . . . Participants are put together in this [natural] environment and challenged to master a series of individual and group problems. A variety of activities take place: rock climbing, a ropes course, canoeing, backpacking, kayaking, and a solo experience. Through the process, participants build self-confidence, stretch their physical and emotional limits, develop leadership skills, and have personal growth and responsibility increased.

(Eagle, 1999, p. 19).
Review of Empirical Studies

The following studies represent an overview of the research pertaining to this area. Presented first is an analysis of numerous studies from the field of adventure-based education, then an examination of the research on females, next a look at female adolescents, and finally a discussion of the uses of journaling during adventure courses.

General Studies

To date, only a handful of meta-analyses have been conducted on the research on adventure programs (e.g., Cason & Gillis, 1994; Hattie et al., 1997). To give a broad overview to the research, two of these will be analyzed: Cason and Gillis (1994), which is the only meta-analysis conducted with research on adolescents, and Hattie et al. (1997), which focuses on Outward Bound type programs.

Overall, from their meta-analysis, Cason and Gillis (1994) found that adolescents who attended an adventure program were 62% better off than those who did not. Although this seems impressive, there are restrictions to the generalizability of these results due to several factors, which will be examined shortly. As Cason and Gillis were compiling the studies to be analyzed, they were selective, and did not include studies that lacked sufficient statistical procedures, were not empirically based, or did not use adolescents as defined by the range of 11 years old to the age of college freshmen. Even though they eliminated 36 of the 79 acquired studies with these restrictions, they found that the remaining studies still varied in quality of the design. To control for this, they coded the design of the studies according to these factors: lack of randomization, equivalent control groups, and lack of follow-up.
In addition to coding for quality of the design, Cason and Gillis (1994) also coded for the duration of the program, the categorical information of the participant (such as whether he or she was from a “normal” population, or “labeled”, such as physically challenged or at risk), the age of the participant, form of publication (dissertation or journal article), and the outcome measure studied (such as self-esteem).

Hattie et al. (1997) did not describe their specific coding variables, but they did state that the participants from all of the studies analyzed were 72% male, and 28% female, with 75% of all participants being adults or university students. The average length of the programs analyzed was 24 days. And only 20% of their studies assessed follow-up measurements in addition to post-test measures. These facts themselves speak loudly of the typical research conducted in this field. It is predominately with adult male participants, with no follow-up measurements after courses of two weeks or more. What about the programs that are one-day events with adolescent females?

Even Cason and Gillis’ (1994) analysis on adolescents did not acknowledge this lack of research. The average age of the participants from their studies was 15.8-years-old and the duration of the programs analyzed was, on average, 54 hours (three weeks). The shortest program analyzed was 36 hours long. Thus, even an analysis which focused on one dimension (age of participant) did not acknowledge the diversity of variance on other factors (program duration and sex of participant). It is necessary to be aware of the limitations of these studies when examining their findings.

Both Cason and Gillis (1994) and Hattie et al. (1997) used effect sizes as the measure of comparison for their analyses. Effect size measures the amount of change due to the given outcomes versus the change due to chance. On the outcome factors from the courses, Cason
and Gillis (1994) found the greatest effect sizes from the clinical scales (ES = 1.047), with self-concept (ES = .339) and locus of control (ES = .302) falling in the middle. Hattie et al. (1997) found the greatest effect sizes in the self-concept domain, which included independence, confidence, self-efficacy, and self-understanding. In addition, these factors were enhanced during follow-up. This demonstrates that self-concept measures can actually increase after program completion, and although Hattie et al. (1997) did not address the length of the follow-up measurement, this provides support that outcome factors can be increased after termination of a program, even without further intervention.

Cason and Gillis (1994) found an overall effect size of .31 for all outcome measures, with a standard deviation of .62. They attributed this large amount of variation to the lack of a standardized measurement scale for measuring the benefits from an adventure program. Cason and Gillis also found that more recent studies had significantly higher effect sizes, and explained that this is possibly because people are choosing better, or more sensitive, instruments with which to measure the benefits. The finding that researchers are choosing better instruments is also supported by Hattie et al.’s (1997) statement that during the 1970s the emphasis was on self-concept, but as the research progressed, the researchers ignored the changes and advancements in self-concept theory and measurement instrumentation. Thus, they continued using outdated instruments which did not accurately measure the benefits. However, perhaps this finding of Cason and Gillis (1994), that the more recent studies have larger effect sizes, indicates a growing awareness of the necessity to use appropriate and well designed instruments. Cason and Gillis (1994) also found a significant correlation between the length of the program and the effect size, such that the longer the duration of the program, the greater the
Effect size from the outcome measures. As was mentioned above, the median program length was 3 weeks, and the minimum was 36 hours, so this meta-analysis represented the literature in general by not examining the effects from a shorter course, such as a one-day course.

Cason and Gillis found a significant correlation for the age of the participants, such that younger participants experienced a greater amount of change due to the course. This is an encouraging finding which supports the use of younger adolescents; however, the average age in Cason and Gillis’ study was 15.8-years old. Thus, there is a question as to whether these findings can be extended to participants of younger ages, such as 12- to 13-year-olds.

Cason and Gillis (1994) noted that one of the limitations of their meta-analysis was that it should not be generalized to the overall effectiveness of adventure programming with adolescents, as the findings mainly came from unpublished dissertations. They pointed out that this reflects one of the large problems in the field: the lack of publications.

For future research, Hattie et al. (1997) recommended that dependable measurements of high quality be used. In relation to this, they recommended that researchers use tests related to the desired outcomes of the programs, and to use unrelated scales in order to control for Post Group Euphoria (PGE). PGE is when the outcome measures of a study are high, but it is unknown if they are high because of the measurement being taken at the immediate end of the program (thus the euphoric state) which would unjustly raise the scores. If measurement scales are included which are not related to the goals and proposed outcomes of the course, then those scales can be analyzed to examine if they increased (thus, reflecting PGE). In addition, they recommended that larger sample sizes be used in order to get a power of .80. They commented that the statistical power of studies is often ignored, which leads to problems. If the power is low, even if the results are present, they will not be
significant. Increasing the sample size of studies will help to combat this. Finally, they recommended that alternative designs be used, apart from the typical pre- and post-test designs. They encouraged the use of time series designs, as well as quasi- or experimental designs.

Overall, these two meta-analyses, Cason and Gillis (1994) and Hattie et al. (1997), give a general overview as to the research that is available on adventure programs. Now the focus turns more specific, with an examination of several studies, both from published and unpublished sources.

Pann (1999) examined the effects of the Summer Scholarship Program conducted by Outward Bound on the self-concept and academic achievement of inner-city 9th and 10th graders from New York city. There were 57 (65% male and 35% female) participants who completed the Summer Scholarship Program (SSP), and 36 participants (56% male and 44% female) in a no-treatment condition. Students who were in the no-treatment control group were students who either were not interested in participating or whose parents would not give them permission to participate. A pre- and post-test design was utilized, using the Self Description Questionnaire-II (SDQ-II), which is a multifaceted self-concept scale, and the Wechsler Individual Achievement Test (WIAT), which is an achievement battery. It is important to note that there are two limitations inherent in the design of this study: there were no long-term follow-up measurements and there was no random assignment of participants.

The Summer Scholarship Program is a six-week Outward Bound course with a strong academic component that targets students at risk for dropping out of school. Pann (1999) found that after students participated in the SSP their verbal academic achievement scores (as measured by the WIAT) significantly increased, but this was not accompanied by an increase
in their self-concept scores. Pann listed several possible reasons for the lack results in the self-concept domain. He stated that the low power of the tests could account for it, as well as the possibility that the SDQ-II might not be good with his culturally diverse sample. This cultural explanation is interesting, as it is rarely brought up in the literature (the typical participant is a Caucasian male). The participants of Pann’s study were predominately Hispanic (43% in the treatment group and 36% in the control group), and the rest of the participants were African-American or African-Caribbean. Pann believed that cultural differences between his participants, and the Caucasian sample the SDQ-II was designed with, could account for the lack of significant findings in his study. Due to the uniqueness of his population, Pann (1999) cautioned against applying conclusions from this study to other populations, as the participants in this study were atypical in relation to the rest of the research conducted on adventure programs. However, he did call for an increase in the amount of research in relation to ethnicity, age, and gender.

A final important point from Pann’s (1999) study comes from a citation that he made in reference to Davis-Berman and Berman’s (1994) work, which pointed out that adventure programs “should focus on impacting their participants’ environments after completion of the program” (as cited in Pann, p. 85). Thus, although Pann’s work did not consider follow-up measurements, nor prolonging the effects of a program after its termination, he did acknowledge the possibility that post-course interventions might hold.

Although it has been pointed out that programs which are only for 1-2 days have not been included in analyses, there have been a few articles written about these programs. In one such article by Braverman, Brenner, Fretz, and Desmond (1990), a one-day ropes course was studied. Their study involved 118 sixth grade students who participated on a 4-H
Adventure Ropes Course. The purpose of the course was described as targeting self-esteem, awareness of physical capability, problem solving skills, and teambuilding. However, contrary to these goals, the adolescents were measured on their independence, extroversion, and anxiety (Braverman et al., 1990). Why the students were measured on factors different from the factors which the course is purported to affect is unknown. This is contrary to Hattie et al.’s (1997) suggestion that measurements be used which are related to the goals and proposed outcomes of the course.

From Braverman et al.’s (1990) lack of findings, they suggested that younger participants might not have the skills to deal with the impact of an experience like a ropes course. Although this could be true, it is important to acknowledge that their lack of findings could be due to the constructs that they chose to measure, instead of the age of the participants. To their credit, Braverman et al. (1990) suggested that debriefing could strengthen the impact of the course. What level of debriefing happened for the sixth graders was not made explicit, but their awareness that further debriefing could affect the benefits gained from the course is important.

A long-term study conducted by Eagle (1999) involved measuring two groups of students who had completed an adventure education program with two similar groups of students who did not complete the program. The students (as eighth graders) either completed the program in 1995-1996 or 1996-1997, and were measured 2 or 3 years later when they were in high school. All groups had relatively equal numbers of females and males, and also were matched on race, age, and scores on a math test. Overall, 63% of the participants were Caucasian, and 37% were minorities (mostly African-American with some Hispanic and Asian).
The adventure education program was called Beyond The Limits, and was designed and implemented by Eagle (1999). This program had 5-8 in-school activity periods, as well as 3-4 all day adventure trips to a ropes course. Eagle used the SDQ-II, as well as the Life Effectiveness Questionnaire-H (LEQ-H). Using the SDQ-II, Eagle analyzed the student’s increase in self-concept, and using the LEQ-H, he examined the students’ achievement motivation, task leadership, social competence, and emotional control.

Eagle (1999) found no differences on the construct of self-concept between the students who had participated in the Beyond The Limits program, and those who did not. Similarly, he found no differences in any of the measures on the LEQ-H scale, nor in the number of office referrals between the two groups, or in their respective attendance records. However, he did find significant findings on the LEQ-H in the group that had participated in the program 21 months earlier (in comparison to the control group of the same year), but not in the group that had participated 33 months earlier. Thus, in the combination analysis, there were no significant findings.

However, from the qualitative measurements he found that students found the ropes course the most memorable, and liked the high elements most of all. Eagle (1999) also found that they considered processing the experience (debriefing) the second most memorable outcome from their experiences. This enforces the strong role and impact that debriefing can have on participants of adventure experiences. Further support is lent to the belief that adolescents can make the necessary abstractions as Witman (1993) found that adolescents valued the processing of the experience over the actual content and experiences of the course (as cited in Luckner & Nadler, 1995).
In response to the question “What have you learned that is applicable to your life today?” Eagle (1999) found several cultural differences (only the differences among the females are reported here). He found that the African-American females rated that the encouragement and support that they learned was most applicable, and that goal setting was second. The Caucasian females considered the cooperation and teamwork that they learned to be most applicable to their current lives, and rated taking a risk as second.

Thus, although few of the quantatative analyses were significant, from the qualitative evidence, Eagle (1999) concluded that the participants had gained something valuable and had experienced lessons that were still currently applicable.

Eagle (1999) encouraged future research to utilize designs involving pre- and post-program testing, as well as follow-up measurements. He also suggested the use of the LEQ-H, because it was specifically designed for adventure experiences, and is currently the only scale which has this qualification. He did state that the one limitation to the use of the LEQ-H was that it did not provide a measure for teamwork.

From these studies it can be concluded that further research needs to address several key areas: more empirical studies with measurements designed for adventure-based experiences, examination of the effects of such experiences on adolescents, the use of designs with long-term follow-up measurements, and interventions designed to enhance or prolong the effects of courses.

Research on Females.

There is a dearth of information and research on the experiences of females on outdoor adventure programs. Specifically, there is a lack of empirical research on the effects of gender-specific groups in outdoor adventure (Lynch, 1999). Ultimately, the
underrepresented group in this area are the adolescent girls, as no programs have been
developed targeting this specific group (Gubitz & Kutcher, 1999). Despite this lack of
empirical research within the published literature, several important points can be found
suggesting the importance of gender-specific groups. These points are specific to all female
courses (as in Henderson (1999) the terminology all female has been used instead of female-
only because it emphasizes the goals instead of the exclusions).

All female courses have numerous benefits for their participants. Among these is the
teamwork that is built between the females as they learn to cooperate and work together
(Gubitz & Kutcher, 1999). In addition, in all female courses, the leadership positions rotate
(Henderson, 1999). Another benefit supporting the use of all female courses is that it allows
women and girls to feel as though the outdoors are not just for men and boys; through the
separation it encourages women and girls to experience the outdoors without fear that they
are intruding in a realm that does not belong to them (Henderson, 1999). Thus, an area that
could benefit from further study is the research on all female courses, specifically with
adolescents. Within this literature, it is important to recognize that benefits from such
courses do not happen solely because of the gender segregation. Henderson (1999) pointed
out that many factors influence the outcomes from adventure experiences including: the
group composition, the effectiveness of the leadership, the talents and skills of the
individuals, and the philosophy of the program. However, before the effects of all female
courses can be explored further, it is necessary to examine the period of adolescence and the
transitional struggles and explorations that adolescent females undertake during this time.
Female Adolescence.

Although it is tempting to define the period of adolescence by age of onset and termination, this approach is not acceptable in all circumstances. Dusek (1996) defined the time period of adolescence as starting at pubescence, or approximately two years before puberty, until adulthood, when adult roles are assumed.

In general, adolescence is for experimentation of different roles and evaluations of different identities (Dusek, 1996). These roles and identities can include being a leader, follower, athlete, observer, or other means of identification such as being intelligent and valuable (Dusek, 1996). In addition, adolescence is a time for developmental risks. Often, these risks are linked to the conflict of adolescent females trying to stay “in touch with themselves” (Basow & Rubin, 1999, p. 31) and meeting the expectations and demands of others.

At this transition, which typically occurs during junior high school, adolescents face “enormous physiological, cognitive, social and environmental changes [which] are either beginning or on the near horizon” (Hirsh & Rapkin, 1987, p. 1225). Some of these cognitive and psychological factors include changes in self-esteem, self-concept, and self-confidence. The social factors can include peer support and female friendships.

One concern for adolescent females during this time period is the decline of self-confidence (AAUW, 1990, as cited in Eccles, Barber, Jozefowicz, Malenchuk, & Vida, 1999). Eccles et al. (1999) also pointed out that during adolescence, girls’ self-esteem drops more than boys’. There are contradictory findings regarding this point, as Hirsh and Rapkin (1987) found that girl’s self-esteem did not change from the end of sixth grade to the middle of seventh, but then increased until the end of seventh grade. However, Dusek (1996)
pointed out that for groups of adolescents, self-esteem does not change over the transitional period, but it can for individuals. Thus, although it appears that adolescent females are at risk for a decrease in their self-confidence and self-esteem during junior high school, the findings are not unanimous and could warrant interventions to possibly increase adolescents’ self-confidence during this time period.

In addition to the well-studied factors of self-confidence and self-esteem other factors such as peer support, attributions, and locus of control have an influence on adolescents. The importance of friendships and peer support on psychological development has been well demonstrated (Hirsh & Rapkin, 1987; Kimmel & Rudolph, 1998). However, during junior high school the opportunity for social support decreases (Hirsh & Rapkin, 1987). Thus, at a time period when it is crucial for female adolescents to receive social support, the opportunities for this are decreasing.

Another possible pitfall for girls is the manner in which they make attributions. Eccles et al. (1999) acknowledged that girls tend to make external attributions for success. For example, girls may attribute a job well done to effort and hard work instead of towards ability (an internal attribution). These types of attributions have detrimental effects such that girls believe that accomplishments they achieve are not due to their own capabilities, but rather to external factors. Thus, the degree of control (or locus of control) that adolescents have over their lives is decreased. This is compounded by the fact that girls, more than boys, are negatively affected by failures, and consequently are not as likely to take risks for higher rewards (Eccles et al., 1999). These two factors, the attribution styles of girls and their greater tendency to pass up safe risks, combine to form a negative cycle in which successes are not attributed to ability and risks are not taken for fear of failure. Thus, an intervention
which would address these factors by increasing the adolescents’ locus of control and providing a safe haven for taking risks would be beneficial to adolescents.

Denmark (1999) acknowledged that the phase of adolescence is a trying and troubled time for girls, but it also is a time for exploration of new ideas, identities, and self-awareness. Often, the literature on adolescent females focuses on the negative experiences, such as teen pregnancy and eating disorders (Callan, 1999). Although it is important to understand and address these issues, it also is necessary to provide interventions for girls to combat the above stated factors: decreases in self-confidence, locus of control, and social support. Denmark (1999) made several recommendations for interventions for adolescent females, including assertiveness training, physical education, leadership training, and increasing acceptable risk taking. The present intervention, an adventure course, combines these recommendations by providing opportunities for the following to happen: physical activity, providing a safe environment for risk taking, encouraging leadership in all participants, and requesting that each participant ask for what she needs.

Journaling.

The influence of journal writing on the effects of an outdoor adventure experience has rarely been studied. In an unpublished work, Savage (1993) examined the impact of journal writing on self-concept throughout participation in an 23-day Outward Bound course. Savage used the Self Description Questionnaire-III (SDQ-III) to measure the self-concepts of 161 participants from the course. Although journaling has always been an important part of Outward Bound courses, Savage further justified it by citing Baldwin (1979) who believed that writing encourages people to reflect, to “relate values to behaviors, and to develop a
more enlightened view of personal growth” (p. 7). Thus, through the process of journaling, increased reflection and contemplation can encourage growth and self-awareness.

Savage (1993) utilized three groups in her study: the first group did not journal during their participation in the course, the second group completed blank journals on topics of their choice, and the third group completed structured journals designed to affect the participants’ self-concepts. A structured journal was provided because it was believed that the structure would enhance reflection on the a priori chosen topic of self-concept. Additionally, this lack did not allow for a personal analysis of face validity of the topics, specifically because Savage questioned the content and construct validity of the journal topics.

The findings suggest that journaling does not increase self-concept as measured by the SDQ-III (Savage, 1993). No significant findings were present in relation to the affect of journaling, either structured or blank, on the dependent variable of self-concept. However, it is important to note that Hattie et al. (1997) cautioned against using scales which solely assess self-concept and are not designed to measure change. Thus, the lack of results might not be due to the inability of journaling to affect levels of self-concept, but rather the way the effects were measured. Unfortunately, the journal topics were not included in the manuscript, and thus could not be evaluated or utilized to develop the topics for the current research. Regardless of the lack of results, Savage encouraged the examination of the effects of journaling writing in further studies. Stremba (1989) also encouraged the use of journaling and believed that journals could be effective during the length of a trip.

Consequently, the present study utilized the use of journals, but instead of journaling during the trip (as it was a one-day course), participants were asked to journal after the course was completed. This was to encourage further reflection and relation to real life after
the experience was over. It was hoped that this extension of the use of journaling would provide the means to prolong and enhance the benefits gained from a one-day adventure course.

**Importance of Transference and Debriefing**

The importance of debriefing, the use of metaphors, and transferring the lessons learned while on an adventure course has been emphasized numerous times in the literature (e.g., Gubitz & Kutcher; 1995; Hart & Silka, 1994; Priest, 1995; Priest, 1996). Within this awareness it is critical to examine the facilitator skills necessary to process the experience, along with whether general debriefing styles or specific styles (specific to the construct being measured) are more effective. Using a general debriefing style means that all emotions and experiences that arise through participation in the program are processed. There is no directing the content of the processing towards a specific goal or outcome. This is in opposition to a specific debriefing style in which the debriefing and processing is focused towards a given construct, such as attempting to influence self-esteem or self-confidence (Priest, 1996).

Priest (1996) examined the effects of different debriefing styles on participants of a Corporate Adventure Training (CAT) program. Corporate Adventure Training programs serve as a source of income for many adventure course providers and represent a different population, business employees, than has been discussed earlier. However, within this limitation, the results of this study still can be related to the present area of concern: the effects of different debriefing styles.

In his study, Priest (1996) questioned whether a specific style of debriefing is better, as the possibility exists that the specific nature of it might restrict what is really happening
from the course and the subsequent processing of it. In Priest’s study, one group of participants was debriefed using a specific style catered towards increasing self-confidence (which was the construct being measured). The restriction that a specific debriefing style might have is an important point, however Priest did not examine whether other factors were affected besides self-confidence as he did not utilize any other scales except one which measured self-confidence.

The participants from the CAT program were measured using the Interpersonal Trust Inventory before, and after, participation on a three day ropes course (Priest, 1996). Four months later the participants were measured for the final time. The results indicated that all participants increased their self-confidence regardless of the debriefing style. However, only the specific debriefing style group maintained the increase over four months on the subscale of acceptance of one’s own ideas. The implications for these findings are that a specific debriefing style could have a stronger affect on maintaining changes over the long-term. This is an important finding, and if replicated could change the methods of facilitation if specific outcomes are sought.

However, it is essential to remember the above stated restriction on this study, that other outcome factors (such as locus of control or social competence) were not measured. Thus, the limitations that the specific debriefing style could have imposed on these other factors was not accounted for and it is unknown whether there would have been other long-term effects from the general debriefing style which were not measured.

Unfortunately, in the field of experiential education there is no standardized training for facilitation or technical skills. Despite this, there have been recommendations made about what general facilitation and technical skills facilitators for adventure courses should
possess. To categorize the skills that are necessary, it is necessary to begin with an analysis of the different types of programs offered within the field of experiential education. Priest (1995) described the following four levels of programs in the field:

1) Recreational- Promotes change through enjoyment.
2) Educational- Promotes change through creativity, awareness, and teaching concepts.
3) Developmental- Promotes change through increasing function and positive actions.
4) Therapeutic- Promotes change through decreasing dysfunctions and negative actions.

Levels one and two will be covered here, as they represent the type of course that the present study utilized. Some of the necessary skills for the first level include the technical skills of belaying, tying suitable knots, using specialized equipment, and inspecting the equipment prior to use. The facilitation skills for this level include instructing participants, contracting with the participants to ensure safe behaviors, and monitoring and encouraging participant use of the challenge by choice method. The skills necessary for the educational programs include all of the skills mentioned above, in addition to the technical skills of spotting (protecting the clients in case of a fall), selecting the appropriate activity for the group, and sequencing the tasks appropriately. The facilitation skills for this level include debriefing, assisting clients to set goals using the S. M. A. R. T. (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and time-referenced) method, and funneling (guiding the reflections of the participants through deliberate questions after termination of the activity) (Priest, 1995).
Given the emphasis on debriefing, it is imperative that the adolescents in the present study have the cognitive capabilities to make the abstractions and reflections necessary for transference. Although a thorough analysis is beyond the scope of this paper, Piaget’s (1952) theory on the four stages of cognitive development provides support for the belief that adolescents have the capabilities to make the necessary cognitions. The first two stages, sensorimotor and preoperational take place until approximately 7 years of age. The third stage of concrete operational is evident in children from 7 to 11 years old. This third stage is characterized by a lack of abstraction, as cognitions are predominately related to reality and things that exist. The fourth stage, formal operational, is evident from approximately 11 years of age and above. This final stage contains the abstract thinking skills such as imagination and hypothesizing about future events or outcomes (Dusek, 1996). This final stage represents a flexible thought process and is the stage that is necessary for the type of abstraction and relation to future actions that are necessary for the debriefing and transference from an adventure course.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to examine whether the benefits from a one-day adventure course could be prolonged through structured journal writing after the experience. Twenty-four adolescents from the Y-Teen program (of the YWCA) completed a one-day adventure course. Approximately half of the participants then completed journaling topics twice a week for two weeks. These journal topics were designed to encourage reflection on social competence, locus of control, and self-confidence, which were the three hypothesized factors that would be affected through participation in an adventure course (and are pertinent to adolescent female development).
This study addresses gaps in the literature by examining whether the long-term benefits of a one-day adventure course with female adolescents can be prolonged through writing. The research was directed towards low-income sixth, seventh, and eighth graders who were members of an after school program conducted by the local YWCA. The basic question is: can the benefits from a short-term adventure-based experience be prolonged through the use of writing?

Hypotheses

The hypotheses are as follows (see Figure 1):

1) There will be a main effect of group of the participant, such that, collapsed over time, the journaling group will be higher on each of the dependent measures of life effectiveness, social competence, locus of control, self confidence and the total LEQ-I score, than the no journaling group.

2) There will be a main effect for time, such that, collapsed over the groups, the measurements of life effectiveness will be highest at Time 2 (post-course measurement), and will be lowest at Time 1 (pre-course measurement).

3) An interaction is hypothesized such that at Time 3 (post journaling measurement), the journaling group will be significantly higher on each of the four dependent variables than the no journaling group.

4) A second interaction is hypothesized such that at Time 4 (long-term follow-up two months after completion of the course) the journaling group will be significantly higher on the four dependent variables than the no journaling group.
Figure 1. Hypothesized results as a function of group and time of measurement.
Chapter Two

Methodology

Participants

The participants in this study were 24 sixth, seventh, and eighth grade females recruited from after school Y-Teen Programs from the Young Women’s Christian Association (YWCA) of the West End. Three participants choose not to participate fully in the adventure course and were eliminated from the analyses, thus they are not included in the total number of participants (N = 24). All members of the Y-Teen programs were invited to participate in the study. Approximately 180 students were approached at nine different after school programs and were given a brief description of the study. Students who came to the separate mandatory meetings with their parents were then able to fill out the necessary permission forms. Participants had to be able to read, speak, and understand English.

After all of the permission forms were completed, the participants were randomly assigned to be in the journaling or no journaling group. Participation was voluntary, and incentives were given to the group that was journaling after they turned in each week’s completed journal topics.

Table 1
Race/Ethnicity of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>No Journaling Group</th>
<th>Journaling Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American-Indian</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (7.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1 (9.1%)</td>
<td>2 (15.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>3 (27.3%)</td>
<td>5 (38.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>2 (18.2%)</td>
<td>3 (23.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>5 (45.5%)</td>
<td>2 (15.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note. Numbers indicate the number of participants in each cell, and the percentages are percentages of the total number of participants for each group: journaling or no journaling.

Table 2
Grade Level of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Journaling Group</th>
<th>Journaling Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Grade</td>
<td>7 (63.6%)</td>
<td>7 (53.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Grade</td>
<td>4 (36.4%)</td>
<td>5 (38.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth Grade</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (7.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Numbers indicate the number of participants in each cell, and the percentages are percentages of the total number of participants for each group: journaling or no journaling.

Materials

Initial Fliers.
At the initial visits to the Y-Teen meetings the researcher handed out fliers with a letter attached that listing the meeting times and locations if the student was interested in participating (see Appendix A for the fliers and letter). The first page of the flier was a brief description of the project, listed the options for the mandatory meetings, and gave contact information for the researcher. Both the flier and the letter were in English on one side and Spanish on the other. The second page of the flier was a letter addressed to the parents and contained information about the nature of the project, a description of the groups (journaling or no journaling), an explanation of an adventure course, and concluded with an invitation for the parents to come to one of the meetings if they were interested in signing their daughter up for the project.
A second reminder flier listed the meeting times, the location, several new options for meetings and a request to call the researcher if there were any problems getting to one of the meetings (see Appendix B for this second flier).

**Informational Packet.**

The information packet given to the parent and child at the meetings include 12 pages of information and permission forms (see Appendix C for the full informational packet). The first two pages of the packet contained a detailed description of the project, including a description of possible journal entries, a sample question from the LEQ-I, and a request for full participation from the student. The third page of the packet was an acknowledgement form for the parent and student which stated that the student read the description on the first two pages and agreed to try to participate to the best of her abilities. The fourth page was a description of a program offered by the Boojum Institute, although it was not a description of the course that the participants would complete. The fifth and sixth pages were a Medical Information and Release for Treatment Form from the Boojum Institute which included questions about medical insurance, allergies, medical history, and current health problems. The seventh through ninth pages were a Participant Acknowledgement and Agreement from the Boojum Institute which served as the release of liability for the Boojum Institute. The tenth page was a Scripps College Participant Consent Form which included an acknowledgement and release of liability for the risks involved, an understanding of the random assignment, acknowledgement of the voluntary participation, and the anonymity of the results and final project. The eleventh page was a transportation release form for the participants to be transported by bus to Joshua Tree National Park. The final page of the
information packet contained demographic questions about the participant (including name, address, school, age, and race).

Other Information Given at the Meeting.

The final two sheets of information were given to the participant after she signed up, completed the first measurement of the LEQ-I and was assigned to a group (see Appendix D for these informational sheets). The first page of these sheets listed what group the participant was in, journaling or no journaling, and gave additional information about the following measurement times. The second page was a list of the items that the participant would need to bring on the day of the course, where and when to meet the bus, and concluded with a request to call the researcher if the participant could not attend the course.

Finally, the parent was given a half-page sheet listing contact information of the researcher, as well as a business card of the program director of the YWCA.

Instruments.

The Life Effectiveness Questionnaire-I (LEQ-I) is a 24-item, multidimensional, self-report measure designed to measure changes in life proficiency or life effectiveness through experience based interventions, such as an adventure course (see Appendix E for the questionnaire and instructions) (Neill et al., 1997). The development of the LEQ-I was prompted by several factors. One of these was the lack of empirical research conducted on the benefits of outdoor adventure type courses. In the past, claims of the successes of outdoor programs were made, however they were not backed up by empirical data, they were solely based on personal experiences (Neill et al.). Thus, there existed a need for methodologically sound measurement scales to be developed.
The second factor was a critique of the measurement tools that eventually came into use (Neill et al., 1997). These questionnaires were often designed for assessment uses and were not intended for measuring the developmental changes that were expected from outdoor experiences (Neill et al.). Consequently, there was a need for a psychometrically sound questionnaire that was designed to measure the changes that occur as a result of participation in an adventure-based experience. The LEQ, and subsequent modifications (including an LEQ-C through LEQ-H) over a period of 15 years resulted in the LEQ-I, which is utilized in the present study.

The LEQ has been shown to have a high internal consistency with alpha levels from eight of the scales ranging from .78 to .93 and test-retest correlations ranging form .60 to .81 (Neill et al., 1997)

The LEQ-I measures nine distinct areas of life effectiveness. The nine scales are measured by three to five questions each, with a self-report method of stating how True (like me) to how False (not like me) each statement is to the participant. Definitions and examples of each subscale are given below (Neill, 1999):

- **Achievement Motivation-** The extent to which the individual is motivated to achieve excellence and put the required effort into action to attain it.
  
  Example: I try to do the best I possibly can.

- **Active Initiative-** The extent to which the individual likes to initiate action in new situations.
  
  Example: I like to be an active, “get into it” person.

- **Emotional Control-** The extent to which the individual perceives he/she maintains emotional control when he/she is faced with potentially stressful situations.
Example: I can stay calm in stressful situations.

- Intellectual Flexibility- The extent to which the individual perceives he/she can adapt his/her thinking and accommodate new information from changing conditions and different perspectives.

Example: I am adaptable and flexible in my thinking and ideas.

- Locus of Control- The extent to which the individual perceives that he/she has personal control of his/her life.

Example: I believe I am responsible for my actions.

- Self Confidence- The degree of confidence the individual has in his/her abilities and the success of their actions.

Example: When I apply myself to something I am confident I will succeed.

- Social Competence- The degree of personal confidence and self-perceived ability in social interactions.

Example: I am competent in social situations.

- Task Leadership- The extent to which the individual perceives he/she can lead other people effectively when a task needs to be done and productivity is the primary requirement.

Example: I am a good leader when a task needs to be done.

- Time Management- The extent that an individual perceives that he/she makes optimum use of time.

Example: I plan and use my time efficiently.
Journal Topics.

The journal topics were developed to be related to the adventure course and to each of the three dependent variables of self-confidence, locus of control, and social competence. The two journal topics for the first week were designed to encourage reflection about the course and to start applying their experiences from the course to their life at school (Topic #1: General Topic) and to encourage thought and contemplation on self-talk messages and their influences on self-confidence (Topic #2: Self-Confidence) (see Appendix F for the first two journal assignments). The self-talk exercise was adapted from Szymanski (1998).

The first week’s journal topics were accompanied by a one page instruction sheet inside of the plastic folder given to each participant who was in the journaling group (see Appendix G for the instruction sheet).

The second week’s journal topics were designed to affect the dependent factors of locus of control and social competence (see Appendix H for the second week’s journal assignments). The third topic (Topic #3: Locus of Control) was designed for the individual to become aware of how actions and attitudes are chosen and that each person has the opportunity to take responsibility for these actions. The fourth, and final journal topic, (Topic #4: Social Competence) was designed to encourage the participant to examine the group processes that took place at the adventure course and to brainstorm methods on how the individual could act differently in order to make social situations more successful.

Design

This study utilized a 2 x 4 mixed factorial design. The two levels of the between-groups variable was participation in the journaling or no journaling group. The groups were operationally defined as the following:
Journaling Group: The group that was assigned (prior to the course) to complete two weeks of journaling entries after completion of the adventure course.

No Journaling Group: The group who was assigned (prior to the course) to have no follow-up writing assignments after the course was completed.

The four levels of the within-groups variable were the time of measurement of the LEQ-I (Time 1, Time 2, Time 3, Time 4). These were operationally defined as:

Time 1- Pre-test measurement prior to any groups participating on the adventure course, completed after the permission forms were signed at the meeting with parents and students.

Time 2- Post-test measurement after the adventure course was completed (at the end of the day at Joshua Tree National Park).

Time 3- Measurement after the journaling ended (after the second week’s journaling topics had been turned in).

Time 4- Final measurement nine weeks after the participation on the adventure course.

In order to assess life effectiveness, there were four dependent variables. The first dependent variable of life effectiveness was the total score on the LEQ-I. This was operationally defined as the total score on the LEQ-I, as measured by the 29-question test which has nine subscales: Achievement Motivation, Active Initiative, Emotional Control, Intellectual Flexibility, Self Confidence, Social Competence, Task Leadership, Time Management, and Locus of Control. The second dependent variable of social competence was operationally defined as the participants’ scores on the Social Competence subscale of the LEQ-I which measures “the degree of personal confidence and self-perceived ability in
social interactions” (Neill, 1999, p. 6). The third dependent variable of self-confidence was operationally defined as the score on the subscale of Self Confidence on the LEQ-I. This subscale measures “the degree of confidence the individual has in his/her abilities and the success of their actions” (Neill, 1999, p. 6). The fourth, and final dependent variable of locus of control was operationally defined as the participants’ scores on the subscale of Locus of Control on the LEQ-I. This subscale measures “the extent to which the individual perceives that he/she has personal control of his/her life” (Neill, 1999, p. 6).

Procedure

Permission was arranged with the program director of the YWCA to attend each Y-Teen Program meeting at each middle school served by the YWCA of the West End (a total of eight schools). Each Y-Teen meeting was held after school on the middle school’s campus. At each meeting the researcher spent 15 minutes describing the study, explaining what an adventure course was, informing the participants of the possibilities for groups (e.g., some participants would be asked to journal twice a week, whereas others would not), and answering any questions that the participants had (see Appendix I for the description read to the participants). After all of the questions were answered, the researcher passed out an informational flier and letter for the parents which described the study.

Due to the low number of parents and participants who attended the meetings during the first week, a reminder flier was given to each member of the Y-Teen program at the meeting the following week. This flier listed the meeting times, the location, and a request to call the researcher if there were any problems getting to one of the meetings.

There were eight different meeting times offered over the course of two weeks (various options for the meeting times were offered in order to provide as many opportunities
for the parents and students to fill out the permission forms as was possible). Each meeting was held at the office of the YWCA of the West End in Pomona. At each meeting there were refreshments. The procedure at each meeting was the same. At the meeting the parents and their child(ren) were welcomed and then invited to sit down. The parents were given two identical informational packets, one was printed on light green paper and was for the researcher’s records, and the second was printed on light yellow and was the copy for the parent’s records. This informational packet contained a detailed description of the project, an acknowledgement form stating that the student and the parents read the description, a description of a program offered by the Boojum Institute, a Medical Information and Release for Treatment Form from the Boojum Institute, a Participant Acknowledgement and Agreement from the Boojum Institute, a Scripps College Participant Consent Form, an Adventure Course Transportation form, and finally a form for demographic information about the participant. After the informational packet was handed out to the parents and their child, a brief introduction was given about the materials in the packet. In this introduction the researcher informed the parents and the student that the program described on the page from the Boojum Institute was not the program that the students would be participating on, but rather represented one type of program that the institute offered. The introduction was concluded by informing the parents and the child that if they had any questions while reading and filling out the forms that they should ask the researcher. Reading and completing all of the necessary forms took 20-30 minutes. After the forms were completed the researcher checked them to verify that they were completely filled out. Any form that was missing necessary information was returned to the parents and student with instructions on how to properly complete it.
After all of the forms were completed the student was taken to a separate room where she filled out the first measurement of the LEQ-I. Before the questionnaire was handed out to the participant, the instructions were given in accordance to the guidelines for administering the LEQ-I (Neill, 2001). After the instructions were given, the one-page questionnaire was handed out to the participants. The participants were instructed to read the page of instructions and when they were done reading it, to turn it over and begin the questionnaire. Each participant was told if they had any questions to ask the researcher.

After the questionnaire was completed the participant returned to the main room and drew a ticket out of a box. These tickets served as the random assignment for the division of the participants into the journaling or no journaling groups. Each ticket was numbered from 1-8 with a number corresponding to each group. After the ticket was chosen, the participant was given information about the group that she was assigned, information about where and when to meet the bus on the day of the course, and an additional page listing what the participant should bring and wear for the course.

Finally, the parent was given a half-page sheet listing contact information of the researcher, as well as a card of the program director of the YWCA.

At each meeting when a parent was present who did not speak English, a college student who was fluent in both Spanish and English accompanied the researcher and translated all of the documents. The researcher helped with translation, as well as answering any questions (in Spanish).

On the day of the adventure course a bus picked up the students at the main YWCA office located in Pomona. In addition to the researcher, another adult chaperone accompanied the participants on the bus. Upon arrival at Joshua Tree National Park the
students were divided into two groups by the facilitators of the course. One group of students completed the rock climbing activities in the morning, whereas the second group completed the team building activities in the morning. After lunch the two groups switched. After the final activities were completed the students were asked to spread out on the benches surrounding the site in order to complete the second measurement of the LEQ-I. The same instructions were given as at the first administration of the questionnaire. After all of the participants had completed the questionnaire they were bused back to the main office of the YWCA where their parents picked them up. The students were reminded that the researcher would be attending their Y-Teen program meetings the following week to hand out the first journal assignments for the participants who were in the journaling group.

During the week following the adventure course the researcher attended the Y-Teen meetings of the four schools who had students participating in the journaling. At these meetings each participant was asked to step away from the group and was given the plastic folder containing the first week’s journal topics, a pen, and a sheet listing the instructions for journaling. The journal topics were printed on paper with a colorful border of people holding hands. Each topic was in a sealed labeled envelope and the students were instructed to open and complete them in order.

The following week the researcher returned to the Y-Teen meetings of each school and passed out the new topics (sealed in envelops like the first ones) and gathered the completed journaling assignments from each student. If the participant completed and turned in the journaling assignment then she received a “thank you” of a piece of candy. The students who had forgotten their journal assignments at home were given the new topics and were asked to bring both completed sets of journals the following week when they would
receive the thank you for both weeks. If the participant was not at the Y-Teen meeting, then the topics were left in the main office and the participant was able to pick them up the following school day.

During the third week after the adventure course the researcher attended the Y-Teen meetings of all of the students who had participated on the adventure course. At this meeting the third measurement of the LEQ-I took place, and if necessary, the participants turned in their journal assignments, and all of the participants were thanked and reminded about the fourth and final measurement that would take place in January. The administration of the questionnaire was the same as it had been for the previous two testing times.

Two months later the fourth, and final measurement using the LEQ-I was conducted. At this time the participants were thanked again and given a certificate of completion for their participation in the adventure course project.
Chapter Three

Results

Effects of an Adventure Course

In order to examine what the effects were of the adventure course on the dependent variables, the main effects for time of measurement between Time 1 and Time 2 are given below. Because the journaling intervention did not take place until after Time 2, the main effect of group is not listed, nor is the interaction.

Social Competence.

With an alpha level of .05 for all tests, a repeated measures ANOVA was used to analyze the main effect for time of measurement (two levels: Time 1 and Time 2). There was no main effect for time, $F(1, 22) = .07$, $ns$, indicating that there were no differences in the students’ levels of social competence as measured before the course and after the course.

Locus of Control.

The main effect for time of measurement was found to be marginally significant, $F(1, 22) = 3.31$, $p < .10$, indicating that the locus of control of the students at the first measurement time ($M = 6.63$, $SD = .68$) was lower than at the second measurement time ($M = 6.94$, $SD = .65$).

Self-Confidence.

There was no significant main effect for time of measurement, $F(1, 22) = 1.11$, $ns$, indicating that there were no differences in the students’ levels of self confidence as measured before the course and after the course.

Total LEQ.
There was a marginally significant main effect for the time of measurement on the total LEQ score, $F(1, 22) = 3.63, p = .07$. This indicates that the total LEQ score was slightly higher at the post-course ($M = 6.64, SD = .81$) than at the pre-course measurement ($M = 6.45, SD = .85$).

**Modifications to Study Design**

Although random assignment had taken place there were differences between the journaling and no journaling groups at the first measurement time. In order to control for these differences, the first measurement time (Time 1) was used as a covariate for all of the subsequent analyses. Thus, because Time 1 is no longer one of the independent variables, there is no way to analyze the second hypothesis that the dependent variables would be highest at Time 2 (post-course measurement), and would be lowest at Time 1 (pre-course measurement). As a consequence, exploratory analyses will be conducted for the main effect of time on each dependent variable, but are not in relation to the original hypothesized main effect of time. This changes the design of the study to a 2 x 3 design, instead of the original 2 x 4 design as was originally intended.

**Analysis of Social Competence**

A 2 x 3 mixed randomized-groups and repeated-measures ANCOVA was performed on levels of social competence. The first independent variable, group, had two levels: one group which completed weekly journal entries after the adventure course for two weeks (journaling group) and the second group which did not have any further intervention (no journaling group). The repeated-measures independent variable was the time of measurement: after the course (Time 2), after the journaling (Time 3), and a long-term follow-up (Time 4). The measurement prior to the course (Time 1) was used as a covariate.
in order to control for the group differences that were present prior to participation on the course. A total of 24 participants completed the adventure course.

For the analysis on the dependent variable of social competence one outlier was deleted: the case with the lowest score from the journaling group at Time 3. A sample of 23 cases remained. Homogeneity of variance, homogeneity of regression, sphericity, and linearity among social competence, time of measurement, and the pre-course measurement were acceptable.

With an alpha level of .05 for all tests, there was a marginally significant main effect of time of measurement after adjusting for the covariate, $F(2, 40) = 2.75, p = .08$, partial $\eta^2 = .12$. A follow-up repeated measures ANCOVA was used to examine the pairwise comparisons to examine what difference between the measurement times accounted for the main effect. However, there were no significant pairwise comparisons. It was hoped that a trend analysis would demonstrate the shape of the relationship, and it was found to have a marginally significant linear relationship over time, $F(1, 20) = 3.10, p = .10$, partial $\eta^2 = .13$. This indicates that there was a general linear increase in the levels of social competence such that the levels increased from Time 2 ($M = 6.49, SD = 1.22$) to Time 3 ($M = 6.86, SD = .94$) and decreased slightly to Time 4 ($M = 6.71, SD = 1.18$) (see Figure 2). Although the levels from Time 3 to Time 4 decreased slightly, there was still a marginally significant increase over time from Time 2 to Time 4. This means that there was linear relationship on the levels of social competence from the measurement directly after the course to the final measurement nine weeks after the course.

The main effect of group was found to be not significant, after adjusting for the covariate, $F(1, 20) = .06$, ns. In opposition to the hypothesized difference, this indicates that
Figure 2. Trend analysis demonstrating marginally significant linear relationship for the main effect of time of measurement on the dependent variable of social competence.
there was no difference between the journaling and no journaling groups on the dependent variable of social competence.

There was no significant interaction between the two groups over time, $F(2, 40) = .35, \text{ ns}$. This indicates that, contrary to the hypotheses, there was no differences between the group which journaled and the group which did not journal as a function of time.

**Analysis of Locus of Control**

A 2 x 3 mixed randomized-groups and repeated-measures ANCOVA was performed on levels of locus of control after participation on an adventure course. The independent variables remained the same as in the previous analysis: a between subjects independent variable of group (journaling or no journaling) and a repeated measures variable of time of measurement (across three measurement times). The measurement prior to the course (Time 1) was used as a covariate in order to control for the group differences that were present prior to participation on the course.

For the analysis on the dependent variable of locus of control five outliers were deleted: 1) two cases were deleted which were the highest scores from the no journaling group at the first measurement time (which served as the covariate), 2) one case was deleted which was the lowest score at Time 3 from the no journaling group, and 3) two cases were deleted which were the lowest scores at Time 4 from the journaling group. A sample of 19 cases remained. With the resulting data set, all assumptions were met.

There was no significant main effect of time after adjusting for the covariate, $F(2, 40) = 1.06, \text{ ns}$. This indicates that the levels of locus of control did not vary over the three measurement times after adjusting for the covariate.
The main effect of group was found to be not significant, after adjusting for the covariate, $F(1, 20) = .02$, ns. Contrary to the hypothesis, this indicates that there was no difference between the journaling and no journaling group on the dependent variable of locus of control.

There was no significant interaction between the two groups over time, $F(2, 40) = 2.16$, ns. This indicates that, contrary to the hypotheses, there were no differences between the group which journaled and the group which did not journal as a function of time.

**Analysis of Self-Confidence**

A 2 x 3 mixed randomized-groups and repeated-measures ANCOVA was performed on the dependent variable of self-confidence. The independent variables remained the same as in the previous analysis: a between subjects independent variable of group (journaling or no journaling) and a repeated measures variable of time of measurement (across three measurement times). The measurement prior to the course (Time 1) was again used as a covariate.

For the analysis on the dependent variable of self-confidence three outliers were deleted: 1) one case was deleted which was the lowest score from the journaling group at the second measurement time, and 2) two cases were deleted which were the lowest scores from the journaling group at the fourth measurement time. A sample of 21 cases remained. All assumptions were met with the resulting data set.

There was a significant main effect of time after adjusting for the covariate, $F(2, 36) = 4.05$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .12$. A follow-up repeated measures ANCOVA was used to examine the pairwise comparisons to examine what difference between the measurement times accounted for the main effect. However, there were no significant pairwise
comparisons between Time 1 and Time 2, Time 1 and Time 3, or Time 2 and Time 3. Once
again, a trend analysis was used to examine the possible shape of the relationship, and it
demonstrated that there was a significant linear relationship over time, \( F(1, 19) = 7.02, p <
.05 \), partial \( \eta^2 = .27 \). This indicates that there was a general linear relationship in the levels of
self-confidence such that the levels changed from Time 2 (\( M = 7.38, SD = .77 \)) to Time 3 (\( M
= 7.43, SD = .64 \)) and stayed the same at Time 4 (\( M = 7.43, SD = .46 \)) (see Figure 3). This
indicates that there was linear relationship in the levels of self-confidence from the
measurement directly after the course to the final measurement nine weeks after the course.

The main effect of group was found to be not significant, after adjusting for the
covariate, \( F(1, 18) = 0.07, ns \). Contrary to the hypothesis, this indicates that there was no
difference between the journaling and no journaling group on the dependent variable of self-
confidence.

There was a marginally significant interaction between the two groups over time, \( F(2, 36) = 2.76, p = .08 \), partial \( \eta^2 = .14 \). A follow-up ANCOVA was used to examine the simple
main effects of the within subjects independent variable of time of measurement at each level
of the between subjects variable of group. Results indicated there was a significant simple
main effect of time for no journaling group, \( F(2, 18) = 5.13, p < .05 \), partial \( \eta^2 = .36 \). This
indicates that there were significant differences in the no journaling group between Time 2
(\( M = 7.24, SE = .21 \)), Time 3 (\( M = 7.58, SE = .12 \)), and at Time 4 (\( M = 7.50, SE = .13 \)). To
examine where the differences were, a Bonferroni adjustment was used to analyze the
pairwise comparisons between each measurement time. However, no significant pairwise
comparisons were found. This indicates that the reason for the simple main effect was not
due to any differences between two of the measurement times, but rather probably due to a
Figure 3. Trend analysis demonstrating significant linear relationship for the main effect of time of measurement on the dependent variable of self-confidence.
complex relationship across several measurement times. As a possible method to examine what this relationship was, a trend analysis was used which demonstrated that there was a significant linear relationship over time, $F(1, 9) = 7.04, p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .44$ (see Figure 4). Although there was a minimal decrease from Time 3 to Time 4, overall, there was a general linear increase over time on the levels of self-confidence for the no journaling group.

There also was a significant simple main effect of time for the journaling group, $F(2, 16) = 4.10, p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .34$. This indicates that there were significant differences in the journaling group between Time 2 ($M = 7.53$, SE = .17), Time 3 ($M = 7.27$, SE = .19), and at Time 4 ($M = 7.34$, SE = .17). As was used before, a Bonferroni adjustment was used to analyze the pairwise comparisons between each measurement time. Similarly, no significant pairwise comparisons were found. Likewise, this indicates that a possible reason for the simple main effect was not due to any differences between two of the measurement times, but rather to a possible complex relationship over time. For a possible interpretation of this, a trend analysis was used and it demonstrated that there was a significant quadratic relationship over time, $F(1, 8) = 6.11, p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .43$. (see Figure 5). This relationship indicates that for the journaling group, the levels of self-confidence decreased after the journaling, but then actually increased during the seven weeks after the journaling had been completed for the final long-term measurement at Time 4.

To investigate the hypothesized interaction that the journaling group would be higher at Time 3 and at Time 4 than the no journaling group, a univariate analysis of variance was used to examine the simple main effect of the between subjects independent variable (group) at each level of the within subjects variable of the time of measurement. Results indicate that there was no simple main effect of group at Time 2, $F(1, 18) = 1.19$, ns. Contrary to the
Figure 4. Significant linear trend analysis depicting simple main effect of time for the no journaling group on the dependent variable of self-confidence.

Figure 5. Significant quadratic trend analysis depicting simple main effect of time for the journaling group on the dependent variable of self-confidence.
hypothesis, there was not a significant simple main effect of group at Time 3, $F(1, 18) = 1.61$, ns. Similarly, there was no significant simple main effect of group at Time 4, $F(1, 18) = .56$, ns.

Thus, in conclusion it appears that the marginally significant interaction between group and time of measurement was due to the linear and quadratic relationships of the simple main effects of time for the no journaling group and the journaling group, respectively.

**Analysis of Total LEQ**

As with the previous analyses a mixed randomized-groups and repeated-measures ANCOVA was performed on the total LEQ-I score after participation on an adventure course. The independent variables remained the same as in the previous analysis: a between subjects independent variable of group (journaling or no journaling) and a repeated measures variable of time of measurement (across three measurement times). Time 1 was again used as a covariate in order to control for the group differences that were present prior to participation on the course.

For the analysis on the total LEQ-I score, seven outliers were deleted: 1) one case was deleted which was the lowest score from the no journaling group at the first measurement time (which served as the covariate), 2) four cases were deleted which were the two lowest scores and the two highest scores at Time 2 from the no journaling group, 3) two cases were deleted which were the lowest scores at Time 4 from the journaling group, and 4) one case was deleted which was the lowest score at Time 4 for the no journaling group. As a consequence, 17 cases remained, however, there were only 6 remaining cases in the no journaling group. Thus, a limitation exists to this analysis due to the unequal sample sizes,
and small sample size within the no journaling group. All assumptions were met with the final data set.

There was a significant main effect of time after adjusting for the covariate, $F(2, 28) = 4.63, p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .25$. This indicates that the overall levels of the LEQ-I scale varied over the three measurement times after adjusting for the covariate. A follow-up repeated measures ANCOVA demonstrated that there were no significant pairwise comparisons between Time 1 and Time 2, Time 1 and Time 3, or Time 2 and Time 3. Once again, a trend analysis was used to examine the possible shape of the relationship, and it demonstrated that there was a significant linear relationship over time, $F(1, 15) = 6.00, p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .29$. This indicates that there was a general linear relationship in the total scores on the LEQ such that the levels remained practically the same from Time 2 ($M = 6.77$, $SD = .60$) to Time 3 ($M = 6.80$, $SD = .67$) and were again very similar at Time 4 ($M = 6.80$, $SD = .61$) (see Figure 6).

The main effect of group was found to be not significant, after adjusting for the covariate, $F(1, 14) = 1.57, ns$. Contrary to the hypothesis, this indicates that there was no difference between the journaling and no journaling groups on the total score from the LEQ-I.

There was no significant interaction between the two groups over time, $F(2, 28) = .78, ns$. This indicates that, contrary to the hypotheses, as a function of time there was no differences between the group which journaled and the group which did not journal.
Figure 6. Trend analysis demonstrating significant linear relationship for the main effect of time of measurement on the dependent variable of the total score for life effectiveness.
Chapter Four

Discussion

Overview of Findings

The results demonstrated that as a result of the adventure course itself, there were no differences in the levels of social competence or self-confidence (between Time 1 and Time 2). However, the results demonstrate that there were marginally significant differences on the levels of locus of control and on the total LEQ score. This indicates that the adventure course did not affect levels of social competence or self-confidence, but increased levels of locus of control and the total LEQ score.

The analyses also showed that there was a linear relationship over the four measurement times for the dependent measure of social competence. However, no other effects were found; contrary to the hypotheses there were no differences between the group that journaled and the group that did not journal, and there was no interaction between the group and time of measurement.

Also contrary to the hypotheses, no differences were found for the dependent variable of locus of control for the independent variables of time of measurement and group, or the interaction between the two.

There was a significant difference for the main effect of time on the levels of self-confidence such that there was a linear relationship indicating the levels of self-confidence from Time 2 to Time 3 to Time 4 were in a generally positive direction over time. Contrary to the hypotheses, there was no main effect for the group, either journaling or no journaling, on the dependent variable of self-confidence. There was a marginally significant interaction, which indicated that for the no journaling group, a linear relationship existed, with an overall
positive trend between Time 2 and Time 4. For the journaling group, a quadratic relationship existed such that the levels of self-confidence decreased from before the journaling to after the journaling, but then increased for the final long-term measurement.

There was a significant relationship for the time of measurement on the dependent variable of the total LEQ score, indicating a linear relationship over time. An examination of the means demonstrated that this linear relationship was neither positive or negative, rather the levels of life effectiveness stayed similar across the three measurement times. Contrary to the hypotheses, there were no differences as a function of the group (journaling or no journaling) nor was there an interaction between group and time of measurement.

Social Competence

The analyses demonstrated that there were no differences in the levels of social competence as measured before the adventure course, and directly after the course. However, for the measurements after the course it was found that there was a linear relationship, in a generally positive direction. So although there were no significant differences between individual measurement times, the linear relationship indicates that the subsequent measurement times for social competence were in a linear, positive relationship after the adventure course had been competed. This is especially important given that between the third measurement (after the journaling) and the fourth, or long-term measurement seven weeks later, there was only a minor decrease in the levels of social competence. Because there was no significant difference between Time 3 and Time, this indicates that the levels of social competence did not decrease after the interventions had ended. The implication from this finding is that regardless of whether the participants journaled or not, overtime, their levels of social competence did not decrease, even after a
long-term period of nine weeks after the course. However, because the initial analysis indicated that there as no difference between Time 1 and Time 2, it appears that over time, the levels of social competence were not affected by the adventure course.

It was hypothesized that participation in the journaling would increase the participants’ social competence, however this was not the case. The lack of difference between the levels of social competence between the journaling group and the no journaling group indicates that the journaling intervention was not successful in prolonging the benefits of increased social competence. This is similar to the finding of Savage (1993) who found that writing did not increase the levels of self concept after participation on an Outward Bound Course. However, as Savage expressed hope for, it is still believed that writing could enhance the effects from an adventure experience. Research has shown that one of the necessary components for obtaining positive effects from such experiences is the processing, or transferences of lessons to ones daily life (Luckner & Nadler, 1995). Perhaps the reason is not that the process of writing is ineffective, but rather that the specific journals themselves did not allow the participants to accurately transfer the lessons learned to their daily lives.

For example, the journal topic designed to affect levels of social competence was geared towards encouraging the participants to process whether they were more successful in social situations. That is, the wording on the LEQ for the variable of social competence uses wording such as, “I am successful in social situations”, and thus the wording in the journal topic was similar. However, at the course the debriefing about the teambuilding activities (which was hoped would increase their levels of social competence) was focused on teamwork, and elements surrounding what was necessary for it to happen, as well as what was harmful. If the participants felt that their ability to work as team increased, this change
might not have been connected or processed as being successful in social situations. As a consequence, any further processing about the construct of social competence using the language from the LEQ, would not have affected the participants. And thus, as was found, there would be no differences between the group that wrote about social competence and the group that did not write any journal responses.

Contrary to the hypotheses, there was no interaction between the group which journaled and the group which did not journal at Time 3 or at Time 4. The reasoning behind this hypothesis was centered on the belief that the journaling would be successful, and the effects would be evident after the journaling had taken place (Time 3) as well as at the long-term measurement (Time 4). However, as it has been established, the journaling was not successful, and thus it is understandable why there were no differences at these two measurement times. That is, if the journaling did not affect levels of social competence because it did not prolong the processing from the course, then it can be seen that this would not affect social competence after the journaling had ended.

**Locus of Control**

Contrary to the hypotheses, the levels of locus of control were not affected over time as a result of the adventure course, nor were they affected by writing assignments after the course. Thus, although there was a marginally significant difference for the levels of locus of control for the measurement before the course and directly after, these differences were not prolonged for the further measurements. This is contrary to White’s (1997) belief that adventure courses have a promising application for increasing levels of locus of control. As a consequence of the conflicting findings between the current study and White’s study, future research should investigate whether locus of control can be affected by adventure
experiences. However, it is important to recognize that just because locus of control is a construct measured frequently in this field (e.g. Cason & Gillis, 1994; White, 1997), it should be investigated whether it continues to be used because it actually is affected by adventure experience, or solely because it is a common construct in psychological literature. Similar to the lag in the field to use accurate scales during the 1970s and 1980s after they were developed (Hattie et al., 1997), the repetitive use of locus of control might be a carry over from a belief that it is affected by adventure courses, when really the focus should turn to other, less popular, but perhaps more relevant constructs. Thus, there is a necessity for future research to branch away from measuring the “typical” constructs such as locus of control, and examine other variables. The measurement scale used in this study, the LEQ-I allows for that to happen, as the LEQ-I measures a total of nine constructs. Although an examination of all nine is beyond the scope of this study, it is important for future researchers to utilize scales such as the LEQ-I in order to expand the current knowledge of what the effects are of adventure experiences.

**Self-Confidence**

There were no differences found between the levels of self-confidence before the adventure course and directly after the adventure course. Although for the measurements after the adventure course (Time 2 through Time 4) a linear relationship over time was found, this does not indicate that the score necessarily increased or decreased. In fact, after an examination of the means, the linear relationship can be interpreted as a constant relationship in the levels of self-confidence as there were only minute differences between the three measurement times. Thus, after the period of nine weeks after the adventure course there were no increases or decreases in the levels of self-confidence. In combination with the
original finding that the adventure course did not affect levels of self-confidence, it can be seen that over the course of the whole study the levels of self-confidence of the participants did not change.

A possible explanation for this was the lack of debriefing that the participants received in relation to their rock climbing experiences. During the rock climbing the focus was on getting every participant to try the best that she could, however there was no group debriefing afterwards for the participants to reflect on what they had learned about themselves. Thus, one of the basic components of learning did not happen: the participants did not make sense of what they learned (Luckner & Nadler, 1995). Although the experience was there and the possibility existed for the participants to increase their levels of self-confidence, the key aspect of reflection and conceptualization did not occur. Thus, from the definition given earlier on experiential learning, the participants skipped the third step of abstract conceptualization that helps to form understanding and create meaning. This finding reinforces the necessity of effective processing and debriefing for participants to reap the benefits from an adventure course.

As was found for both the variables of social competence and locus of control, there were no differences between the group which journaled and the group which did not journal. Similar to the argument presented above, this does not imply that writing as a way to prolong the effects of a course is not possible (although that is one interpretation). Rather, it can also be interpreted to mean that the debriefing that happened while on the course did not work synchronously with the journals which were designed to prolong that debriefing. Thus, there is a necessity for future researchers to examine whether self-confidence can be affected by
adventure experiences with appropriate processing, and whether those benefits could be prolonged through related writing exercises to further the transference to daily life.

Interestingly, a marginally significant interaction occurred which indicated there was a significant simple main effect of time for both the no journaling group and for the journaling group. These effects were not due to any comparisons between the individual measurement times in each of the two groups but rather due to a complex relationship across time. A trend analysis demonstrated that across time there was a generally positive linear trend for the no journaling group. There was a quadratic relationship over time for the journaling group indicating a decrease and then a subsequent increase in the levels of self-confidence. Taken as a whole, these results are in direct opposition to what was hypothesized. Within the no journaling group it was expected that the scores would decrease in a linear fashion after the adventure course. However, the results demonstrated that there was a linear increase. Thus, although no further intervention had taken place, the levels of self-confidence for the no journaling group did not decrease after the course, but rather actually showed a linear increase. This indicates that even without any further intervention, such as journaling, the participants were able to avoid a decrease in levels of self-confidence. Thus, contrary to what previous studies have found (e.g., Eagle, 1999; White, 1997) during the time period after an adventure experience there is not necessarily an obligatory, or expected, linear decrease in scores.

Interestingly, there also was a simple main effect of time for the journaling group, which was demonstrated through a significant quadratic relationship that the scores decreased after the journaling, but then increased (a quadratic relationship implies that there is a change in direction in the relationship, thus differentiating it from a linear relationship
where there is no change in direction). Taken at face value, it appears that the journaling had a detrimental effect on the participants. This could be true, and would mean that through the process of journaling, either because of the specific topic, or because of the nature of journaling itself, the levels of self-confidence decreased, but then increased after the journaling had stopped. However, an alternative explanation exists such that the journaling could have served to increase the expectations of the participants about what they could accomplish. That is, if, through the process of journaling the participants became more aware of their levels of self-confidence and their expectations of what they could accomplish with it, but then when they tried to implement this into action, they were unsuccessful, this could account for a decrease in levels of self-confidence. However, the question which needs to be asked is this: is the process of becoming more aware and having higher expectations, which might be accompanied by an immediate decrease in self-confidence, actually beneficial in the long run? Although this line of argument is purely speculation, it warrants further research into whether adventure experiences or follow-up journaling actually can change the expectations of the participants themselves and what the implications of such changes might be.

**Total LEQ**

The analyses indicated that there was a marginally significant increase in the total levels of life effectiveness from before the adventure course to after the adventure course. They also demonstrated that there was a significant main effect of time in the form of a linear relationship, which indicated that the levels of life effectiveness were almost identical during the three follow-up measurements after the course. Thus, after the increase in life effectiveness due to the adventure course, the overall levels stayed the same for the follow-up
measurements, indicating there was no decrease over the long-term. This finding is important because it demonstrates that even from an intervention such as a one-day adventure course, the overall benefits can be prolonged. However, as will be discussed below, a lack of a control group limits the generalizations that can be made from this data.

As was found in the previous analyses, there were no differences between the group the journeled and the group that did not journal. However, this was to be expected for the total life effectiveness scale. The journal topics only addressed the three constructs that were expected to change as a result of the adventure course (social competence, locus of control, and self-confidence), and thus could not be expected to impact the other six constructs that combine with these three to form the total measure of life effectiveness.

In addition, there was no significant interaction between the group and the time of measurement. This indicates that the levels of life effectiveness were not different between the two groups as a function of the time of measurement. Again, it was not expected that the journaling group who wrote on three of the nine variables measured by the LEQ-I would be different that the group who did not write when they were measured after the journaling (Time 3) or seven weeks after the journaling had been completed (Time 4).

Limitations

A limitation to this study is the small number of participants. Although over 150 girls were given information about the project and were invited to participate, only 27 attended the meetings with their parents to sign up. At each information meeting with the students many of the members of the Y-Teen programs expressed interest in participating, however, as demonstrated, the number who actually came to sign up was drastically lower. One reason for this could be fact that the area served by the YWCA contains predominately low-income
families. Thus, although the sign-up times were during the afternoon and evenings, many students reported not being able to come because their mom or dad did not get off of work until after 8:00 pm. Additionally, students reported that their parents did not have cars, and could not make it to the main YWCA office. Although arrangements were made with some parents to meet at their daughters’ middle schools, arrangements could not be made with all of the parents. Thus, one of the limitations, but also one of the greatest benefits of this project comes from the nature of the population itself. Low-income families do not have the capabilities to sign their children up, but those who were able to sign up expressed their appreciation for this opportunity for their children.

Because the number of students who were able to sign up was low, the original design of this project could not be followed. The original design contained a third experimental group who would not go on the adventure course until all measurements had been completed (thus serving as a control group). The lack of a control group is problematic, however under the circumstances it could not be avoided. Without a control group it is unknown whether the differences that were found over time were a) because of the intervention itself, or b) due to maturation effects, or c) because of the interactions with the researcher.

**Future Studies**

Future studies should investigate what actually caused the linear trend in levels of social competence. That is, why was there a linear relationship in the levels of social competence after the course, and after the intervention was completed, when previous research has shown that the benefits of adventure experiences generally decrease (Eagle, 1999)? Was the debriefing style on the course specific and focusing on affecting levels of social competence such that the participants experienced a prolongation of the effects, such
as Priest (1996) found? Or was it due to the transference and relation to daily lives the participants might have made after the course was over that contributed to this relationship? There is a need for future research to examine the process of what happens after an adventure experience has been completed, not just what the immediate results are.

In addition, research designs which employ similar writing methods as used here and in Savage (1993), should be careful in creating the writing topics, and should only assign topics which specifically relate to topics which have been processed while on the course. This would enable the writing activities to actually continue the processing and transference from the course, instead of trying to bring in a new construct (as happened here with social competence).

Finally, although the quantitative data presented here does not provide substantial support for the position that an adventure course can have positive benefits for adolescent females, it is important to recognize the limitations inherent in quantitative data. That is, the participants were not presented with a method to openly respond and give feedback regarding what they got out of their experiences on the course. Although the LEQ-I is a well-designed and relevant scale, it nevertheless presents guidelines for interpreting the effects of an adventure experience. This limitation is especially crucial to keep in mind with an understudied population such as the current one (adolescent females from diverse backgrounds).

In conclusion, although this study has offered some valuable results, including a necessity to further investigate how the effects of an adventure course could be prolonged through writing, it also has posed some more questions, some of which will be answered in the second study.
STUDY TWO

Chapter Five

Introduction

Introduction to the Problem

The purpose of the previous study was to examine whether the benefits from a one-day adventure course could be prolonged through structured journal writing after the experience. The results indicated that the intervention was not successful; the journaling did not enhance the effects from the adventure course. Although there were several linear relationships over time, such as on the variables of social competence, self-confidence, and the total LEQ score, these need to be interpreted cautiously. In addition, because the LEQ provided a framework for measuring the effects of the adventure course, the participants were not able to respond freely. That is, there was a restriction on what they could demonstrate they learned from their participation because of the quantitative nature of the LEQ-I. As Roberts (1996) pointed out, women and their experiences in adventure related activities have rarely been studied. Thus, to measure adolescent females from diverse backgrounds, with a scale which was developed to measure outcomes of a field dominated by White males, is a limiting factor. Because of this limitation, it is important to consider what other effects of the adventure course might have been present, which were not measured by the LEQ-I.

In order to investigate this the present study will utilize a qualitative method of interviewing the participants in order to examine if, and how, the adventure course affected the participants. In this manner, the participants will not be given a structured format (such as the LEQ-I) which imposes predetermined constructs as the only possible outcomes, but
rather will be presented with open-ended questions which will encourage the participants to voice their own opinions on the effects of an adventure course.

A second source of qualitative data will be to examine the journal entries themselves. Even though the journaling did not serve its purpose by prolonging the effects on the three hypothesized variables, did it affect the participants in another way? What themes did the participants write about within the constraints of the specific topics? To examine these questions a content analysis of the journals will be conducted.

As a framework to further understand these two areas of qualitative data, a topic will be introduced which has rarely been studied in the current literature: ethnic and cultural considerations. Newberry (2000) acknowledged that adventure, and the reasons for participation, are culturally specific. Newberry portrays contrived challenges, such as adventure courses, ropes courses, and Outward Bound experiences, as a distinct European-Western creation whose purpose is to build character, satisfaction, and self-esteem. Within this awareness that the concept of contrived challenges comes from a European-Western perspective, Newberry questioned the underlying values which are imbedded in adventure education. That is, Newberry asked, “What are the effects of running programs for diverse populations based on philosophies that are imbued with European-Western, middle class values?” (p. 14). Thus, Newberry inherently questions the “typical” effects of adventure experiences, such as locus of control and self-confidence, and insinuates that they might not be appropriate constructs to examine when working with populations whose cultural background is different than the “standard” upon which adventure experiences were built.

Given that the participants of this experiment were from diverse backgrounds and ethnicities, this limitation is important to consider. As such, Newberry’s (2000) position, that
it is crucial to examine the cross-cultural interpretations and experiences of risk, challenge, and adventure, will be a foundation for this qualitative analysis.

In conclusion, the question that this second study set out to answer is the following: what are the thoughts, meanings, and impressions of the participants from the adventure course, within a contextual understanding of their ethnic background? Before this question is addressed, a brief review of the current research on ethnic differences and similarities in outdoor experiences is necessary.

Review of Previous Research

Roberts (1996), as one of the few professionals who has focused on the experiences of women of color in the outdoors, acknowledged the lack of research on this population in experiential education. Roberts also pointed out that not only are women of color ignored in the adventure research and writings, but more specifically, what is ignored is how the diverse nature of the ethnic backgrounds of these women might affect their experiences. That is, not only are women of color an underrepresented population in the research, but a factor which is crucial to take into consideration (their ethnic and cultural background) is largely ignored. However, it is important to point out that even in her paper, which criticizes the lack of knowledge on how cultural and ethnic background affect experiences in the outdoors, the majority of her article described the barriers to participation that women of color face and less on how their actual experiences in the outdoors have been affected by their cultural and ethnic history. Although Roberts examines three case studies of women it still leaves many questions unanswered about the influences of ethnicity and culture on the meanings given to adventure experiences.
Roberts (1996) also addressed the differences between the difficulties faced between women of color and White women as they try to increase in their participation levels in a White, male dominated, field. She pointed out that White women only combat the barrier of a gender stereotype towards participation in the outdoors, whereas women of color, such as Black and Mexican American women also have the barrier of race as a separate domain to address. Roberts admitted that certain activities “have not been considered socially acceptable forms of recreation” (1996, p. 227) for women of color. For example, she pointed out that wilderness backpacking is seen as a more acceptable form of recreation for a White woman, but for a Black woman it is more acceptable to go for a walk in a park. In this manner, Roberts demonstrated that one of the barriers towards participation in outdoor activities is the perception of what is seen as socially acceptable.

The majority of the research on women of color in the outdoors is similar to the focus of Roberts (1996) in that the predominate research has been on the barriers that exist for women of color to participate in outdoor and adventure activities (e.g., Carr & Williams, 1993; Roberts & Drogin, 1993). Although this area of the literature does not directly tie into the present study on the meanings and experiences given to adventure courses, one study will be reviewed below because it is one of the few which in any way addresses a relationship between women of color and participation or experiences in outdoor adventures.

Roberts and Drogin (1993) examined what dimensions affected the non-participation of Black women in outdoor experiences and concluded that there were six factors. The first is the history of oppression and racism that Black women face. The second barrier is the stereotypes that exist on two levels: race and gender. The third factor is the lack of role models who participate in outdoor experiences. The fourth factor is due to experience, that
is, often Black women have had insufficient exposure to the options available for outdoor activities. The fifth barrier is limited accessibility to areas for outdoor recreation. And finally, the sixth barrier they listed was the economic conditions that many Black women face. Together, Roberts and Drogin suggested that these six factors provide reasoning for why there are low levels of participation of Black women outdoor programs and experiences. However, Roberts and Drogin suggested that outdoor participation of Black women might increase through the use of social clubs, minority groups, or other social support systems. Thus, in the present study, it was hoped that the Black adolescents, and all students, would feel that they had a support group present in the other girls who attended the course. As a consequence, this could affect the way they experienced the course and the meanings they took away from those experiences. The qualitative nature of this study will allow for this possibility to be examined.

An important consideration within any study which purports to study ethnic differences or similarities is the way in which ethnicity is defined. Roberts (1996) defined ethnicity as an identification which comes from ones heritage or nationality. However, she cautioned against using this as the sole factor for characterization because not everyone chooses to embrace their ethnicity. Even with the limitations this definition imposes, it provides a deeper level of identification than using ethnicity as a unidimensional and categorical variable such as what is found on the United States Census. Carr and Williams (1993) pointed out that many previous studies that examined ethnic membership and levels of outdoor recreation at national and state parks often only used this second level of identification. In this study, if, when given the opportunity to respond to an open-ended question about her ethnic identification, a participant identified with a different ethnicity than
she listed on the original form, this was noted, and the response given verbally was used in the subsequent analysis.

Carr and Williams (1993) used ancestral group membership, generational status, and levels of acculturation in the United States as measures of ethnicity. They used two factors to determine ancestral group membership: descent (such as Hispanic or Anglo) and country of origin. The second factor they used was generational status which they took to be a good indicator of the length of time the family or the individual had been in the United States. The third factor was level of acculturation which was measured using a language skill and preference scale. Using these three dimensions, Carr and Williams were able to have a better understanding of the ethnicity of their sample, and thus similar methods will be used in this current study. Unfortunately, because the journals were collected last semester these measures of ethnicity were not able to be collected for the participants whose journals are analyzed. Thus, only the participants who were interviewed were able to verbally respond and expand on what they considered to be their ethnic identity.

In agreement with what Carr and Williams (1993) urged further researchers to do, this current study attempted to move beyond a simple examination of participation rates in the outdoors, and instead examined “the meaning or significance of participation (or lack of it) to the individual or group” (p. 23). Thus, this represents a need to shift from solely quantitative data, to a more in-depth view that can be gained from qualitative data. To accomplish this, the current study investigated the question: what are the thoughts, meanings, and impressions of the participants from the adventure course, within a contextual understanding of their ethnic background?
Because there has been no previous research on the different meanings and experiences of female adolescent participants on an adventure course, this is purely an exploratory study. As a result of this, no hypotheses have been made. The only expected outcome is that there will be differences between the ethnic groups on the thoughts, meanings, and impressions of the adventure course.
Chapter Six

Methodology

Participants

Journal Analysis.

The journals from 10 of the participants were used in the analysis. Thirteen girls were assigned to the journaling group in the previous study, however, two participants who completed the journaling topics were eliminated from the data analysis of the previous study. Thus, the journals from these two participants were not included in the journal analysis as their experiences on the course deviated from the normal experience. Consequently their representations of the course in the journals would not be able to be generalized to other populations, and thus they were not included in the final sample.

The 10 journals which were analyzed from the first journal assignment were written by students of the following ethnicities: 3 Latina participants, 2 Hispanic participants, 1 Black and White and Mexican (multiracial) participant, 1 White participant, 1 Black participant, 1 Black and American Indian (biracial), and 1 American Indian participant. Ten journals were also analyzed from the fourth journal assignment, however the journal from the Black and American Indian participant was replaced with a journal from a White participant (each participant did not return the first or fourth journals and thus could not be included in the respective analyses).

Interviews.

All participants from the previous study were invited to participate in the interviews (N = 27). After letters and permission slips were sent to the participants, and they were telephoned numerous times, a total of 12 participants returned the forms and completed the
Interviews were given a small thank you gift (a carabiner/keychain) after completion of the interview.

Six of the interviews were selected to be analyzed and presented in this paper. These interviews were selected because of the quality of the interview (responses were more than just a few words) and because they represented a relatively diverse group based on ethnicity. The demographics of the participants who were selected are as follows: two 6th grade students were Hispanic, one 6th grade student was Mexican American, another 6th grade student was Latina, and the final student in the 6th grade was White, Black, and Mexican, and the last participant was a 7th grade student who was White.

Materials

Journal Analysis.

The descriptions of the journals were given in the previous study. For reference, please see Appendix F and H for the journal topics.

Interviews.

All participants received a letter which was addressed both to the participant and the parent who signed the original permission forms (see Appendix J for the letter). The letter thanked the participants and their parents for their participation so far, and encouraged them to continue through this final phase. The letter described the purpose of the interviews, and indicated the procedures to follow if they signed up. Also included in this mailing were two identical copies of a permission form (see Appendix K for the permission form). The permission form included a notification of informed consent, which had to be signed by both the original parent who signed the permission forms last semester (in order to compare signatures to guarantee that it was the parent who was signing the form) and his or her
daughter who participated on the adventure course. Additionally, two dates were listed so
the participant was able to indicate which date she preferred to be interviewed for 20 minutes
during her Y-Teen meeting for the week. A self-addressed stamped envelope was included
in the mailing for the permission forms to be returned to the researcher. The form also
included information about the interview being tape recorded, and the confidentiality of the
information gathered. Both the letter and the permission form were in English and Spanish
to accommodate the families that were fluent in one or both of the languages.

The interview questions were designed to pose open-ended questions that were not
looking, or leading towards one answer (see Appendix L for the interview questions).
Another goal was not to impose a closed and restricted framework for communicating their
experiences and meanings given to those experiences as a result of participation on the
adventure course.

Procedure

Journal Analysis.

Because the journals had been collected during the previous study, and were
explained in detail, only the process for coding the journals is described below.

The journals were transcribed into a Microsoft Word document. The responses were
grouped by each question, thus all of the participants’ responses for Question 1 were
transcribed, then all of the responses for Question 2, etc. The participants’ identification
numbers were written next to their responses. This became the master document. This
document was altered and only the journal responses for each participant were entered into a
Microsoft Excel spread sheet (the identification numbers were deleted for the next levels of
coding). This level of coding involved finding one to two descriptive words to identify what
was written. A primary descriptive code was given to each journal entry, as well as a secondary code if it was necessary. In this phase of coding, the journals were not being analyzed, simply described. After codes of descriptive words had been developed, the journal entries, without any identifying features, were given to a confederate in order to establish interrater reliability of the coding of the journals. The second coder was given the journal entries, and the descriptive codes which had been established by the researcher. She was asked to assign the codes (there was one set of possible code options for each of the journal entries on the same topic) to either the primary code or secondary code for each journal entry. Any discrepancies between the original coding and the coding completed by the second coder were discussed and the appropriate code(s) were agreed upon to establish 100% interrater reliability.

After this initial round of descriptive coding, it was determined that only two of the four overall journal assignments would be able to be analyzed. Two journal topics were eliminated because the nature of the journal design did not allow for an analysis to be conducted across groups. That is, the questions were sequential, and did not make sense without consideration of what had been written previously by the individual participant. Because the journals were going to be analyzed in groups, thus breaking up the narratives of each participant’s journal, an accurate comprehension of these two journal topics would have been difficult. In addition, the responses to these two journal topics were minimal, and were often only one line. As a consequence, the first journal topic and the fourth journal topic were analyzed in the following analyses. Within each journal topic there were three or four questions, so this resulted in an analysis of seven individual questions.
For this next level of analysis, the descriptive codes were examined, and were grouped into themes. Each journal entry from one participant was given a theme, and then the participants were grouped according to who had written on the same theme. Thus, after this final level of analysis for each journal question there were two or three groups formed as a function of the same themes being covered in their journals entries. A paper trail had been established so that from the final grouping by theme, there was a record that could be used to go back to the original descriptive codes, and from the descriptive codes to the original transcription of the journal entries. Thus, after the final level of analysis had taken place the ethnicity of the participant who wrote each original journal entry was revealed, and the groups of themes were analyzed to see if there were differences or similarities as related to the ethnicity of the participant. These themes and group differences or similarities are discussed in the results and discussion section.

Interviews.

Permission was arranged with the program director of the YWCA to continue using the same participants from the previous study. A letter and permission form were sent out to all participants who went on the adventure course (N = 27) (see Appendix J and K for the letter and permission form). There was an additional copy of the permission form included in this mailing which served as the copy for each participant’s records.

The letter instructed the participant and her parent to complete the permission form and return it in the self-addressed stamped envelop provided. After the permission forms were received the participant was contacted prior to the interview date to confirm that the assigned day worked for both parties. All participants who did not send back the permission form after the first week were called and asked if they had received the letter, and if so, if
they were interesting in participating in the interview. Calls were repeated with all
participants who expressed interest, until an interview time had been arranged and their
permission form was received.

The interview itself took place for 20 minutes during the participants’ after school Y-
Teen meeting during the weeks of March 25th–29th, or April 1st–5th. At each Y-Teen meeting
when the interviews were scheduled the instructor knew which students would be
interviewed, and had been given advance notice that the interviews would be taking place.

At each interview time, each student was asked to step outside of the Y-Teen
classroom to go to a picnic bench or grassy area close to the classrooms. The participant was
thanked for volunteering to participate in the final phase of the project, and asked if she
would give permission to tape record the interview (permission had been given on the
permission form, but the participant was asked again in order to provide a convenient way for
the tape recorder to be turned on after an affirmative answer was given). The interview
format and questions were followed in the same manner with each participant. The
participants were told that they could choose to not answer any questions and could stop the
interview at any time without penalty.

After the interview was completed each participant was thanked and was given a
small carabiner/key chain as a reminder of the adventure course, and as a final thank you
present for her participation. All participants were cautioned that it was not a real carabiner,
and thus could not be used to rock climb; it only could be used as a decorative key chain.
After the interview was completed the student was walked back to her Y-Teen classroom and
the next student to be interviewed was called out for the same process.
After all of the interviews were complete the taped interviews were transcribed, and any names which had been said during the interview were entered only as initials. After transcription, the first level of coding of the interviews involved reducing the amount of extraneous words (such as “um” or sentences that were not finished), but still staying close to the original voices and sentence structure of the participants. In the second level of coding the themes emerged. Each interview was coded thematically as a narrative, without comparison to the other interviews. The themes and subsequent analyses of six interviews, and examples from the actually interviews, are reported in the results and discussion section. The analysis in the results and discussion section presents the interviews as case studies. This method was chosen as a means to allow the narrative of the interviews to remain whole. In addition it allowed for a more personal look at the individuals. Each participant’s narrative is presented verbatim, although sections have not been included which were either irrelevant to the overall themes of the interview, were repetition of ideas said previously, or consisted of extraneous words.
Chapter Seven

Results and Discussion

Journal Analysis

The first journal assignment (which had three questions) was designed to focus on the participants’ general experiences and thoughts about the adventure course. This first journal topic was not designed to enhance or prolong the effects of any variable from the LEQ-I, rather it was intended to introduce the participants to the process of journal writing and to allow them to choose the topics they wanted to write about (within the question presented to them). As such, the participants responded to this journal assignment with some of the most informative and detailed responses found in any of the journals. (Please note that in the direct quotations of the journals the punctuation and spelling is the original, no modifications were made during the transcription of the journals.)

Journal One: Question One.

The responses from the first question, “Describe how your experience on the course affected you” were focused around two themes: self-confidence and teamwork. Of the ten journal responses which were analyzed, four were related to self-confidence, five were related to teamwork, and one was not able to be categorized into a theme. Across these three divisions, there were no differences in the ethnic diversity of the participants who wrote about self-confidence or teamwork.

Within the group of four participants who wrote about self-confidence there was an interesting difference between one participant (who was Latina), and the three others (Black and American Indian, Latina, and White). All four journal responses addressed the notion of self-confidence, but only one participant was able to articulate it in detail. The Latina
student’s response shows a high level of awareness and the ability to express what the effects of the adventure course were:

My experience on the course affected me by showing me that if I try hard enough I can accomplish anything. This course also taught me about trusting people and that to believe in myself and others as well. I learned that you can accomplish anything if you just use teamwork, trust, and believing in yourself. First I thought that I would never climb any rock but I did, and it was so fun. I also learned how to be brave and have some courage in myself.

Although this response gives rather general statements about self-confidence, in comparison to the other three responses which were less articulate it can be seen that the degree of conceptual understanding of self-confidence is large. The other three participants wrote about self-confidence, but without using the words which directly demonstrate they understand it and have processed it as self-confidence. One example, from the participant who was White, wrote:

I’ve never gone rock climbing before and it was hard. At first I thought it looked easy, but when I tried it wasn’t easy at all. Then I got the hang of it and went up. I didn’t make it to the top, but I think I did a great job.

From her response, it is evident that she went through a progression at the course; initially, the rock climbing was hard (although she first thought it would be easy), then she tried it, worked through the difficulties, and was able to succeed. Even though she did not make it to what some would see as the “ultimate goal”, or the top, she was still proud of herself, and was positive in her affirmations of what she did.
Even though the White participant demonstrated that she gained something from the course, it is evident from her journal that the theme of self-confidence (in relation to the rock climbing) was not processed by the facilitators at the course. If the facilitators had processed it, then perhaps she would have been able to articulate her feelings in terms of self-confidence, or self-respect, instead of solely stating what her experiences and subsequent feelings were. As Hattie et al. (1997) said, “Feedback is the most powerful single moderator that improves affective and achievement outcomes.” (p. 73). Thus, if this student had received some feedback while on the course, either from the processing with the group, or individually from the facilitator, the outcome, or results from the course might have been more developed on a conceptual and cognitive level.

The focus of the participants who wrote about teamwork centered around their awareness of the importance of working as a team. One participant who was Black wrote, “I also learned that we have to work together like when we did the one course where we had to figure out how to get across the lava [in reference to the group game]. We had to work together and help each other, like if they need help we can help them.” Another participant who was Latina wrote, “I also learned that team work is very, very important because together we could accomplish lots of goals”. These two participants demonstrate that one of the benefits they got out of participation in the adventure course was a sense of teamwork. This supports Gubitz and Kutch’s (1999) statement that teamwork is one of the benefits from all women’s courses. Whether these participants would have had the same feelings of teamwork if there had been male students on the course is unknown, but it is important to note that this qualitative data gives credit to Gubitz and Kutch’s position (which was not supported by empirical studies).
Journal One: Question Two.

In response to the second question, “Was one part of the course more difficult or easy than the others? Describe which one was more difficult or easy, and why. Please provide details, and be specific.”, the majority of the participants (8 out of 10) chose to write about what was difficult, or hard about their experiences on the course. Within this group of eight participants, three themes emerged about what was difficult on the course. No ethnic differences as a result of the grouping by themes emerged from this analysis.

The first theme focused on the difficulties which were of a physical nature (physically climbing the rocks) and also were individual in orientation (no group words or plural words such as “we” were present in their journal responses). That is, one clear distinction between these three participants (who identified as themselves as White, Hispanic, and Black and White (biracial)) was that the barriers they faced at the course were individual in nature, and were a challenge on the physical level. The second theme which emerged from the journal responses was the difficulties which were on a social level (relations with others at the course) and on an interpersonal basis (between the individual participant and other participants who were at the course). An example of this theme can be seen in the journal entry of a participant who was Latina, “I think that the hard part was when our group was with Beth [the facilitator] and we where playing this hard game that was about a river of lava and we had to work as a group.” This journal entry represents the difficulties that this participant faced on a social level by working with a group (versus an individual barrier) and an interpersonal level (the participants “had to work as a group”). The third theme of the difficulties faced on the course was on an emotional level (being scared about the rock climbing) and was individual in nature. An example from this theme can be seen in the
response from a participant who was Black and American Indian, “I think that the course more difficult was the one with Mark [the facilitator] because we had to climb the rocks and I never climbed anything before and I was real scared but I made it.”.

These three themes which emerged demonstrate the variety of experiences and difficulties that participants face on an adventure course. Although there were no group differences between ethnicities, no other literature has examined the barriers that participants face while actually on a course or partaking in outdoor experiences. Previous research has examined the barriers to participation (prior to actually participating) but these results represent a different area of research (e.g., Tierney & Dahl, 1998). The responses to this journal question indicated that the participants from this study faced three challenges: an individual physical challenge, a social group challenge, and an individual emotional challenge. Future research should investigate these three types of challenges in more detail in order to gain a more specific understanding of how and when these are faced, in addition to finding appropriate ways to process and provide feedback to the participants regarding these challenges.

Journal One: Question Three.

The third, and final question from the first writing assignment asked the participants to share what they learned about themselves from being on the course, and to relate it to their life at school, and with their friends. Two themes emerged from the journal responses to this question: an ability to get new friends and self-confidence. Similar to the first two journal questions, in response to this topic, there were no group differences by ethnicity.

The responses which were grouped into the first theme centered around the idea that it was easy to make new friends (four students wrote on this theme). One of the participants
who was Black wrote, “It will probably be more easier than I thought to get new and more friends.”. This idea was mirrored by the other participants who wrote on this topic (they identified themselves as Latina, American Indian, and Black and American Indian). As Hirsh and Rapkin (1987) pointed out, adolescence is a time period when friendships and social support is crucial, and also very relevant to the daily lives of adolescents. These findings demonstrate that through an intervention, such as an adventure course, participants were able to gain a positive perspective of friendship, and even increase their awareness of their abilities to make friends.

Six participants wrote responses that were grouped into the second theme of self-confidence. These responses centered around the idea that with self-confidence, and a belief in themselves, the participants could accomplish what they set out to do. Typically, self-confidence is seen as an individually focused trait or aspect. However, two of the participants’ journal entries integrated their new knowledge of their self-confidence into the context of their relationships with their friends (although the question did ask for the participants to relate what they learned to school and their friends, it is interesting that only two participants actually did this under the theme of self-confidence). One of the participants, who was Hispanic, wrote, “I learned that I have self confidence. It’s very different at school because I think I don’t have self confidence. With my friends I’m different.” In this example it is evident that the participant has not transferred her knowledge gained from the course (that she has self-confidence) to her life at school, or with her friends. One way that this could have happened at the course could have been through the use of SMART facilitation. As Priest (1995) described, using the SMART method of facilitation involves setting Specific, Measureable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-referenced goals.
Thus, if this participant had shared her belief that she did not have self confidence at school, perhaps then the facilitators could have helped her process it further, and concluded with the setting of goals using this method.

The second participant who related her levels of self-confidence to her friends went about it in a different way, she wrote:

I learned that I can be brave when I want to, and I have to keep believing that I can and stop telling myself that I cant because that just proves that I don’t trust my self and that I also don’t have any faith in my self at all. I have to keep telling myself that I can. My friends also tell me sometimes that they don’t think I can, but I can prove them wrong.

In this journal, the Latina student demonstrated her determination to keep her positive belief that she can accomplish what she sets out to do, even if her friends tell her that she can’t do it. As compared to the previous example where the participant did not relate her positive experience at the course to what she could do with her friends, this participant took the opposite stance and demonstrated her willingness to try to use her experience at the course in her life away from the course, with her friends. It is important to recognize that within these two examples, from a Hispanic student and a Latina student (who could have been grouped into one ethnic category), two different descriptions of self-confidence emerged. Roberts (1996) emphasized that it is important to study specific groups, but also to acknowledge the diversity of experiences across individuals. The current method, of examining group themes, but also identifying individual experiences through specific examples, allows for this to happen. Future research should incorporate this method into the design of studies to examine the differences and similarities across groups and individuals alike.
Journal Four: Question One.

The fourth, and final journal assignment was designed to enhance the processing and thinking about the experiences of the group. In this manner, it was hoped that the participants would recognize ways they could become more successful in group situations (through integration of their experiences on the course to their daily lives).

The first question asked the participants to describe their initial, or beginning, thoughts and feelings about the group that they were in at the course. The responses to this question were not grouped into themes for several reasons: primarily, because no clear themes emerged which had groups larger than two participants. The second reason these responses were not grouped into themes is because some participants did not answer the question as it was intended, that is they answered the question in response to how they felt about their group in general, after their day long experience with them. Because the question was designed to examine the initial thoughts and feelings about the group (which was hoped would reveal how the participants approached being in a new group), and this was not answered, this question was not analyzed after the initial descriptive coding.

Journal Four: Question Two.

The second question from this journal assignment was, “How did your thoughts and feelings change after working with that group for the day?” The one theme that emerged from this question was an ability to make new friends. Five of the nine participants, of varying ethnicities such as Latina, American Indian, and Black and White, responded with journal entries on this theme. One participant, who was Latina, wrote, “They changed because at last I could find a friend but before that I couldn’t find one.” Another Latina student wrote, “I now know what to do when I don’t know someone and I want to get to
know them.” These journals represent part of a process that some of the students went through at the course: a change from not knowing or being friends with the majority of the girls at the course and throughout the events of the day becoming friends with them.

Throughout all of the journal entries, friendship, and making new friends, was a typical part of a response to the question. This emphasizes the importance, and prominence of friendship during the developmental time period of adolescence, which supports the research of Kimmel and Rudolph (1998) and Hirsh and Rapkin (1987). These researchers emphasized the importance and necessity of friendship during female adolescence. The current findings demonstrate that these adolescents were in fact focusing a majority of their time and energy towards social interactions.

**Journal Four: Question Three.**

The responses to the third question in this journal assignment were grouped in to three themes. In response to the question, “After observing how you worked with other people at the course, how can you relate that to how you work with your classmates or your friends? Do you take the role of the leader? Or are you a follower? (Give specific examples.)”, the participants wrote on three topics: being a follower, being a leader, and being friendly or increasing social relations. Three participants, two who identified as Latina and one as Hispanic, wrote that they were followers. Within their journal responses it was evident that did not see any change in their abilities or possibilities of being a leader or follower as an effect from the adventure course. The extreme example of this came from one of the Latina participants who wrote:
I think I am a follower because I am not a very good leader, I’m even too quite [sic] with my friends. So I am a follower, I don’t even want to be a leader, I can’t even follow my own directions. So I am not a leader, no, no, no I am a follower.

The underlying emotions of this journal entry are important to notice. This participant seemed to be critical of the fact that she considered herself a follower. This is evident in her wording, “I’m even too quite [quiet] with my friends”, and “I can’t even follow my own directions”. The critical tone can be seen from the use of the word “even”, which implies a lack of something, or a detrimental effect from an inability to do something. However, it also is important to examine the way in which this participant defined being a leader. That is, because this participant considered herself to be too quiet and unable to follow directions, she did not consider herself to be a leader. However, within the Hispanic and Latina culture it is important to develop “capacidad” or high levels of maturity, responsibility, and capability (Nieto, 2000). These traits are especially supported and encouraged in females. Being a leader in the Hispanic culture might mean showing capacidad, or maturity, responsibility, and capability. This participant’s comments demonstrate that she has internalized some of the characteristics of leadership that the European American culture supports: being verbal and assertive. However, this could be seen as being contrary to what is considered being a leader in the Hispanic culture, thus creating a conflict within the participant. Future research should investigate the cultural considerations and meanings of leadership, and should examine if leadership opportunities for all types of leaders are being encouraged at adventure courses.

The second theme which emerged was from the participants who considered themselves to be leaders. However, within this group of three students (who were American
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Indian, White, and Black and White), three different notions of leadership emerged. The American Indian participant demonstrated the perspective that there could not be one leader, but rather it was beneficial if there were multiple leaders who worked together as a team. This was in contrast to the White participant who portrayed leadership as an individual choice, but within the context of her social friendships. She wrote, “I would say that I am a leader, because when my friends went off I stayed where I wanted to. The course showed me a lot of the same problems I have with my friends, like working together”. In this way, she demonstrated that she considered herself to be a leader because of her choice to stay where she wanted to (an individual decision), but this was within a social or interpersonal relationship with her friends. Within the overall theme of being a leader, the third perspective offered came from the student who identified with a biracial ethnicity of being Black and White. She considered herself to be a leader because of the way other people acted towards her, she wrote, “I think I am more of a leader now, because when people need answers they look to me for them”. From this journal entry it can be seen that her concept of being a leader is when she is accessed by other students asking her for help or advice because she has a certain level of competency.

It is essential to recognize that within this diverse group of adolescent girls, numerous definitions of leadership emerged. As a consequence, it is important to keep this in mind if scales are developed as a way to measure if levels of “leadership” are affected by an adventure course. The evidence from this study suggests that defining leadership might be very difficult, and any future researchers who are developing a leadership scale should be cautious and bear these differences in mind.
The third theme from this question was in regards to friends and an increase in social relations. Three participants (two who identified as Latina and one who identified as Black) responded to the third question in relation to social relations. One participant, a Latina, wrote, “I know how to relate with someone new in my class or school”. The other Latina participant in this group wrote, “It could help because we can be friendly with all our classmates”. These examples demonstrate the possibility for using their new ability to be friendly with people who they do not know, or who might not be close friends. Thus, from their experiences on the course (by being in a group with other students who they did not know) they were able to explore ways to relate to new people.

Journal Four: Question Four.

The fourth and final question that the participants answered in their journal assignments was, “Would you like to change anything about how you act in group situations in order to make it better for you (or to make it more successful)? What would you do? (Be specific!)”. Two themes emerged during the analysis of these responses: a group of students had a desire to increase their levels of socialization and another group of students would not change how they acted on the course. Three participants (who were White, Latina, and Black) responded that they would have liked to be more involved with the group. The White participant wrote, “I would also socialize more than I did.” This is similar to what the Latina participant described, “I would speak more with the other girls and participate more in the games.”. These responses indicate that the participants thought it would have been better for them if they had been more social or involved in the group processes.

This is in contrast to the response given by four other participants in response to the question. This group of participants (two who were Latina, one who was White, and one was
American Indian) said that they would not want to change anything that happened on the course.

Interview Analysis

The following case studies are described using the same method Nieto (2000) used for presenting the case studies of the views of late adolescents on the topic of schooling and education. Each case study starts off with a commentary and description of the participant, then gives a brief summary of the themes present throughout the interview, moves into the transcription of the interviews, and finally ends with another commentary which includes further analysis of the themes and relates them to previous research. The names given below are fictitious, and have been assigned to the participants to protect their privacy.

Case Study 1.

The first case study is of Janet, a 6th grade student who identifies with a Hispanic ethnic identity. Janet speaks English at home with her parents, although she would like to learn Spanish so she could speak with her great grandmother, who only speaks Spanish. Her family has been in the United States for at least three generations, as both her parents and her grandparents were born here. She describes her culture as one which is more diverse, not like that of people from other countries which she perceives to be more unified. She also presents a healthy respect for diversity, as she says, “I have a whole bunch of different colored friends, and I don’t take them for granted for being different.”. The themes present throughout Janet’s interview are of the “realness” of the experience (for example climbing on real rocks instead of rock walls with handholds) and her experiences of making new friends.

In describing her reasons for wanting to attend the adventure course and what she expected, Janet said:
Well, my daddy, he’s in the military and I was in girl scouts, and sometimes we would go on field trips and do it [rock climbing] but not on real rocks. . . . I liked how we did it on not real rocks, but I wanted to see if it was any different. . . . I knew it was going to be far away and everything, but I didn’t know it was going to be real rocks, I always thought they were going to be fake where they had steps for you and everything.

When asked to describe her experiences on the course, Janet said:

Well, when we got there I remember it was really windy and there was a lot of dirt and everything and my shoes got really dusty. . . I was in the second [group] to do the rock climbing, and the lady that we went with, she told us all about the animals and the things that were around in the desert. Then we ate, and we did the rock climbing, how he [the facilitator] showed us to put our belt on, and tell us all the directions to do, like if you wanted to stop or go down, or keep going and everything, he gave us signs to do that.

In response to the question, “How did the adventure course influence you, how did it affect you?”, Janet replied:

Ok, well it seemed like it helped me a lot because when we were rock climbing it seemed like it was taking me through my life. You can either go more forward, or you can stop and stay where you are. And so it was kinda like you are actually in real life, so if you want to go farther you can and if you don’t want to then you don’t.

When asked what she felt at the end of the day and then what she shared with her family when she returned home, Janet said:
Well, I was tired . . . I had a lot of fun . . . I met a lot of new friends that I can maybe, hopefully, keep in touch with. . . . I told them [my family] about what we did, the first thing we did. And about what I learned and about my new friends that I made and, mostly, mostly about how fun it was.

As is evidenced by Janet’s interview the two prominent aspects from her experiences on the course are the “realness” of the experience (rock climbing and the surrounding desert area) and her experiences of making new friends. The first theme is one which has not been explored in previous literature. Because past literature has typically only research the White male, who is practically expected to have had previous wilderness experiences, the focus has not been given to adolescent females of diverse backgrounds who might not have the same outdoor experiences as other groups. Thus, as was prominent in this interview, the very nature of the adventure course being outdoors, in a relatively remote area, with “real” rocks to climb, can have a large impact on the perceptions and experiences of participants. Future research should take this into consideration and should examine whether this distracts the participants from processing the experience and taking meaning away from it, or actually enhances it.

**Case Study 2.**

This case study presents the interview with Karen, a 7th grade student who identified with a White ethnic identity. As is more typical with White, or European Americans, Karen did not display a high level of awareness of culture (Nieto, 2000), and was not able to articulate what she thought her culture encompassed. Karen’s family has been in the United States for at least three generations, and English is the only language they speak. Two themes emerged from her interview in relation to the experiences she had on the course, and
the meanings given to them. The first is her experiences cooperating in big groups, and the second theme was an overall perspective of the adventure course as a combination of learning and fun. When asked to describe how her experiences with the group were, Karen said:

Well, the group, there was, like, maybe three or four people who didn’t want to go climbing, they just stayed in their little group talking, plus watching everybody else. . . One girl . . . she was in her own little group, just giving everybody an attitude, but other than that, everybody was cooperating all together and they were doing everything as the instructors told us.

When Karen was asked what the trip meant to her and how she changed, she replied:

The course kinda meant to me . . . like having fun, but then learning something. Kinda like a school field. How it’s like an educational field trip, it was cool. . . .

[when asked if the course changed her] Maybe a little, it helped, it probably changed with me cooperating in a big group. Now I think I would be able to do that better than I used to be able to.

From the interview with Karen, two issues can be brought up. The first is her experiences being in a group, and the conflict that she experienced while in the group. Karen was in the group with the three participants who were eliminated from the quantitative analyses in the first experiment. As she indicates, those participants were not involved, were “giving everybody an attitude”, and in general, were not being part of the group. But even with this possibly negative group experience, when asked what she learned from the course, Karen said, “I learned how to cooperate in a big group”. Thus, even though there was a chance that
Karen would have a group experience that could have been detrimental, she still found positive benefits from the group processes.

Karen linked the adventure course experience to an educational field trip, where she had fun, but also learned something. This reflects the fact that the course was primarily a recreational experience, one which promotes change through enjoyment (Priest, 1995). Although it was hoped that the course also would be an educational program, which promotes change through creativity, awareness, and teaching concepts (Priest, 1995), it is evident from Karen’s comments that she did not experience the course in this way. Thus, because the course was not interpreted, or perhaps even conducted, as an educational program, it is important to consider this when relating these results to other studies. As Garvey (1999) pointed out, it is necessary to take into account the facilitation styles, and by extension, the type of program orientation, when describing a study and generalizing it in comparison to other studies.

Case Study 3.

The third interview presented here is from the interview with Veronica, a 6th grade student who is Mexican American. Although her family speaks English at home, she said it was because her “brother and sister don’t have a clue about Spanish”, however she knows a little Spanish, and she said that her mother and father speak Spanish fluently. She said she learned Spanish by listening to her parents speak when they didn’t want the children to understand, but in this manner Veronica learned how to understand Spanish. She said that if they moved back to Texas, where her grandmother lives, they would only speak Spanish as that is the only language her grandmother speaks. Veronica’s family has been in the United States for at least two generations, although perhaps longer, as she did not know if her
grandparents were born in the United States or Mexico. There were several themes present through Veronica’s interview: the role the adventure course played in increasing her ability to work as a team and have less of an “attitude”, the pride that she gained from her experiences, and the “realness” of the experience (rock climbing on real rocks).

When asked what she thought the adventure course would be like, Veronica replied:
Well I thought . . . we were going to go to a place and actually rock climb on one of those ones where they have little steps for you. . . . I thought it was going to be inside a building or something like that. I had no intention it was going to be around a whole bunch of other rocks and stuff like that and actually be with real trainers and out in the wild with snakes and stuff that are out there.

When asked what she remembered about the course, Veronica answered:
Rock climbing with all the gear and the helmets and the shoes. Going all the way to the top, touching where I’m thinking it’s the bell and going all the way. And then getting along with other girls. Usually I’m not very good at being friendly. Usually I have a real bad attitude problem, but I’m surprised that I got along with the girls and along with the coach and all that and the leader. And I’m glad that I went on it ‘cuz my attitude was more common than I thought it was.

From this it becomes evident that two things were important to Veronica, the experience itself because it was different and more “real”, but also her realization that she got along with the other girls. That is, from her experiences on the course she realized that she had a better attitude which was more evident in her everyday experiences than she thought.

This change in her attitude and notions of teamwork became clear when she responded to the question, “Do you think the course changed you in any way?”:
My mom thought I changed a lot after I came back from the course . . . other people were saying, wow, did your mom give you a really good spanking? My aunt said that because I had a really bad attitude problem, and they were all amazed how I was helping around the house and working as a team with my brother and sister. [When asked to clarify if that was true from her perspective, and not just her mom’s, she said] Yeah, I see the same thing but not as much, she sees it as, wow, terrific, but I see it as ok.

From this comment Veronica brings up an interesting perspective, the idea that perhaps even if the participants do not think they changed or were affected by the adventure course other people around them might see changes. Thus in the future, one additional way to examine the benefits of the adventure course might be through asking teachers or parents of participants to give feedback as to what they thought the benefits of the course were.

The third theme evident in Veronica’s interview is her pride of her experiences on the course. When asked what she shared with her family, she said, “I shared the certificate that I had, which I put in a frame and it’s on our wall of certificates. I shared the picture with my family at the dinner table.” The participants received a certificate and photo of the whole group after the fourth and final measurement of the LEQ, and through Veronica’s comments it is evident that this had an effect on her. Through this, she was able to share the physical reminders of the course (the certificate and the photo) with her family.

Her pride also was apparent when she shared with her classroom at school on the following Monday. Veronica said that when she was sharing with her classmates the boys said “Oh, you, a girl, went rock climbing?” and her nonchalant reply, “Yeah, of course”, indicated that she did not consider it out of the ordinary that as a girl, she rock climbed, but
nevertheless was very proud of it. This attitude, that it was very appropriate for Veronica, a Mexican American adolescent to go rock climbing, and be proud of it presents an interesting juxtaposition with one of the characteristics that Roberts (1996) pointed out about Mexican American women. She said that often adolescent females stay close to the home and are guarded so that they can be prepared for the role of the wife and mother. This seems to be a very general, and possibly stereotypical, portrayal of Mexican American adolescents. From the case study of Veronica it can be seen that it is important to not generalize characteristics about groups to individuals.

Case Study 4.

María is a 6th grade student who identified with a Latina ethnicity. María was born in Mexico, along with her parents and grandparents. When asked what language she spoke at home, she initially replied, “Spanish”, but then modified her answer to convey that she speaks both Spanish and English at home. Overall, María’s interview was less descriptive than the other interviews presented here. Although the quality of the interview itself was good, María did not expand on her answers, and typically gave one to two sentence responses. The predominant theme that emerged from her interview was that she had fun, and she did not feel that her experiences on the course affected or changed her.

When asked why she wanted to go on the adventure course and what she was expecting, María responded:

Well, the way you talked about it, it sounded kinda fun, so I wanted to go. . . . I was, like, nervous because I didn’t know what we were going to do, and if I was going to be with my friends or not.
In response to the question about what she remembered from her experiences on the course, she said, “Well, we rock climbed, that was really fun. We played some games. And we went hiking. That’s it.” In response to the question “Do you think you experienced the course differently from other students who were there?”, María replied, “Maybe they didn’t have as much fun as I did.”. Thus, although María was not very descriptive in the activities that she participated in at the course, she did communicate that she had a lot of fun, and she thought that she possibly had more fun than other students who were there. This was emphasized when she said what she shared with her family, “I told them, that, like, we had another adventure course, I would want to go again. And that I had a lot of fun, and that I met new people and new friends. And that it was fun.”

This interview represents several of the other interviews which were conducted, but not reported here. That is, several other students said that they had a lot of fun on the adventure course, and wanted to go again, but they did not learn anything from it and did not think it changed them. From the group of 27 adolescents who participated on the course, 12 of them were interviewed, and approximately half of those participants who were interviewed (5 students) said they had fun, but did not think the adventure course changed or affect them. It is important to recognize that there is going to be a variety of reactions, experiences, and meanings taken from an adventure course; some students might not take anything away from it except a fun experience, whereas others might use what they learned in their daily lives. In any case, both of these outcomes demonstrate that it was a beneficial and positive experience, however for some it may have a longer lasting impact on their lives.
Case Study 5.

Vanessa is a 6th grade student who considers herself to be “half White and Black and Mexican”. When asked what culture she identified with, whether it would be more closely associated with the values and beliefs from her White, Black, or Mexican ancestry, she replied, “I’m not sure, because I feel like I’m each of them. I’m the same part of the same percentage. So I’m not really sure.” Vanessa speaks English at home, but her grandmother speaks mostly Spanish, and so with her she has to speak Spanish (although she acknowledged that she only knows a little Spanish). Vanessa’s family has been in the United States for at least three generations, as both her paternal and maternal grandparents were born in the United States. The theme from Vanessa’s interview is that of a progression. Her case study indicates how she went through the process of being shy and nervous before the course, then having fun on the course and working with people, next she demonstrates what she got out of the experience, and finally offers some insight as to how it might affect her next time.

When asked why she wanted to sign up for the project and go on the adventure course, Vanessa answered, “I never done things like that, I’ve always been shy and stuff like that. So I thought it would be fun so I gave it a shot. . . . [I felt] kinda scared and nervous.”

In response to the question about what she remembered from her experiences on the course and whether anything kept her from participating fully, she said:

I remember how fun it was to climb the rocks and stuff. And the games were cool because you got to think how to work together. . . . [In response to the question, “Did anything hold you back?”] No, because I wanted to give it my best. Because like I
said, I haven’t done anything like that, so I wanted to see how it would feel, so I just went along with it and it was really cool.

When asked if she learned anything from the course, Vanessa responded:

I learned how to work together. It helped me when I got back to school and we had to do a project with a certain amount of people, so it helped me to work with other people. Because usually I do stuff by myself, but it helps to get along with people well.

The next question that followed asked what it meant to her, and she said, “It meant a lot to me because it changed my attitude a lot, how to be open with people”. When asked to expand on how it affected her, she replied, “Like if people are talking to me and stuff, like in Y-Teens [the after school YWCA program] when they talk about certain stuff, it helps to actually talk with them, instead of being quiet.”

Vanessa offered an insight to the whole process when she said, “Now I think that if I went on more [adventure courses] then it would actually help me to improve in my attitude.”

Thus, although she acknowledged that her experiences on the course did affect her, by helping her to see that she could be more involved with people and talk to them more, in this final comment she addressed the possibility that more experiences on the course, which should be accompanied by more processing by the facilitators, could benefit her. This is an interesting point that Vanessa thought that only on her second time on an adventure course would she be able to improve her attitude. Although it was not followed up at the time of the interview, it would be beneficial to ask Vanessa why she thought this was true. Was it, perhaps, because the first time she needed to truly experience it all, and take in the “realness” of the experience, as was demonstrated through the interview with Janet? Could the second
trip for Vanessa be more beneficial because she would be able to focus on the processing and
cognitions associated with the experience instead of the pure behavior and perception intake
possibly associated with the first course? Future research should examine what the effects of
multiple adventure course experiences might be, especially for participants such as in this
study, who do not come to the course with a background of being in the wilderness (the
majority of the students who were interviewed had only been camping once, typically for a
weekend as the longest time period).

Case Study 6

The final case study presented is from the interview with Griselda who is a 6th grade
student who identified with a Hispanic ethnic identity. Her family has been in the Unites
States for at least three generations, although one of her grandmothers was born in Mexico.
Griselda and her family speak Spanish at home, but her interview demonstrated that she was
completely fluent in English as well. A clear theme from her interview was her insecurities
about herself and her lack of friends, as demonstrated through her thoughts and feelings
about the other girls on the trip.

In response to the question, “What first got you interested in wanting to sign up for
this project and go on the adventure course?”, Griselda replied:

I thought it would be fun to go rock climbing with other people because I thought I
would get to see other people and see if they are better than me or you know, how
they are going to act and stuff. . . . [when asked about her feelings prior to the course]
I was excited . . . I was wondering if the girls would be nice or if they would be rude
or something, I wasn’t really sure what they were going to be like.
When asked to describe the group that she was with, and how the group functioned, Griselda said:

When we did the project, we all sort of answered the same questions, so I thought that’s cool because they are like me, I do the same thing . . . [when asked what project] Like when we would get together and play ball and you would have to say things about yourself.

The reasoning for Griselda’s comparison of herself to other girls became more clear in her responses to the questions about what she learned from the course and how it changed her:

Yeah, I think I should go out and meet other girls and they probably aren’t all going to be mean to me or something. And some of them will be nice. I think I should go and take a chance in seeing other girls and stuff.

The fact that she met new girls on the adventure course, and they were nice to her (thus indicating possibilities for friendship), was evident from her comments in response to the question about what she shared with her family and friends when she returned:

All the girls were really nice to me and I got to meet other girls from other schools and that we all rock climbed together and stuff. . . . I told one of the girls who is in the YWCA that she should have went because it was really fun. And I also told the girls that were at the thing [the adventure course], that there was girls they should meet from our school too, because they were really nice.

Throughout her description of her experiences on the adventure course, a change is noticeable in her perspective of the other girls on the course. Initially she was nervous about whether or not they would be nice. However, throughout her experiences at the course, she
made new friends and realized that she could use these experiences to meet other girls at school. As was indicated in the journal analysis, one of the important benefits the participants received through their participation on the course was an awareness of the possibilities for friendship. Given the importance of friendship at this period in adolescent female development, this is not surprising. This knowledge should be used in future courses with adolescent females, as friendship and other similar themes should be processed as a way to further benefit this population.

Additionally, the interview with Griselda brought up an important point in terms of following up interventions with further processing. Griselda was not in the group which completed the journaling topics, and thus the possibilities for further reflection and processing ended after the adventure course was completed. Griselda acknowledged the detrimental effect that no further processing had on her when she responded to the question “How did the adventure course change you?”:

I don’t know how it did, I don’t remember really how we, I don’t know. I had fun on that day. And the next days I didn’t really think about it any more. But then I think about it now, and I think I should, because I don’t have any friends and I should go make some.

In her comments, Griselda touches on one of the very points that this research was designed to investigate: whether it would be beneficial to follow the adventure course with another sort of intervention. She admitted that although she did not think about the course after its completion, during the interview almost four months after the adventure course she recognized that there were possibilities for how it could still have an effect in her life.
Thus, it is evident that while on the course itself, and in the days following one of the basic components of learning did not happen for Griselda: she did not make sense of what she learned (Luckner & Nadler, 1995). Although the experience was there and the possibility existed for her take and apply what she learned about making new friends, the key aspect of reflection and conceptualization did not occur. Thus, this finding reinforces the necessity of effective processing and debriefing for participants to utilize the benefits from the course in their daily lives. Through the interview with Griselda the importance of transference has been demonstrated, but more specifically, of the necessity to follow-up adventure experiences with further processing or different types of interventions such as journaling which could encourage contemplation and further prolong the benefits gained from a course.
Chapter Eight

General Discussion

Overall, these two studies have provided numerous insights and directions for future research on the effects that female adolescents experience as a result of participation on an adventure course. From these, there are four main points that should be emphasized.

The first point is in relation to the research question of the first study: Can the benefits from a short-term adventure-based experience be prolonged through the use of writing? For the circumstances and conditions in the present study, the answer is no. However, as has been pointed out, it is important recognize that there was a discrepancy in the current study between the processing that happened on the course and in the writing assignments given to the participants following the course. Because these two different forms of processing the experience did not focus on similar constructs (such as the difference between teamwork and social competence) it is understandable why the use of writing was not effective in prolonging the effects from the course. It is critical for future research to take this into account and have the flexibility to create writing interventions that directly relate to the processing that occurred on the course.

The second point comes from the integration of the qualitative and quantitative analyses. Through the examination of the journal entries and the interviews conducted with the participants, two themes emerged as being relevant to the experiences and meanings given to the participation on an adventure course. The first was in the realm of self-confidence and an increase in the participants’ beliefs of their abilities that they could accomplish what they set out to do. The second clear theme was that of friendship and the realization that they made new friends and had increased abilities to do so. This is very
relevant given the importance of social relations for adolescent females in this period of their development (Dusek, 1996). However, within the quantitative analysis, the LEQ-I only provided a means for one of these constructs to be measured, and even then, the results indicated that levels of self-confidence did not increase. There are conflicting results because the interviews indicated that the levels of self-confidence and awareness of self-confidence actually increased for some participants. Thus, in conclusion it can be seen that when studying this population, it is important to utilize qualitative as well as quantitative methods in order to examine the effects from an adventure course.

The third key point comes from Study Two, and the presentation of the case studies. Throughout the interviews it was demonstrated that the participants who had stronger reasons to change (such as Veronica’s perceived attitude problem or Griselda’s insecurities about friendship) also were able to see the greater possibilities for change as a result of their participation in the course. Yalom (1995) pointed out that one of the most important criteria for successful group participation is motivation for change. This is very similar to a statement by Savage (1993) who emphasized that one-day outdoor adventure programs may affect their participants, but only if “such an experience occurs at a time when the person is predisposed for change” (p. 94). Thus, these two participants, who had motivations to change, were able to actually see greater possibilities to be positively affected by the adventure course. It is postulated that if facilitation and processing had occurred with the participants on these issues or concerns, then they could have experienced a large degree of beneficial change as a result of their participation on the adventure course.

The fourth, and final conclusion of these two studies relates back to the literature presented initially. As numerous researchers have pointed out (e.g., Hart & Silka, 1994;
Luckner & Nadler, 1995; Priest, 1995), the necessity of debriefing and of processing the experience is crucial. In these studies, this has been shown to be essential both through the use of relevant processing to prolong the experience through writing as well as through increasing the possible benefits on levels of social competence and teamwork.

In ending, it is essential to recognize that this is really only a beginning. The vast majority of the research presented here has been conducted in the past ten years, indicating the brief history of the field but also the increased awareness that it is only through research that some of the most relevant questions can be begin to be answered.
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Appendix A

Initial Flier and Letter
YWCA of the West End and Scripps College are offering you an opportunity for

Adventure

Questions:
Want to make new friends?
Want to participate in team building games?
Want to try rock climbing?

Answer: YES!

Then participate in the adventure course project! You (as a member of Y-Teen Program) will be able to participate in an adventure course at Joshua Tree National Park, with no cost to you or your parents!

What you need to do:
Both you and one of your parent or legal guardians must come to one of the mandatory informational meetings where you will learn more about the adventure course, and sign the necessary permission slips.

Options for meeting times:
1) YWCA West End Office on November 19th (Monday) or 20th (Tuesday) come for 30 minutes anytime from 3:00 pm to 5:30 pm.
(The YWCA West End Office is located at 218 W. “E” Street, Ontario.)

2) YWCA West End Office on November 26th (Monday) or 27th (Tuesday) come for 30 minutes anytime from 3:00 pm to 5:30 pm.
(The YWCA West End Office is located at 218 W. “E” Street, Ontario.)

3) On November 27th (Tuesday) we will meet at a central location (to be announced at your next Y-Teen meeting) for an hour from 6:00-7:00 pm.

There will be refreshments at all meetings!!

(Please remember that both you and your parent or legal guardian have to come to one of these meetings if you want to participate!

If you have any questions, please call Leann Terry, (909) 607-5128.)
YWCA West End y la universidad de Scripps están presentandote una oportunidad para una

Adventura

Preguntas:
¿Quisiera hacer nuevas amigas?
¿Quisiera participar en juegos para mejorar su grupo?
¿Quisiera tartar de escalar montañas?

Respuesta: ¡Sí!
¡Entonces participa en el proyecto de aventura! Tu (como miembro del programa de Y-Teen) tienes la oportunidad de participar en un curso de adventure en Joshau Tree National Park, ¡y es gratis para ti y tus padres!

Qué necesita hacer:
Ambos tu y uno de tus padres o custodios tienen que asistir a uno de estas reuniones mandatorias donde pueden aprender más sobre el curso de adventure, y pueden firmar las formas necsarias.

Opciones para las reuniones:
1) La oficina de YWCA West End en el 19 de Noviembre (Lunes) o el 20 de Noviembre (Martes) por 30 minutos a cualquier hora desde las 3 de la tarde hasta las 5:30 de la tarde.
(La oficina de la YWCA West End está en 218 W. “E” Street, en Ontario.)

2) La oficina de YWCA West End en el 26 de Noviembre (Lunes) o el 27 de Noviembre (Martes) por 30 minutos a cualquier hora desde las 3 de la tarde hasta las 5:30 de la tarde.
(La oficina de la YWCA West End está en 218 W. “E” Street, en Ontario.)

3) El 27 de Noviembre, nos reuniremos en una locación central (que sera anunciado en la próxima reunion de Y-Teen) por una hora desde las 6:00 de la tarde hasta las 7:00 de la tarde.

¡¡Habrás bebidas en cada reunión!!
(Por favor, ¡Recuerda que ambos tu y tu padre o custodio tienen que asistir a una de las reuniones si quieres participar!)

Si tienes preguntas, por favor, llama a Leann Terry, (909) 607-5128.
November 26, 2001

Dear Parent(s) or Guardian(s):

My name is Leann Terry, and I am a senior at Scripps College in Claremont. I am conducting a project for my senior thesis that involves taking 6th, 7th and 8th grade female students from the YWCA West End on a one-day adventure course. At this adventure course the students will participate in team building activities, games, and rock climbing. This is a great way to build self-esteem, self-confidence, and make new friends from other Y-Teen Programs. Your child has been invited to be one of those students (and there is no cost to the YWCA or to your family). The YWCA has approved this project, and is excited about the opportunities it presents to the members of the Y-Teen Program.

The primary purpose of my project is to examine the short-term and long-term benefits from participation in an adventure course. These courses have been shown to have positive benefits such as increase self-esteem, self-confidence, and teamwork. In total, an experience like this, gives the possibility for a powerful experience to adolescents in a crucial time in their lives.

All students who participate in this project will be given the opportunity to go on an adventure course with the other students who participate. If your child participates, she will be assigned to go on the course in early December, or in January of next year. She also will be asked to complete a one page questionnaire four times over the next several months in order for the benefits of the course to be examined. If your child completes the course in December she may be asked to complete journal entries twice a week for three weeks as part of the project.

If you and your child are interested in this project, and she would like to participate, there will be several informational meetings, you and your child must come to one of them if she wants to attend the adventure course. At the meeting you will be able to find out more information about the project, you will be able to fill out the necessary forms, and it will give you a chance to speak with the researcher in person. The flier on the first page contains the information about where and when the various meeting times will be.

I hope to see you at the meeting, and if you have any questions prior to then, please contact me at (909) 607-5128.

Sincerely,

Leann J. Terry
26 de Noviembre de 2001

Estimado padres o custodios,

Mi nombre es Leann Terry, y soy una estudiante en mi cuarto año en la universidad de Scripps en Claremont. Como un proyecto de investigación para mi tesis necesito chicas de los grados de sexto, séptimo y octavo de la asociación de YWCA para participar en un curso de aventura de un día. En este curso de aventura las estudiantes pueden participar en actividades para mejorar sus juegos en equipo, juegos, y escalar montañas. Esta es una manera fabulosa para aumentar autoestima, autoconfianza, y para hacer nuevas amigas de los otros programas de Y-Teen. Su niña ha estado invitado para participar en este curso (que es gratis para su familia y la YWCA). Las directoras de la YWCA dieron su aprobacion para este proyecto, y tienen anticipación para las oportunidades que da para los miembros de su organización.

La meta de este proyecto es para investigar los beneficios inmediatos y prolongados que vienen de participación en un curso de aventura. Estos cursos tienen beneficios positivos como incrementando la autoestima, la confianza en sí misma, y la habilidad para trabajar como un equipo. En total, una oportunidad como esta da la oportunidad para una gran experiencia para el grupo de adolescentes en un tiempo crucial de su desarrollo.

Todos las alumnas que participen en este proyecto tendrán la oportunidad para participar en un curso de aventura con las otras alumnas. Si su niña participa, ella será nombrado a un grupo para participar en el curso en el principio de diciembre or enero del próximo año. También, todas las alumnas van a llenar un cuestionario de una página cuatro veces en los próximos meses para examinar los beneficios de un curso de aventura. Si su niña participa en el curso en diciembre, hay la posibilidad que ella necesite escribir diarios dos veces cada semana por tres semanas como parte del proyecto.

Si usted y su niña tienen interés en este proyecto, y ella quisiera participar, habrá unas reuniones de información que son necesarios para usted y su niña. Solo tendrá que asistir a una de las reuniones. En esta reunión le dan más información sobre el proyecto, podrá llenar los papeles de autorización, y podrá hablar con la investigadora. La primera página tiene información sobre donde y cuando serán las reuniones.

Me gustaría verles en la reunión, y si tiene preguntas antes de la reunión, por favor llamame a (909) 607-5128.

Atentamente,

Leann J. Terry
Appendix B

Reminder Flier
DO YOU WANT TO GO ON THE ADVENTURE COURSE!?

THEN DON'T FORGET TO COME TO ONE OF THESE MEETINGS WITH YOUR PARENT OR LEGAL GUARDIAN!!

OPTIONS FOR MEETING TIMES:

1) YWCA WEST END OFFICE ON NOVEMBER 26TH (MONDAY) OR 27TH (TUESDAY) COME FOR 30 MINUTES ANYTIME FROM 3:00 PM TO 5:30 PM.
   (The YWCA West End Office is located at 218 W. "E" Street, Ontario.)

2) ON NOVEMBER 27TH (TUESDAY) WE WILL MEET AT THE YWCA WEST END OFFICE FOR AN HOUR FROM 6:00-7:00 PM.
   (The YWCA West End Office is located at 218 W. "E" Street, Ontario.)

IF YOU ABSOLUTELY CAN'T MAKE IT TO ONE OF THESE MEETINGS, PLEASE CALL LEANN, AND SHE WILL ARRANGE A SEPARATE MEETING TIME/PLACE WITH YOU!!

IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS, OR NEED DIRECTIONS TO THE WEST END OFFICE, PLEASE CALL EITHER ROCHELLE PHILLIPS AT THE YWCA: (909) 983-YWCA/(983-9922), OR LEANN TERRY: (909) 607-5128.
¿QUISIERA PARTICIPAR EN EL CURSO DE ADVENTURA?

¡ENTonces, RECuerDA QUE NECESITA ASISTIR A UNO DE ESTAS REUNIONES CON SU PADRE O CUSTODIO!

Opciones para las reuniones:
1) La oficina de YWCA West End en el 26 de noviembre (lunes) o el 27 de noviembre (martes) por 30 minutos a cualquier hora desde las 3 de la tarde hasta las 5:30 de la tarde.
   (La oficina de la YWCA West End está en 218 W. "E" Street, en Ontario.)

2) El 27 de noviembre, nos reuniremos en la oficina de la YWCA West End por una hora desde las 6:00 de la tarde hasta las 7:00 de la tarde.
   (La oficina de la YWCA West End está en 218 W. "E" Street, en Ontario.)

¡¡SI NO HAY UNA MANERA PARA ASISTIR A UNA DE ESTAS REUNIONES, POR FAVOR, LLAMA A LEANN, Y ELLA SE PUEDE REUNIR CON USTEDES EN UN LUGAR O TIEMPO DIFERENTE!!

Si tiene preguntas, o necesita direcciones a la oficina de la West End, por favor llame a Rochelle Phillips a la YWCA: (909) 983-4WCA/(983-9922), o Leann Terry: (909) 607-5128.
Appendix C

Informational Packet
Detailed Description of the Project

Background

The idea for this project comes from studying the effects of adventure courses for the past several years of my education at Scripps College. Through this process I have come to realize that, overall, the amount of research on one-day adventure courses is very small. Additionally, the amount of research on the long-term effects from a course is almost non-existent. That is, many researchers and facilitators from adventure courses believe that there are many beneficial outcomes from a one-day course, both in the short-term and long-term, however there is a lack of research to support this belief.

Through my project, I hope to be able to address this lack of research in a way that benefits the research field in general, and also benefits a section of the community which would not otherwise be offered this opportunity.

Project Details

This project has several phases. First, if your child decides to participate, all of the necessary forms must be filled out completely and signed by you, as the parent or legal guardian, and your child.

After all of the forms have been completed, the names of all students who are participating will be entered into a computer database. From this database the computer will randomly select 2/3 of the names. Random selection means that each child has an equal chance of being picked as part of the 2/3 of the students. These are the students who will participate on the course on December 1st or 2nd. The remaining 1/3 of the students will participate on the course on January 26th. Thus, all students will be able to participate in the course, regardless of which group they are in.

Thus far, your child is in one of two groups: 1) Adventure course in December or 2) Adventure Course in January.

Of those students who are in the first group (Adventure course in December) a little over half of those students will be randomly selected to complete bi-weekly journal entries (2 one-paragraph journals per week) for three weeks (6 total journal entries). As an incentive to turn the journals in each week, those students who are journaling will receive a candy bar or a gift certificate or coupon to a local store. (The journaling materials of paper and pencils will be provided by the researcher).

Several of the journal topics might ask your child to respond or think about a television show that she has watched, thus part of the consent for this project is to allow your child to watch a television show every week (the particular show can be decided upon between you and your child).

Here are two examples of what the journal topics might be:

Example 1: Describe your favorite TV show. Include descriptions such as:
1) What happens during a typical episode?
2) Is there an overall plot or theme to the show?
3) Why do you like this show?

Example 2: This topic is for you to relate some of your experiences on the adventure course. Please write about each of the following:
1) Describe how your experience on the course affected you.
2) Was one part of the course more difficult or easy than the others? Describe which one was more difficult or easy, and why.

3) From your overall experience on the course, what did you learn about yourself?

In the end, your student has an equal chance as any other student to be placed in one of the three groups (all of which will be invited to participate in the course):

| Group 1: Adventure course in December and journaling twice a week |
| Group 2: Adventure course in December and no journaling |
| Group 3: Adventure course in January and no journaling |

Your child will be notified of what group she is in soon.

Regardless of what group your child is in, she will be asked to fill out a questionnaire. This questionnaire, called the Life Effectiveness Questionnaire was designed to measure the effects of adventure courses. Here is a typical question from the questionnaire (students are instructed to circle a number from 1 to 8, indicating how similar the statement is to them):

| False | True |
| not like me | like me |

I am a good leader when a task needs to be done. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Your child will be asked to complete this questionnaire a total of four times throughout the next several months.

With the necessity to answer this questionnaire, and with the possibility of journaling, all students who participate in this project should be able to read and write English, but will be given the opportunity to write the journals in Spanish.

Transportation to the adventure course, which will be held in Joshua Tree National Park, approximately 2 hours to the east, will be by bus on a Saturday or Sunday during December and January. Students will need to arrive at the given destination at 7:00 AM on the Saturday or Sunday of their course, and will need to be picked up from the same place at 7:00 PM of the same day.

Conclusion
Those are the details of the project, and a description of the various groups that your child might be randomly assigned to (if she chooses to participate in the project). I would like to end this description with this statement directed towards the students themselves: I believe that the option to participate in this project is a wonderful opportunity for you (otherwise I would not be putting the time and energy into this project). I have been a participant on courses such as these and have enjoyed each one immensely. From those experiences I have learned a lot about myself; by taking risks, being open to new ideas and ways of thinking, and I was willing to participate fully in the opportunities presented to me.

I encourage each of you to participate in this project, but only if you are willing to put some of your time and energy into it. The challenge adventure course is aptly named, because at times it is challenging. You may get frustrated or scared, but the facilitators of the course will encourage you to work through that, and I believe that you can do it. The facilitators will encourage you to push your boundaries, but only as far as you choose, so ultimately, the challenge is yours. However, throughout this experience you will be asked to participate in self-reflection and I ask that you be willing to do this.

You may be assigned to participate in journaling twice a week after the completion of the challenge course in December, and I ask that each one of you be willing to participate fully in
that, should you be assigned to that group. This means being responsible and writing on the topics each week, and turning them in on time. Others of you may not go on the adventure course until January, but you will be asked to complete the questionnaires ahead of time. Similarly, I encourage each of you to fully complete those questionnaires, even though you will not have been on the course yet.

Thus, if you choose to participate in this project I encourage each of you to be willing to participate to the best of your abilities- no matter what group you are assigned to be in.

(Please continue to the next page).

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

I, the student, have read and understood the above stated information, further more, I agree that I will try to participate and complete all activities (adventure course, questionnaires, and/or journaling) to the best of my abilities.

Student’s Name (please print): ____________________________________________
Student’s Signature: ____________________________________________________
Date: ______/_____/_____

I, the parent or legal guardian, have read and understood the above information, and I understand that my child has an equal chance as any other student of participating in the adventure course in December as in January.

Parent or Legal Guardian’s Name (please print): ____________________________
Parent or Legal Guardian’s Signature: _____________________________________
Date: ______/_____/_____


I - General Information

Information requested in this form is vital to an effective response if a medical emergency occurs during this course. Boojum must receive a completed Medical Information and Release for Treatment (and Participant Acknowledgement and Agreement) before you will be allowed to participate in this course.

Course Location and Date(s): Joshua Tree National Park
December 1 & 2, 2001, January 26, 2002

Course offered through: Scripps College & YWCA

Participant Name (print clearly)
___________________________________________________________

Address ____________________________________________________________________________
City __________________________________________ State _______ Zip ____________________
Phone (_____)___________________________ Birth date_____/_____/_____ Age_____ Sex _____

Person to be notified in case of emergency _________________________________________________
Relationship _________________________________ Home Phone (_____)____________________
Work Phone (____)__________________________ Cellular Phone (____)_____________________
Physician _________________________________________ Office Phone (____)_________________

Restrictions for medical treatment? _______________________________________________________

Medical Insurance Company  ____________________________________________________________
Medical Insurance Company Tel. No. __________________ Policy Number _______________________
Name of Policy Holder ___________________________ SSN of Policy Holder ___________________

II – Medical Information

A. Allergies (including medicines, foods, bites and stings) – list below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allergy</th>
<th>Reactions</th>
<th>Medications Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Medications – list medications you are using, including psychiatric and over-the-counter medications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medication</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Dosage (size and freq.)</th>
<th>Current side effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Current Exercise Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Time / Distance</th>
<th>Pace (easy / moderate / strenuous)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### III - Health Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Blood Pressure /</th>
<th>Pulse Rate</th>
<th>Date Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(Within past 6 months)

Have you been in counseling with a psychiatrist, psychologist or other therapist within the past two years?
Yes _____ No_____ Detailed description, including symptoms and restrictions: (use add’l pgs if req’d)
If Yes, Therapist's Name _______________________________________________________________
Therapist's Phone (_______)______________________      Fax (______)_________________________
Address _____________________________________________________________________________
City _______________________________________________ State _______ Zip __________________

Do you have a history of:

1. Seizure within past year........ [ ] [ ]
2. Hospitalization w/in past 2 years......................... [ ] [ ]
3. Emergency Room visit within past year.................... [ ] [ ]
4. Family history of heart attack [ ] [ ]
5. Head / neck / back / shoulder / arm / hand / leg / knee / foot pain, injury, stiffness or swelling [ ] [ ]
6. Asthma or shortness of breath [ ] [ ]
7. Date of last tetanus shot ...... [ ] [ ]

Issue # Detailed description, including symptoms and restrictions (use add'l pages if necessary)

IV – Health Problems  Do you have any of the following conditions?

A  [ ] [ ] Resting pulse rate over 100
B  [ ] [ ] Systolic blood pressure over 150 and/or diastolic blood pressure over 90
C  [ ] [ ] Experiencing chest pain and/or pressure
D  [ ] [ ] Heart disease past or present (including high blood pressure)
E  [ ] [ ] Abnormal heart murmur (If you have a normal or functional murmur, written confirmation by your physician is required. Only abnormal murmurs require a physician’s exam.
F  [ ] [ ] Diabetes
G  [ ] [ ] Seizure disorder (If “yes” your physician must confirm that you are seizure free for one year.)
H  [ ] [ ] Fainting / Dizziness
I  [ ] [ ] Chronic illness or physical infirmity
J  [ ] [ ] I would prefer my physician’s advice prior to program participation

Issue Detailed description, including symptoms and restrictions (use add'l pages if necessary)
If you have checked “yes” on any of the above conditions, you must contact the Boojum Institute at least two weeks prior to the course start date to discuss whether you should attend the course.

V – Consent for Treatment
I give my consent and permission for any emergency anesthesia, operation, hospitalization or other treatment that might become necessary. I certify that the information on this form is correct to the best of my knowledge and that there is no other medical or psychological information I am withholding that will in any way affect my performance during this course.

Participant Signature __________________________________________ Date

Parent or Guardian Signature __________________________________ Date

(parent or legal guardian must sign if participant is under 18 years old)
Name of Participant: (Print Clearly): ________________________________________________
Course Location and Dates: Joshua Tree National Park
december 1 & 2, 2001, January 26, 2002
Activities: Rock Climbing, Hiking, Low Initiatives
Course offered through: Scripps College & YWCA

In consideration for the Boojum Institute for Experiential Education (“Boojum”) permitting me to participate in the above named course, I, the participant (“Participant”), and in the case of the participant being under the age of 18, my parents or legal guardian for themselves and on my behalf, hereby represent, acknowledge and agree as follows:

Acknowledgement and Assumption of Risks:
Although Boojum has taken reasonable steps to insure that I have appropriate equipment and skilled instructors so I can enjoy activities in which I may not be skilled, these activities are not without risk. Certain risks cannot be eliminated without destroying the unique character of the activities. The same elements that contribute to the unique character of these activities can be causes of loss or damage to my equipment, accidental injury or illness, or, in extreme cases, permanent trauma or death. Boojum does not want to frighten the participant or reduce his or her enthusiasm for these activities, but thinks it is important for the participant to know in advance what to expect and to be informed of the inherent risks. The following describes some, but not all, of those risks:

The course takes place outdoors, and exposure to natural elements can be uncontrollable and may be harmful. The participant may be exposed to extreme or inclement weather, including rain, snow, lightning, cold, heat, and intense sunlight. The participant can be injured by natural hazards including: animals, insects, toxic plants, falling rocks or trees, flooding, ice and snow. The participant may engage in strenuous and/or prolonged physical exertion which may reveal previously unknown health problems or make known health problems worse. The course, or part of the course, takes place in a remote location where there are no medical facilities, physicians or health-care providers other than Boojum staff first responders, and there may be no immediate means of communication or rapid transportation. There is risk that medical care for accidents or illnesses may be significantly delayed, and that the first responder care provided by Boojum may be inadequate for a serious accident or illness.

In courses that include hiking: participants will be walking over lose rocks, steep slopes, and in rugged terrain while carrying personal and/or group gear. They risk injury from falling down slopes or off rocks, as well as abrasions, ankle and knee injuries, and fractures.

In courses that include camping: participants will be setting up camp and sleeping in tents or outside, preparing meals and cooking over camp stoves, being around an open campfire, and using primitive toilet facilities. They risk extended exposure to heat or cold, falling onto tents, equipment, or campfires, burns and cuts from cooking, and exposure to infection.

In courses that include canoeing or kayaking: participants will be paddling a canoe or kayak by themselves or with a co-participant or instructor. They may fall into the water or the boat may turn over requiring them to float (with the aid of the personal flotation device provided to them) or swim to shore. They risk being exposed to or falling into cold moving water, being struck by paddles or other boats, and being exposed to water-borne toxins or infections.
In courses that include rock climbing or a challenge course: participants will climb objects while attached to a rope protection system. While rock climbing participants may climb up to 75 feet high on rock walls or boulders. On a challenge course participants may climb or trees poles, move across ropes, wires and poles at heights up to 40 feet, swing on ropes and balance on platforms. In both cases, while climbing participants will wear a helmet and a harness, and be attached to a rope protection system supported from above and operated by a Boojum Instructor or another participant. The rope protection system is intended to keep the participant from falling more than a few feet if they slip, and is used to lower the participant to the ground when the activity is completed. The participant may also operate the rope protection system, under the direction of a Boojum Instructor, while another participant climbs. Rock climbers will use their hands, feet, arms, and legs to grip rock cracks, ledges and holds. The rock may be rough and have sharp edges. Rock climbers risk scrapes and abrasions while climbing and risk striking or sliding across the rock if they fall or if they slip while being lowered. Challenge course participants risk scrapes, abrasions or splinters while on the course and also risk swinging into parts of the equipment with their body if they fall or if they slip while being lowered. In both cases, the rope may slide through their hands or across their body and cause rope burns. The participant could experience vertigo or other mental impairment brought on by exposure to heights or fear of falling. Objects may fall and strike participants while they are in the course area. In extreme cases the rope protection system could be damaged by rock fall or fail in some other way, in spite of Boojum’s efforts to operate within accepted industry standards, and the participant could fall to the ground.

In all courses: any of these risks or activities could result in damage, injury or, in extreme cases, result in permanent trauma or death. Lapses of judgment or the careless conduct of other participants may cause the participant injury. Although Boojum endeavors to operate within accepted industry standards and has a risk management plan that seeks to reduce the risk of participation in the course, those standards, the plan, the instructors, and the equipment provided by Boojum, are not infallible and errors in judgment and/or equipment malfunction may occur. The instructors may misjudge the weather, the terrain, or the participants’ abilities or fitness. They may give inadequate warnings or instructions. They can not provide continuous supervision.

I am aware that this course entails risks of injury or death to myself. I understand that the description of these risks is not complete and that other unknown or unanticipated risks may result in injury or death. I agree to assume responsibility for the risks identified herein and those not specifically identified. My participation in this course is purely voluntary and no one is forcing me to participate, and I elect to participate in spite of the risks. I am fully capable of participating in this course. Therefore, I assume full responsibility for myself, including my minor children, for bodily injury, death, and loss of personal property and expenses thereof (including costs of rescue, evacuation, and field treatment) as a result of these inherent risks and dangers and of my negligence in participating in this course.

Release and Indemnity:
Some Boojum courses take place on federal lands whose managing agencies allow service providers such as Boojum to collect from their clients only an acknowledgement and assumption of inherent risks to be encountered on those lands. Releases of liability are not allowed. Accordingly, the Release and Indemnity portion of this Agreement applies only to those
activities that take place off those federal lands. The remaining portions of the Agreement apply to all Boojum activities, wherever they take place.
Except with respect to an injury or loss that occurs on public lands whose rules and regulations prohibit my doing so, as described above, I acknowledge and assume all risks of my course, and any other activity of Boojum whether those risks are known or unknown, described in the preceding Acknowledgement and Assumption of Risks, inherent or otherwise.
In addition, I, and if I am under the age of 18, my parents or guardian, for themselves and on my behalf, agree as follows:

1. To release and forever discharge Boojum, including its officers, directors, trustees, employees, agents, representatives and support personnel either employed by or acting under the direct supervision of Boojum (collectively “Boojum and/or its agents”) from all claims, liabilities and losses asserted by or on behalf of me, or by my parents or guardian, for injury, loss or damage resulting, directly or indirectly, from my enrollment or participation in a Boojum activity or the use of its equipment or facilities. This release includes injury, loss or damage caused or claimed to be caused in whole or in part by the negligence of Boojum and its agents. I, and my parents or guardian if I am under 18 years of age, understand that in signing this document I, or we, surrender our respective rights to make a claim or file a lawsuit against Boojum and/or its agents for personal injury, property damage, wrongful death, breach of warranty or contract, or under any other legal theory, except in cases of intentional wrongs or the gross negligence of Boojum and/or its agents.

2. To defend, hold harmless and indemnify Boojum and/or its agents from any claim and from any liability, loss, damages or expenses (including attorneys’ fees) resulting from a claim brought by me or a member of my family for loss or damage in any way arising out of my enrollment or participation in Boojum activities or use of its equipment or facilities, except to the extent that a court or arbitration determines that Boojum is responsible for the loss or damage due to the intentional wrongs or gross negligence of Boojum and/or its agents.

Additional Provisions: (applies to both proceeding sections)
In addition I, and if I am under 18 years of age, my parents or guardian, for themselves and on my behalf, agree as follows:
I confirm that the I am physically and mentally willing and capable of engaging in the activities of the course and know of no physical, mental or medical condition that I have not disclosed to Boojum in writing that would interfere with my safety on this course, or be a risk to the health and safety of instructors and co-participants on the course. I will bear all costs of losses that may be suffered, directly or indirectly, by any party, due to my failure to disclose a known physical, mental or medical condition.
I understand and accept that independence, responsibility and autonomy are important elements of the experience provided by this Boojum course, and that I, if under the age of 18, may be treated as a young adult with limited direct supervision. I understand that my misconduct, unwillingness or inability to meet the requirements of the course may result in my being removed from the course at my additional expense. I accept that the decision to remove the participant is at the sole discretion of the Boojum staff.
I agree that any photographs of the participant taken by Boojum and/or its agents while on the course by become the property of Boojum and may be used for publicity, marketing and / or advertising purposes.
This agreement will be interpreted and construed according to the laws of the State of California, and in the event of any legal action which results relating to this agreement or any of the subject
matter covered by it, such legal action will be initiated, maintained, and decided only in Riverside County, California. If any portion of this Participant Acknowledgment and Agreement is found to be invalid or unenforceable, the remaining portion shall nevertheless remain in full force and effect. I, and if I am under 18 years of age, my parents or guardian, for themselves and on my behalf, have read this entire document, fully understand it, have satisfied any questions and concerns I, or we, may have, and voluntarily accept the terms and conditions stated herein without modification. I, or we, acknowledge that this agreement shall be effective and binding on myself, my heirs, assigns, personal representative, and estate and for all members of my family including any and all minors accompanying me. I acknowledge that I am not relying on any oral, written, or visual representations or statements made by Boojum to induce me to participate in this course.

Signature of Participant: __________________________________________
Date: ______________
Print Name: ____________________________ Age: _____
Address: ______________________________________________________
Telephone: ____________________________

The parent(s) or guardian of a participant under 18 years of age must sign below to reflect their understanding and agreement to all the terms of this acknowledgement and agreement for themselves and on behalf of the participant. The parent or guardian confirms that they have the authority to make this commitment.

Signature of Parent or Guardian: ________________________________
Date: ______________
Print Name: ____________________________
Address: ______________________________________________________
Telephone: ____________________________

Parent(s) or Guardian of participants under the age of 18 must sign for participant to be eligible to enroll.
Scripps College Participant Consent Form

I, a member of the Y-Teen Program of the YWCA West End, and my parent or legal guardian understand and agree to the following:

· We acknowledge that there are risks associated with the adventure course, and agree that neither Scripps College nor the YWCA of West End, nor the national association, nor any person or member associated with these three institutions, will be held liable or responsible for any damage, harm, loss of personal property, or any other detrimental affects resulting from participation during the adventure course, or travel to or from, the course at Joshua Tree National Park in California.

· We acknowledge and agree that if the student’s physical and/or medical condition changes prior to participation in the adventure course, that we will notify the researcher, Leann J. Terry, for consultation to determine if the student is still able to participate in the adventure course, and if necessary, we will complete another set of Medical Information and Release for Treatment forms to reflect the change in the student's physical, mental, or emotional health.

· We understand and agree that all participation in the events for this project (including but not limited to completion of surveys and tests, participation at the adventure course, and journaling) is voluntary and I, as the student, may withdraw or terminate my participation at any time without penalty. I, the student, further understand that if I withdraw or terminate my participation I will still be eligible to attend the adventure course if I have not already done so.

· We understand and agree that the student will be randomly assigned a date to participate in the adventure course, and further understand and acknowledge that I, the student, will be asked to complete questionnaires and tests, prior to or after participation in the adventure course. We also understand that the student may be asked to complete journaling exercises after her participation in the adventure course.

· We understand that all information collected will be confidential, and will only been seen by the researcher, Leann J. Terry, and her two supervisors: Dr. Sheila Walker, and Dr. Ann Renken, all of Scripps College. (Forms which are for the Boojum Institute will be given to them in addition to the above mentioned people). However, we understand that if information is given that demonstrates that the participant may be harmful to herself or others, or harmed by others, then the appropriate authorities will be notified.

· We understand that when this research is written-up, there will be no way to identify the individuals who participated. All data will be presented in group form or anonymously.

· We (I, as the student, and my parent or legal guardian) have read and understood all of the information presented to us, and are willing to participate in this project.

Student’s Name (please print): ____________________________________________
Student’s Signature: ____________________________________________
Date: ____/____/____
Parent or Legal Guardian’s Name (please print): ________________________________
Parent or Legal Guardian’s Signature: _________________________________________
Date: ____/____/____
Adventure Course Transportation Form

I, the parent or legal guardian, ____________________________, give permission for

name of parent/guardian

_______________________ to be transported by bus to Joshua Tree National Park, for the

student’s name

challenge course conducted by The Boojum Institute, on December 1, 2001, December 2, 2001

or January 26, 2002, depending on which group my child is randomly assigned to. I understand

that there will be adult chaperones supervising my child while she is on the bus.

Parent or Legal Guardian’s Name (please print):_________________________________

Parent or Legal Guardian’s Signature: _________________________________________

Date: _____/_____/____
Information about You

Finally, I need to know a little bit about you, the student:

Name: __________________________________________

Home Address: ___________________________________

___________________________________

___________________________________

Home Phone Number: (___) ____________

Grade Level: ____6th ____7th    8th ____

School: _______________________________

Date of Birth: _____/_____/_____

Race/ethnicity (IE. Asian, Black, Chicana, Latina, White): ________________________

Please check here if you do not give the researcher permission to contact you by phone if necessary: _______

Thank you!!
Appendix D

Additional Informational Sheets
Thanks for signing up and filling out the first questionnaire!!

Here is some information that you will want to know:

- You have been assigned to the group that will go on the course on **Saturday, December 1st**. The second sheet of this packet contains information about where to meet, what to bring, and what time we will leave and get back.

- You also have been assigned to the group that will not be completing journaling activities.

- There will be three more times that you will fill out the questionnaire. Each time will be at your Y-Teen meeting: 2nd time (Week of 12/3-12/7), 3rd time: (Week of 12/17-12/21), and the 4th time: (Week of 1/21-1/25). I hope you will be at the Y-Teen meeting for these weeks!

If you have any questions throughout the duration of this project, or if you won’t be at a Y-Teen meeting when it is necessary, please call me! My number is (909) 607-5128.

Thanks!
Leann Terry
Thanks for signing up and filling out the first questionnaire!!

Here is some information that you will want to know:

- You have been assigned to the group that will go on the course on Saturday, December 1st. The second sheet of this packet contains information about where to meet, what to bring, and what time we will leave and get back.

- You also have been assigned to the group that will be completing weekly journals for the next 3 weeks after the course. The journal assignments, paper, and pens will be given to you each week at your Y-Teen meeting. You will have a week to complete each journaling assignment, and at the following Y-Teen meeting, Leann will come and will pick up your completed journals. In return for the completed journals you will get the next week’s topic, and, if both journal topics are completed, you will receive a small gift (coupons to stores, or candy!).

- There will be three more times that you will fill out the questionnaire. Each time will be at your Y-Teen meeting: 2nd time (Week of 12/3-12/7), 3rd time: (Week of 12/17-12/21), and the 4th time: (Week of 1/21-1/25). I hope you will be at the Y-Teen meeting for these weeks!

If you have any questions throughout the duration of this project, or if you won’t be at a Y-Teen meeting when it is necessary, please call me! My number is (909) 607-5128.

Thanks!
Leann Terry
Information for Adventure Course Participation on December 1st

1. Participants for the challenge course should wear loose fitting clothing in which you will be comfortable doing physical activities.
2. Participants should dress in layers as the temperatures could change. A hat to protect yourself from the sun is advisable. It is also important to bring sun block.
3. Please bring a water bottle or something to drink throughout the day! Bagels will be available for breakfast on the bus, and lunch will be provided by the adventure course. (A small snack will be provided on the trip home).
4. We will be meeting to board the bus at 7:00 AM on Saturday, December 1st. The bus will be at the YWCA West End Office (located at 218 W. “E” Street, Ontario). Please do not be late, as we do not want to be late to the challenge course, as it cuts down on the activities that you will be able to accomplish during the day.
5. We will return at 6:30 PM on the same day. I encourage you to have your parent or guardian waiting at the YWCA West End Office so we will not have to wait around for everyone to be picked up.

If you have any questions about what to bring or what to expect at the course, please give me a call (909) 607-5128. If you have an emergency and can not make it on this day, please notify me immediately.

I’m looking forward to seeing you on Saturday!

Thanks!
Leann Terry
Appendix E

Life Effectiveness Questionnaire-I and Instructions
PLEASE DO NOT TURN OVER YET
READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS

This is a chance for you to consider how you think and feel about yourself in some ways. This is not a test - there are no right or wrong answers, and everyone will have different responses. It is important that you give your own views and that you be honest in your answers and do not talk to others while you think about your answers. They will be used only for research purposes and will in no way be used to refer to you as an individual at any time.

Over the page are a number of statements that are more or less true (that is like you) or more or less false (that is unlike you). Please use the eight point scale to indicate how true (like you) or how false (unlike you), each statement is as a description of you. Answer the statements as you feel now, even if you have felt differently at some other time in your life. Please do not leave any statements blank.

FALSE

NOT LIKE ME

3 4 5 6 7 8

This statement doesn’t describe me at all; it isn’t like me at all

TRUE

LIKE ME

1 2

More false than true

More true than false

This statement describes me very well; it is very much like me.

SOME EXAMPLES

A. I am a fast thinker.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

(The 6 has been circled because the person answering believes the statement “I am a fast thinker” is sometimes true. That is, the statement is sometimes like him/her.)

B. I am a good storyteller.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

(The 2 has been circled because the person answering believes that the statement is mostly false as far as he/she is concerned. That is, he/she feels he/she does not tell good stories.)

C. I enjoy working on puzzles.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

(The 8 has been circled because the person really enjoys working on puzzles a great deal, therefore the statement is definitely true about him/her.)

** ARE YOU SURE WHAT TO DO? **

If yes, then please turn the page over, write your name, today’s date, and circle your answers for all the statements.

If still unsure about what to do, ASK FOR HELP.

PLEASE GIVE HONEST, PRIVATE ANSWERS

© These materials are copyright and may only be used with the permission of James Neill
### L.E.Q. - I©

**NAME:**

**AGE:** ____ years  

**DATE:** __/__/____

**MALE / FEMALE**  (circle one)  **COURSE CODE:**

**GROUP:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>FALSE not like me</th>
<th>TRUE like me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01. If I try hard enough, I can succeed at anything.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02. I plan and use my time efficiently</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03. I am successful in social situations</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04. When working on a project, I do my best to get the details right.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05. I change my thinking or opinions easily if there is a better idea.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06. I am in control of things that happen to me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07. I can get people to work for me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08. I can stay calm in stressful situations.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09. I like to be busy and actively involved in things.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I know I have the ability to do anything I want to do.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I do not waste time.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I am competent in social situations.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I try to get the best results when I do things.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I am open to new ideas.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I believe I am responsible for all my actions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I am a good leader when a task needs to be done.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I stay calm and overcome anxiety in new or changing situations.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I like to be active and energetic.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. When I apply myself to something I am confident I will succeed.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I manage the way I use my time well.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I communicate well with people.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I try to do the best that I possibly can.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I am adaptable and flexible in my thinking and ideas.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I don't believe in chance, fate or destiny.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. As a leader I motivate other people well when tasks need to be done.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I stay calm when things go wrong.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I like to be an active, 'get into it' person.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I believe I can do it.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I can change the way I think and behave.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

© These materials are copyright and may only be used with the permission of James Neill © ITP 400 LEQ-DOC
Appendix F

Week One Journal Assignments
Please write one to two paragraphs on each topic. Be as informative, descriptive, and in-depth as you can. Each journal topic should take you no longer than 20-30 minutes.

**Topic 1**: This topic is for you to relate some of your experiences on the course. Please write about each of the following:

4) Describe how your experience on the course affected you.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

5) Was one part of the course more difficult or easy than the others? Describe which one was more difficult or easy, and why. Please provide details, and be specific.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
6) From your overall experience on the course, what did you learn about yourself? How can you relate this to your life at school? With your friends? Be specific!
Topic 2: Every individual, including you and me, have thoughts that are in our heads. Sometimes these thoughts are spoke out loud, but other times they are kept inside of our minds. Sometimes these thoughts can be about our actions, or what motivates us, or on any other topic. These thoughts about ourselves can be called “self-talk”. Often, our self-talk can aid us in accomplishing a task. For example, if I have to finish a book report, I can tell myself “I can do it! I can get it done!” Other times my self-talk can be harmful to the task that I want to accomplish: “I can’t do it, it’s too hard and I’m not good at this”.

For each statement write the message that you often tell yourself (your self-talk) about each statement. For example, here is my response to the statement:

When something takes a lot of time I know that the time I put into it is worth it, because I have chosen to work hard at the task and I will be proud when I am finished.

When I succeed

When I fail

When something is really hard

When I am not sure that I can do something

When something is really easy

When I know that I can do something

Now that you have written about each of those, decide which of the messages you tell yourself get in your way, or aren’t helpful to you. Choose one of those messages and rewrite it below, with a different message, or self-talk, that you can tell yourself that will help you.
Finally, did your experiences, thoughts, or actions at the adventure course change any of the self-talk messages that you tell yourself? How did it change them? If it didn’t change them, could you use your experiences to change them? Be as specific as you can.
Appendix G

Instruction Sheet for Journals
**Journal Folder**

This folder contains the two topics for this week’s journaling for the Adventure Course Project. Please complete these two topics by the Y-Teen meeting for next week, and bring this folder (with the completed journals) to your meeting!! Leann will come to your meeting and will exchange your completed journals for new topics, and a small surprise if both topics are complete. =)

Please finish the first topic before you open the second one. Also, please keep these materials together (if you lose the pen, you don’t get a new one)!

If you have any questions, please give me a call, Leann, 607-5128.

Thank you!!

(Please remember the agreement that you signed about participating to the best of your abilities).
Appendix H

Week Two Journal Assignments
Week 2

Topic 3:
Each person in the world acts in certain ways. Last week, I chose to watch television instead of doing my homework. Obviously, that wasn’t the best choice because my homework was due the next day and I didn’t get it done. When my mother asked me why I didn’t turn my homework in, I told her it was because it was too hard and I didn’t have time to finish it.

What I didn’t tell my mom was that I chose to watch television instead of finishing my homework. So when my mom asked what happened, I didn’t take responsibility for my actions (I didn’t tell her what I really did, I made up an excuse). Each of us has the option to take responsibility for our actions. We each have an option to choose what we will do.

Just like we each have the ability to choose what action to take, we also each have the ability to choose what attitude we will have.

With this in mind, please write about each of the following topics.

1) Choose one of your actions from the adventure course or an attitude that you had while you were on the course. Did you choose to do that action or have that attitude? Or did it come naturally, without you thinking about it?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

(Please continue to the next page)
2) Now that you are given the option to take responsibility for that action or attitude, are you happy with what you did or felt?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

If you could change that action or attitude, what would it have been? (What would you have done differently during the day at the adventure course?)

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
NAME: ____________________________

**Topic 4**: At the course you were placed in a group with other students who you might not have known very well at first. With this in mind, write about the following:

1) Describe your initial, or beginning, thoughts and feelings about your group.

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

2) How did your thoughts and feelings change after working with that group for the day?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

3) After observing how you worked with other people at the course, how can you relate that to how you work with your classmates or your friends? Do you take the role of the leader? Or are you a follower? (Give specific examples).

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

(Please continue to the next page)
4) Would you like to change anything about how you act in group situations in order to make it better for you (or to make it more successful)? What would you do? (Be specific!)

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________
Appendix I

Description Read to Participants
Hi. My name is Leann Terry, and I’m here today to ask for your help with a project that I’m doing. I’m a senior at Scripps College in Claremont, and since it is my last year in college, I am conducting some research on what are called adventure courses. So you are probably wondering, “what are adventure courses”? Well, adventure courses are one-day events for groups of 20-30 people which take place in the outdoors. At the course that I am organizing, which is being run by The Boojum Institute, a professional outdoor institution which will run the course which will take place outdoors in Joshua Tree National Park each group will participate in adventure-based games. Additionally, during the afternoon of the course the focus will be on the individual through the use of rock climbing. Not only are these activities fun, but they help to build teamwork, leadership skills, and encourage personal growth in the participants. What I need your help for, is to be those participants! I need 80 6th, 7th and 8th grade girls from the YWCA West End to be involved in my research by going on a adventure course and then possibly doing some journaling afterwards. This journaling will involve writing on an assigned topic twice a week for 3 weeks and then turning that writing in. In addition, each person who goes on the challenge course will fill out a 30-question survey both before the course, and several times afterwards. That way, for my research, I can measure how your experiences on the course affect you. So, not only does this really help me out for my research project, but it provides a great opportunity for you to have fun, challenge yourself in a new way, and hopefully learn something new about your selves.

So, if you think this sounds like something you are really interested in, I’m going to pass around something for you to take home which give some more information about the project, and information about a meeting for you and your parent or guardian to come to. At the meeting I’ll be able to explain the course, journaling, and surveys in more detail, and if you are interested in participating, there will be forms for both you and your parent or guardian to sign. There will also be some food and drinks at the meeting, so you can just come to eat and drink a little, even if you aren’t sure if you want to do it.

**Are there any questions?** Great. **Now I’ll pass around the packet with more information, and I hope to see a lot of you at the meeting. Thanks for your time.**
Appendix J

Second Study Introduction Letter
March 16, 2002

I’d like to thank you for your participation in my senior thesis project on the effects of adventure courses. Your cooperation has been what has made it all possible.

I would now like to invite your daughter to participate in the second and final phase of this project, a 20-minute interview. I would like to do follow-up interviews with all of the participants to be able to talk to them one on one and find out what they gained from their participation on the adventure course. I’m particularly interested on whether culture and ethnicity played a role in shaping your daughter’s experience.

To accomplish this phase of my project, I’d like to meet with your daughter for 20-minutes during one of her Y-Teen meetings in the next couple of weeks. The interview would take place right outside of the Y-Teen classroom, and after it is complete your daughter will be given a small thank you present for her participation. The interview itself would be very informal- there are no right or wrong answers- I’m simply interested in her thoughts and feelings about her experiences at the course.

This is a very important phase of my project, and I hope it will work out for your daughter to participate. If you are both interested in this, please complete the orange permission form and send it back to me by March 21th, 2002 (the duplicate permission form is for your records).

If you have any questions, please don’t hesitate to call me: (909) 607-5128.

Thank you for your time!

Leann Terry
Scripps College
Quisiera decir gracias por sus participaciones en mi proyecto sobre los efectos del curso de aventura. Su cooperación ha sido que me ayudé hacer todo de esto.

Ahora, me gustaría invitar su hija para participar en el segundo y final etapa de este proyecto, una entrevista por 20 minutos. Me gustaría hacer estas entrevistas, o conversaciones con todos los participantes del curso de aventura para hablar con ellas, y descubrir que obtengan desde su participación en el curso. Particularmente tengo interés para saber si había un efecto de cultura o ethncidad en la formación de las experiencias de su hija.

Para cumplir esta etapa de mi proyecto me gustaría hablar con su hija por 20 minutos durante uno de sus reuniones de Y-Teen en las próximas semanas. La conversación estará cerca del salon de clase de Y-Teen, y después su hija va a recibir un regalo pequeño para su participación. La conversación será muy informal- no hay respuestas correctas o incorrectas- solamente quiero saber sobre sus pensamientos y emociones sobre sus experiencias durante el curso de aventura.

Esta etapa de mi proyecto es muy importante, y ojalá que su hija pueda participar. Si tienen interés en esto, por favor, cumplir la forma naranja y enviarlome antes del 21 de marzo del 2002 (la otra forma es para ustedes).

Si tienen preguntas, por favor llamame: (909) 607-5128.

Gracias para su tiempo!

Leann Terry
Scripps College
Appendix K

Permission Form for Second Semester Study
Scripps College Participant Consent Form

I, a member of the Y-Teen Program of the YWCA West End, and my parent or legal guardian understand and agree to the following:

· We understand and agree that all participation in the interview is voluntary and I, as the student, may withdraw or terminate my participation at any time without penalty.

· We understand that the 20 minute interview will take place during the after school Y-Teen meeting and may be tape recorded.

· We understand that all information collected will be confidential, and will only been seen or heard by the researcher, Leann J. Terry, and her two supervisors: Dr. Sheila Walker, and Dr. Ann Renken, all of Scripps College. However, we understand that if information is given that demonstrates that the participant may be harmful to herself or others, or harmed by others, then the appropriate authorities will be notified.

· We understand that when this research is written-up, there will be no way to identify the individuals who participated. All data will be presented in group form or anonymously.

· We (I, as the student, and my parent or legal guardian) have read and understood the information presented to us, and are willing to participate in this phase of the adventure course project.

Student’s Name (please print):_______________________________________________
Student’s Signature: _______________________________________________________
Date: ____/____/_____

(NOTE: THE PARENT WHO SIGNED THE CONSENT FORMS IN NOVEMBER MUST BE THE ONE TO SIGN THIS FORM)

Parent or Legal Guardian’s Name (please print): ________________________________
Parent or Legal Guardian’s Signature: _________________________________________
Date: ____/____/_____

(Please choose the date that would be best for the interview.)

March _____          ________________  (Please write your name by
April _____          ________________  the date that works best for you.)

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Leann Terry (909) 607-5128, or her two advisors: Dr. Sheila Walker (909) 607-2908 or Dr. Ann Renken (909) 607-1846.
Forma de permiso para participacion por la universidad de Scripps

Soy, una miembra del programa de Y-Teen de la YWCA West End, y mi padre o custodio legal entendimos y estamos de acuerdo al siguiente:

· Entendimos y estamos de acuerdo que la participación en esta entrevista/conversación es voluntaria y que yo, como la estudiante, puedo decidir a terminar mi participación en cualquier momento sin daño.

· Entendimos que la entrevista/conversación estará durante la reunion de Y-Teen y estará grabado.

· Entendimos que la información será confidential y solamente será visto o oido por la investigadora, Leann J. Terry, y sus supervisoras: Dra. Sheila Walker y Dra. Ann Renken, de la universidad de Scripps. Aunque, entendimos que si información está compartido que demostrará que la participante tiene la posibilidad de estar daño a su misma o otras, o estaba dañado por otros, entonces los autoridades apropiados serán notificados.

· Entendimos que cuando esta papel de investigación está terminado, no había una manera de identificar los individuos quienes participados. Todo la información serán presentado en formas de grupo o de manera anónima.

· Nosotros (yo, como la estudiante y mi padre o custodio legal) han leído y entendido la información, y tengamos ganas de participar en esta etapa del proyecto de adventure.

Nombre de la Estudiante (por favor escribir): _______________________________________
Firma de la estudiante : _______________________________________________________
Fecha: ____/____/_____

(EL PADRE QUIEN FIRMADO LAS FORMAS EN NOVIEMBRE DEBE FIRMAR ESTA FORMA DE PERMISO)

Nombre de Padre o custodio legal (por favor escribir): _______________________________________
Firma de Padre o custodio legal: _______________________________________________________
Fecha: ___/___/_____

(Por favor escoge la fecha que será mejor para la entrevista.)

marzo ______ ______________________
abril ______ ______________________ (Por favor escriba su nombre acerca de la fecha que está mejor.)

Appendix L

Interview Questions
Interview Questions

Instructions to participants: I’m going to ask you a series of questions about your experiences before, during, and after the course, finally some questions about you. After I ask each question, take some time to think about it if you need to. I’m not looking for any particular answers, there are no right or wrong answers. What I really want to know is what is “true” for you. What is “true” for you might not be the same as what your friends feel, and that’s completely ok. I’d like for you to be honest in your answers . . . try not to think about what I want to hear, but rather, what you really felt and experienced. I know what I get out of adventure courses, but I’m really interested in what you got out of it and how it affected you.

You are welcome to pass on any question, and not answer it if it makes you feel uncomfortable. You are also free to stop the interview at any time and return back to the Y-Teen meeting without any penalty.

Do you give me permission to tape record the interview so I don’t have to be taking notes the whole time?

Do you have any questions before we begin?

Area 1: Impressions Prior to Course

1. What first got you interested in wanting to sign up for this project and attend the adventure course?

2. What did you think the adventure course would be like? Did you have any ideas about what to expect?

3. What were your feelings about going on the adventure course before you were actually there?

4. What were your wilderness/outdoor experiences before you went on the course?

Area 2: Thoughts about the Course

1. Describe your experiences on the course. What do you remember?

2. Do you think anything held you back from participating fully on the course? Can you describe it?

3. How were your experiences with the group that you were with? Describe how the group functioned.

4. What were your impressions of the leaders?

5. Do you think you experienced the course differently from other students who were there?
Area 3: Meanings given to their Experiences

1. Now that you have told me about the factual information that you remember about the course, I’d like you to take a few minutes to think about what you got from the course. That is, did you learn anything from the course? What did it mean to you? How do you think it affected you? Once you have taken some time thinking, go ahead and share what you want to.

2. What did you feel at the end of the day after your experiences on the course?

3. Do you think the course changed you in any way? If so, how?

4. Was there something that you didn’t like about the course, something that you thought should have been done differently?

5. Did you tell your family about the course? What did you share with them?

6. What happened when you returned to school the next Monday? Did you share with your friends? How was that?

7. Is there anything else that you’d like to share with me that I didn’t ask about?

Area 4: Demographic and Ethnic Information

1. As I mentioned in the letter that I sent home to you and your parent, I am interested in the cultural perspective and meanings given to the adventure course experience. Before I ask you about that, I’d first like to ask you about your race and ethnicity. What is your race or ethnicity?

2. Something that is often associated with race and ethnicity is culture. Culture can be defined as someone’s values, beliefs, and languages. What culture would you say you identify with? Why? (What language do you speak at home?)

3. Finally, were you born in the US? (If not, when did you move here?) Were your parents born in the US? How about your grandparents?

Debriefing: Thank you for your participation in this interview. I really appreciate the time that you have spent sharing with me. Do you have any final questions or comments?