Portland State University

PDXScholar

Dissertations and Theses

Dissertations and Theses

6-1-1972

A study of the characteristics of runaways and their families in two social agencies

Susan G. Greer

Portland State University

Sarah J. Hertlein

Stephen C. Regner

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Greer, Susan G.; Hertlein, Sarah J.; and Regner, Stephen C., "A study of the characteristics of runaways and their families in two social agencies" (1972). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 734.

<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.734>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

(A STUDY OF THE CHARACTERISTICS OF RUNAWAYS AND
THEIR FAMILIES IN TWO SOCIAL AGENCIES)

by

SUSAN G. GREER

SARAH J. HERTLEIN

STEPHEN C. REGNER

A report submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF
SOCIAL WORK

Portland State University
1972

TO THE OFFICE OF GRADUATE STUDIES:

The members of the Committee approve the practicum of Susan
G. Greer, et al, presented June 7, 1972.

L. Jay Conrad, Chairman

Dr. Quentin D. Clarkson

Terry Jones

APPROVED:

Dr. Gordon Hearn, Dean of the School of Social Work

June 7, 1972

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research group wishes to acknowledge the following individuals:

Mr. L. Jay Conrad, the Practicum Chairman, who provided a great deal of guidance and insight toward the completion of this research study. His time and support are greatly appreciated.

Mr. Quentin Clarkson, Associate Professor, who extended himself to the research group as a consultant throughout the entire study.

Mr. Terry Jones, Director of Contact Center Runaway Program, as well as the Runaway staff, who provided resource information in addition to their counseling cooperation in obtaining data.

Mr. Robert Dahl, Supervisor of Counseling Services of the Multnomah County Juvenile Court, and the participating intake and field counseling staff, without whose help we could not have completed this study.

Mr. Floyd Harmon, Cleveland High School, and Mr. Jack Ryan, Lincoln High School, for their assistance.

Ms. Carol Stone, our typist.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS	ix
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION	1
Purposes of the Study	
Questions to be Studied	
Definitions	
Delimitations	
II REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	8
III METHODOLOGY	25
Selection of Sample	
Preliminary Survey	
Final Survey	
Collection of Data	
Data Processing	
IV PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA FROM PRELIMINARY QUESTIONNAIRE	35
Variables	
Summary	
V PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA FROM FINAL SURVEY	66
Introduction	
Variables	
VI CONCLUSIONS	102
Results	
Impact for the Community	
Implications for Future Research	
FOOTNOTES	111

APPENDICES	115
A, B, C Preliminary Questionnaire	
D, E, F Final Questionnaire	
G Frequency Tabulation Tables of Independent Variable for Second Questionnaire	
BIBLIOGRAPHY	139

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I	Runaway Dispositions in Multnomah County Juvenile Court According to Residency--1970	29
II	Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Sex	67
III	Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Race	68
IV	Frequency and Means of Subjects' Ages	71
V	Frequency and Percentage Distribution of School Grade Levels	72
VI	Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Residing Area	73
VII	Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Marital Status of Natural Parents	75
VIII	Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Marital Status of Natural Parents--Married Compared to All Other Categories	76
IX	Length of Time Parents Have Been Separated or Divorced	77
X	Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Living Arrangement of Child Prior to Running Away	78
XI	Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Intact Family	80
XII	Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Person Having Legal Custody if Subject Not Living With Natural Parents	81

TABLE	PAGE
XIII Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Visitation With Absent Father	82
XIV Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Visitation With Absent Mother	83
XV Analysis of Variance: Subject's Feelings Toward Parents (or Institution) He Was Living With	84
XVI Analysis of Variance: How Subject Thinks Parent(s) Feel Toward Him	85
XVII Frequency Distribution of Total Number of Siblings and Percentage Distribution of Unnatural Siblings	86
XVIII Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Ordinal Positions	87
XIX Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Potential Treatment of Subject in Relation to Siblings	89
XX Analysis of Variance: How Subject Feels Parents Trust Him	90
XXI Analysis of Variance: Subject's Trust of Parents	91
XXII Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Adults With Whom Important Matters Are Discussed	92
XXIII Frequency and Percentage Distribution for How Long Subject Was on the Run	93
XXIV Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Previous Runaway Experiences	94
XXV Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Event That Precipitated Runaway	95

TABLE		PAGE
XXVI	Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Previous Juvenile Court Contacts	96
XXVII	Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Status Offense Referrals to Juvenile Court	98
XXVIII	Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Subject Having Been in Trouble at School	99
XXIX	Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Type of Trouble in School	100
XXX	How Subject Feels Toward School	101

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

FIGURE		PAGE
I	Total Monthly Referrals to Multnomah County Juvenile Court for <u>Runaway</u> in 1971	3
II	Percentage and Total Number of Runaway Referral to Juvenile Court for 1967-1971	3
III	Age Groupings of Juvenile Court and Contact Center Runaways in Preliminary Survey	38
IV	Age Groupings of Male and Female Runaways in Final Survey	70

"If there is anything that we wish to change
in the child, we should first examine it
and see whether it is not something that
could better be changed in ourselves."

C. G. Jung

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION
PURPOSES OF STUDY

Running away from home has always been a potential alternative for children who were unhappy, sought adventure, or simply wanted to test their ability to survive by themselves. Certainly adolescence is a critical period in one's life when considerable experimentation of new behavior takes place, usually culminating in a sense of identity for the young person. This identity is not achieved without considerable stress and anxiety, particularly for the child and his parents. Breaking the dependent ties between child and parents, and seeking a unique identity can be a painful, difficult experience for the young adult. The achievement of independence is further complicated by parents who do not understand the process, have much different values than their child, or still need the dependent relationship of their child. What this adolescent phenomenon results in is often times the young person deciding that running away is the answer, usually temporarily, but sometimes permanently. The incidence of this behavior has undergone significant change in the past few years.

In Oregon, running away is defined as a delinquent act and comes under the jurisdiction of the Juvenile Court. ORS 419.476 states:

Children within jurisdiction of juvenile court.
(1) The juvenile court has exclusive original jurisdiction in any case involving a person who is under 18 years of age and: . . . (f) who has run away from his home.

Currently, the Juvenile Code Revision Committee in Oregon is considering placing runaway acts in a separate category from delinquency. If this policy were adopted, new treatment alternatives will need to be developed to adequately handle this enormous number of non-delinquent referrals. In 1971, about 24% of the delinquency referrals to Multnomah County Juvenile Court were for runaway (See Fig. I).

This represents the most frequent delinquent referral to the court, and moreover signifies a tremendous social problem. In the last five years, running away has increased about ^{7%} in proportion to the total delinquency referrals to the court. (See Fig. II). Thus the evidence seems clear that this pattern of behavior is becoming increasingly frequent. Widespread publicity has been received about runaway rates soaring throughout the nation. Public reaction has been largely punitive and fearful of the potential involvement of runaways in drugs, theft, truancy, and sexual promiscuity. Because of the relative uniqueness of the runaway experience as it now exists, minimal current research information is available. It was our feeling that knowledge about runaways, their families, and the social agencies which serve them is essential if significant prevention and treatment for the problem were to be implemented by the community.

The purpose and scope of this exploratory research was essentially two-fold; to contribute descriptive information about runaway youth and their families to the community, and to evaluate the current populations of two agencies which service them. An underlying goal throughout the research was to utilize the data collected to identify trends in runaway behavior, increase the potential for predictability, and provide some real insight into prevention techniques. Our informal

Figure I

Figure I reflects total monthly referrals to Multnomah County Juvenile Court for Runaway in 1971

Figure II

Figure II reflects the percentage of Runaway referrals out of delinquency referrals and the total number of each group for years 1967-1971

Delinquency Referrals

Runaway Referrals

hypothesis was that there is a significant difference in specific variables between runaway and non-runaway populations. We were interested in developing a typology of runaways, identifying those factors which increase a child's probability that he/she will run away. Finally, we wanted to know if different agencies tend to serve a particular kind of runaway who has specific characteristics. These constituted the major goals for this research practicum.

Since most law enforcement and social service energy is spent at the point of crisis, this research sought to identify trends in the scope of the problem which would aid preventative services for runaways. Hopefully, the impact of this practicum will influence crucial issues in terms of family dynamics, treatment intervention, community resources, and delinquency prevention. The results of this study will be distributed to the participating agencies and other interested segments of the community. Probably more detailed hypothesis testing will be needed; however, this study forms a base of information for future research. Better assessment of meeting the problem by evaluating all existing services should be a continuing focus for the social service community.

QUESTIONS TO BE STUDIED

Essentially, there were three basic questions which we hoped to answer from this research. They were as follows:

1. Are there significant differences between runaways and their family characteristics vs. non-runaways and their family characteristics? The specific variables used for this question were personal-demographic data, family composition, attitudes toward family and

school, parental attitudes toward runaway and non-runaway, and reported delinquency.

2. Are there significant differences between the characteristics of runaways and their families who are referred to Multnomah County Juvenile Court and the characteristics of runaways and their families who seek help from Contact Center? The same variables used in Question #1 were used in this question.

3. Are there significant differences between chronic runaways and their family characteristics vs. non-chronic runaways and their family characteristics? Again, the same variables used in Question #1 were used in this question.

These three questions determined the research design for analysis of the data and the specific content of the questionnaires. Each question on the final survey was given statistical analysis to identify significant differences in terms of the above three questions.

DEFINITIONS

The following operational definitions were used in this research:

1. Runaway--a child between the ages of 12-18 who was referred to Juvenile Court for being a runaway, or was gone without parental permission for more than 24 hours.

2. Non-runaway--a child between the ages of 12-18 who identified himself on the questionnaire as never having run away from home.

3. Age--this was computed to the nearest year on the final survey.

4. Chronic runaway--a runaway who identified himself as having run away 3-9 times before.

5. Non-chronic runaway--a runaway who identified himself as having run away 0-2 times before.
6. Intact Family--a family composed of at least one natural parent and one step-parent if the other natural parent is gone.
7. Status offense--a delinquent act such as runaway, truancy, curfew, and drinking which are not criminal acts for an adult.
8. Portland Area--the geographical area of Washington, Clackamas, and Multnomah counties.
9. Significant difference--a statistical difference which results in a .05 level of probability.

DELIMITATIONS

Perhaps the most difficult research to perform in the social sciences is longitudinal follow-up--a limiting factor of this research practicum. Primarily because of time limitations we could not follow our runaway population after they received service from the agencies studied. This type of information is crucial; further evaluative research needs to be done on agencies serving the runaway population. Also, treatment and dispositional information is only available on the preliminary survey. Due to the design of the final survey, we could not receive data related to the treatment and disposition. Comprehensive research needs to be done on this component of runaway services.

Another obvious problem with this research design is that only runaways who came in contact with Juvenile Court and Contact Center were studied. Certainly there are many runaways who never seek help from social service agencies or who have no contact with the juvenile

justice system. What proportion of the total runaway population these agencies are actually seeing is only speculation at this point in runaway knowledge. It is entirely possible that the undetected runaway population may have unique characteristics from our sampling. A final limitation of this research is the lack of any personality assessment for the runaway and non-runaway groups. Some people have suggested emotional instability causes certain kids to run away from home. No data in this practicum can adequately answer this theory of causation. Only further exploration will solve these unanswered questions.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Youth who run away from home are a common phenomenon in our current society. In the Washington, D.C. area alone, there are now 10,000 runaway youths per year.¹ In the Portland, Oregon area, the Multnomah County Juvenile Court recorded 1,965 runaways in 1971.² Children and adolescents leaving home of their own accord is something that has always occurred. However, studies concerning this phenomenon in the U.S. have mostly taken place since the 1920's. From this time to the present, many reasons have been suggested for why children run away. George Outland in 1938 predicted that the causes of running away would change:

As general conditions improve, the basic economic and social reasons for boys leaving home will be modified, the spirit of adventure will be sublimated into other channels, and transiency will tend to become more and more the wandering of the maladjusted.³

Many of the current writers on the subject would disagree with this prediction which tends to emphasize the social and economic influence on running away. The primary purpose of most of the articles and texts to be reviewed was to discover the factors suggested as causes of adolescent running away. For this reason, organization of this section will be centered basically on those significant factors suggested as causes of youth who run away. At the time when the above statement by Outland was written, this country was just beginning to recover from the influence of the Depression. As with other runaway

studies conducted during this decade, Outland's research focused on the economic determinants of human behavior. His study, covering the period of one year--from 1934 to 1935--dealt with the transient experiences of 3300 boys who had registered with the Los Angeles bureau of the Federal Transient Service. His data consisted of verified information from the social agencies with which each of these boys had been in contact. The author grouped the direct or immediate causes for the transiency under these general headings: economic (seeking employment, left home because of job loss, etc.), social (broken home, trouble with parents or step-parent, trouble with the law, etc.), adventure, reason connected with the army, personality defect, educational, and miscellaneous. Of the sample group, 86.7 per cent left home because of one or a combination of the first three causes--economic, social, and adventure. The primary reason for a boy leaving home was found to be economic problems: "More than 30 per cent of the families represented were active relief cases at the time the boy left home, and an additional 5 per cent had no member of the family working."⁴

Another study of this same period, Boy and Girl Tramps, by Thomas Minehan (1934),⁵ closely resembled Outland's study. The author, from interviews with children who were on the road during the Depression years, found that 387 of the 466 boys and girls he talked to stated definitely that hard times drove them away from home. In addition to economic hardships, Minehan also included dislike of school, trouble with parents or step-parents, a desire to see the country, and the rather vague factor of "the difficulties and desires of adolescence" as other factors influencing children to leave home.

August Aichhorn, however, took another view of transient children. In his book, Wayward Youth, (1935)⁶, he does not see transiency as a phenomenon resulting mainly from economic circumstances. Instead, he includes running away with truancy and stealing and lists all three as symptoms of delinquency, like the symptoms of a disease. He states that these symptoms are "the result of psychic forces which found no socially acceptable outlet and therefore forced him [the youth] to misbehavior which was at odds with society."⁷ He also distinguishes between manifest and latent delinquency:

The boy who plays truant, runs away, or steals is manifestly delinquent; the boy in whom these experiences lie dormant is in the stage of latent delinquency. Suitable circumstances only are needed to turn latent into manifest delinquency.⁸

A fourth, quite dissimilar view of runaway children was written during the period of the Depression by Douglas A. Thom (1932).⁹ This author did not consider running away either as a result of economic hardship or as a symptom of delinquency, but instead as a natural phenomenon of youth:

Every year, innumerable children "run away" for no outstanding reason. They are pushed on by the spirit of wanderlust that urges the more venturesome to seek new scenes, new faces, new experiences, and real adventure. Their running away is in no way an indication that their homes are bad or their parents unjust, or that they themselves are suffering from any particular conflict in life; it is simply an indication that they belong to that group of human being who are more concerned with having new experiences than they are with enjoying a quiet security.¹⁰

From this statement, one would gather that the only determinant within the adolescent of running away is a spirit of adventure. Other studies by psychoanalytic authors, however, have shown that there is often important psychological determinants involved in running away. Three

of these studies suggest that the prime cause of adolescents running away from home is an attempt to escape a supposed or a realistic incestuous relationship.

Amos Robey, et al (1964)¹¹ in a clinical setting studied 42 teenage girls who had been referred for running away. Contacts involved one interview with the parents and at least three interviews with the subject, although treatment in some cases continued as long as two years. From these contact as well as from a review of the family's history, a pattern emerged concerning the family relationships of these girls. Significant factors in this pattern included a disturbed marital relationship, inadequate control by the parents over their own and their daughters' impulses, and a love-depriving mother who subtly pushed her daughter to assume the maternal role. These authors regarded running away by an adolescent as more than a "childish escapade." They felt it was indicative of either severe individual or family pathology, resulting from a variety of intolerable conditions within the home. The authors, therefore, conclude: "The cause most frequently observed in this study was the unconscious threat of an incestuous relationship with the father, the fear of the resultant dissolution of the family and the concurrent depression."¹²

Another article by Dorothy Wylie and Joseph Weinreb (1953)¹³ also establishes an incestuous relationship as the principle cause for teenage girls running away. The authors use a case example to demonstrate how treatment of the mother successfully alleviates the Oedipal conflict. It was found that this treatment of the mother, which centers on helping her recognize her own feelings regarding

the family relationships, is more appropriate than direct therapy of the runaway girl.

Fear of an incestuous relationship is also reported as a factor in male runaways. Frederick Rosenheim (1940)¹⁴ uses three case studies to show that male adolescents run away to escape the Oedipal conflict. Dr. Rosenheim concludes: "The running away is self-banishment. . . The boy cannot stay at home because of his own violent hatred, guilt and fear."¹⁵

Because of the emotional problems facing adolescents, Herbert Staub (1943)¹⁶ advocates that runaways should not be treated as criminals. His detailed case history of a runaway adolescent boy showed that his motives for running away came from unresolved conflicts in childhood involving his parents. The adolescent was at the point where he was still testing his parents and searching for the "good" parent. This conflict was exhibited by his running away.

An adolescent's home situation and particularly his relationship with his parents has been identified as a significant area in which friction may cause the adolescent to run away. In contrast to the previous discussion, the following studies do not specify that these parent-child conflicts stem from an underlying Oedipal wish. Lawson Lowrey¹⁷ over a five-year period from 1935 through 1939 studied 2,756 runaways who had been given service by the Travelers' Aid Society. The average age of the boys in this investigation was 16, while that of the girls was 17; it was found that boys pre-dominated at the earlier ages and girls at the later ages, yet the proportion of runaway males was greater for the total group. Although the specific method of obtaining his data is not cited by the author, he stated

that the main reasons for running away centered around the parent-child and sibling relationships. There was often either open hostility in these relationships or a feeling of rejection experienced by the runaway. This feeling of rejection resulted either from parents who were over-protective or else psychologically neglecting of the child. Lowrey did not feel that the running away by the adolescent was particularly pathological; to the contrary he stated: "In many instances running away seems to be a healthy mode of response to an intolerable situation."¹⁸ A further comment by Lowrey regarding this phenomenon asserted:

. . . running away is not necessarily a complex psychopathological phenomenon, but represents in the great majority of cases a simple and primitive reaction to an uncomfortable situation, the details of which are not necessarily understood either by the individual or by those in the environment.¹⁹

Leo Kanner (1950)²⁰ agrees with the supposition that a runaway is responding to the home situation and also points out the significance of leaving home even to a child who has yet to attempt it:

The common, usually short-lived, escapades are immediate responses to situations evoking acute fear, anger, or spite. . . In the fantasies of unhappy children who feel neglected, unwanted, or unloved, the idea of going away often plays a considerable role as a daydream which may never be enacted. They may spin dramatic yarns around this preoccupation and, if the situation seems to become intolerable, they may actually run away.²¹

The view of running away as resulting from the unmet needs of the child was put forth by Morris Reimer (1940): "The dominant perseverance and tenacity in the act of getting away suggest urgent needs which the child is striving to gratify."²² In the clinical treatment of runaway children, Reimer found that those he dealt with

differed somewhat from adolescent runaways. The younger children usually exhibited extreme swings between unprovoked assaultive behavior and over-obedient behavior. In looking at the histories of these children, a common element of an early, extremely traumatic experience appeared:

Cruel treatment in the first years of childhood at the hands of psychotic or alcoholic parents and other terrorizing influences, such as constant fighting of parents, severe physical trauma in the form of repeated accidents or starvation, poverty or death of one or both parents, or separation of the parents, are prominent in the milieu of these children.²³

Reimer's explanation of the psychodynamics involved in such families shows parents who are unable to offer spontaneous affection to their children. To counteract all the underlying needs that are not met by his parents, the child, in turn, builds a strong system of defenses by which he denies any helplessness. These defenses are exhibited in strong negative attitudes. Reimer explains:

From a practical standpoint, the compensating reactions of the child only serve to drive him "more and more with his back against the wall," until compelled to run away from the unyielding environment and seek to satisfy that which urges him on, i.e., the need for security. The child hopes to find a new parent, one who will support and love him.²⁴

Because of his narcissistic needs, the child has little energy to invest in interpersonal relationships--he is thwarting his own needs even while he is attempting to satisfy them. This circumstance creates two polarities: the need for love and the need for hostile aggression. From his experience with this particular group of runaways, the author reached the following conclusions: 1) a basic factor of these children was the lack of parental love, which resulted from mismatched, mentally

ill, or inadequately adjusted parents, and 2) the symptoms of these runaway children resulted from the unmet needs for love, for hostile aggression, and for increased self-esteem.²⁵

Randall Foster (1962)²⁶ studied the parent-child relationship and its influence on juvenile delinquents, including those who had and those who had not run away. His sample of 175 consisted of children referred by a juvenile court to a psychiatric clinic for treatment. The runaway sample contained an equal number of boys and girls, though the incidence of running away for girls was found to be 64.2 per cent, while it was 34.7 per cent for boys. Two groups, one of 100 runaways and another of 75 nonrunaways, were established and all subjects were seen in a diagnostic psychiatric interview. From these interviews, three areas of information were gathered: 1) demographic information, 2) information concerning the parent-child relationship, and 3) information concerning the runaway activity of the experimental group.

The author concluded from this study that there was a greater incidence of parent-child separations for the runaways as compared with the nonrunaways. This separation usually was from the father and occurred before the child was five; a reunion between the parent and child usually did not take place. There was more often a step- or adoptive parent in the family of the runaway delinquent than that of the nonrunaway. These families also exhibited more physical aggression and open sexual activity in the home; they tended to be more mobile than the families of the nonrunaway group. The parents of the runaway child were found to show open rejection of the child. Of the runaway children themselves, there was a limited ability to express their aggressive impulses in socially acceptable ways. Truancy

was twice as frequent in the runaway group. Punishment from or arguments with parents was the main reason given for why these children ran away. From these results, the author suggests:

It is apparent from the data presented here that the loss of a parent or the presence of a substitute parent is not in itself sufficient to determine this symptom. Nor is an intact family a guarantee that a child will not run away. These disturbances in family structure rather appear to interact with other factors, such as the degree of parental rejection and the extent of overt aggression or sexual promiscuity in the home, in the formation of this symptom.²⁷

Theodore Leventhal (1964)²⁸, in analyzing the psychodynamics of runaways, emphasized the difference in the degree of "inner control" by runaways as compared to nonrunaways. His study involved an experimental group of 42 runaways and an equal group of nonrunaways. Through diagnostic interview data, Leventhal studied the manifestations of uncontrol in both groups of adolescents and developed a scale for rating it. His criteria for uncontrol were: 1) discharge-type behavior, such as temper tantrums, impulsivity, and enuresis, 2) deficient mechanisms that usually regulate behavior--examples of this being poor judgment and insufficiencies in cognition and mobility, and 3) a self-image of being helpless and unable to control.²⁹ Results showed that runaways manifested more uncontrol in each of these areas than did nonrunaways; some behavior and personality traits that expressed this greater uncontrol included demanding behavior, envy, orality, stealing, truancy, irresponsibility about time, suspiciousness and poor physical coordination. Further significant points included the fact that one-third of the runaways in comparison to none of the nonrunaways, verbalized their lack of control and that in

extended therapeutic contacts with 16 runaways, their main concern was with having little or no control over their inner impulses as well as external events.³⁰ Leventhal concludes:

It would thus appear that runaways, as a group, experience in many areas and for many types of stimuli, poor control. . . The danger for them is of ego loss and it has been speculated that when such a threat becomes imminent, reactions of a gross, intense, and desperate nature may appear--e.g., running away.³¹

Differences within the runaway population were also significant:

. . . runaways referred by police and other correctional agencies have lower uncontrol ratings than ones where parents refer themselves or are referred by nonpunitive agencies. . . Contrary to what might have been expected, the police referrals seem to have less difficulty with control than the other runaways.³²

A specific type of runaway--the runaway foster child--is considered by Joseph Paull (1956)³³. He notes that the dynamics of such a child are different from one who is in his own home. The reason for foster children running away, he suggests, is because of their inability to accept a substitute home and substitute parents.

A study conducted by Lawrence Bradshaw, et al, (1969)³⁴ in Salt Lake County, Utah, showed that 30 percent of all referrals to the juvenile court in that county were for running away. From a sample group of 80 taken from these runaway referrals, it was found that 60 percent had a previous record at the juvenile court. Events precipitating the running away usually fell in three areas: trouble with parents or foster parents, trouble at school, or trouble with relatives. Seventy-five percent of the time problems in the home was the reason for running away. Although a vast majority of the sample (85%) said they ran away because of a personal problem they had for six months or longer, sixty-three percent felt they had not been helped in resolving

these problems.

There are several studies concerning runaways that propose that runaway behavior can be used as a predictive tool of delinquency. One of these is James Hildebrand's study (1963)³⁵ in which he asserts that runaways for the most part represent youth who have a problem, but in most cases have not developed a definite anti-social attitude. The author feels that such behavior has great significance in terms of further acting out and should be recognized as a danger signal in attempts to control crime. This study involved 262 runaway cases reported to police in a section of Brooklyn, New York, and was concerned with investigating four areas: age distribution, recidivist patterns, length of time away from home, and motivation for leaving. It was found that in this study the frequency of boys to girls running away was equal. It was also found that boys run away at a younger age and that this behavior peaks at age 14 to 15; for girls the rate of running away increased until age 17. The recidivist rate showed that boys repeatedly ran away at a younger age, usually around 12, while girl repeaters increased as their age increased. Until age 12, most runaways stayed away from home for one day or less; the length of time away increased as the runaway's age increased.

Motivation for running away was found to be the most difficult factor to determine. Rather than one isolated cause, there were exhibited a variety of factors that interacted to cause the running away. The most influential of these was a poor home environment--a large part of which was lack of family discipline. A second factor was school; difficulties in this area were exhibited by truancy, poor grades, and misconduct. The author notes that in most cases of

runaways, their parents expressed complete ignorance as to why their children ran away. If they did affix blame, it was to the school or the neighbor's children. Hildebrand concludes that running away is a strong indicator of problems within the family and as such should prompt intervention to solve the problems before they are acted out in criminal behavior.

A study by Ivan Nye and James Short (1957)³⁶ also designates running away as a behavior that implies future delinquency. With a total sample of 2,350, these investigators attempted to develop a delinquency scale. The sample population included normal high school students from two sections of the country as well as residents at a boys' training school. They constructed an initial list of 21 items of criminal and anti-social behavior. Running away was found to be the first item on the scale that occurred in less than 10 percent of the high school population, while it occurred in 61 percent of the training school population. Running away, then, formed the cutting off point between these two populations and appeared to be a significant behavior problem that was highly related to serious delinquent behavior in boys.

In a 30-year follow-up study, Lee Robins (1958)³⁷ investigated the psychiatric status of 179 male patients who were seen at a child guidance clinic as children and interviewed 30 years later. Of the 179 sample, 56 had a history of running away from home. The other male patients had childhood problems that did not include running away. Based on the Nye and Short study, the author makes the following statement: "Running away was chosen as the behavior problem to study because it promised to select a group with a serious degree of anti-social behavior in childhood."³⁸ Results showed that in comparison

to normal control subjects and to the male patients who did not run away as children, the adult who had run away as a child had a higher rate of psychiatric illness. Those who had been runaways also had a higher incidence of delinquency and reformatory experience. In comparing runaways to nonrunaways according to juvenile offenses, runaways again showed a higher rate of psychiatric illness. Robins, therefore, points out that runaway behavior is predictive of later mental illness even when the high rate of delinquency and reformatory experience is taken into account.

A joint report of Robins and Patricia O'Neal (1959)³⁹ continued to study the rate of adult deviance among mental patients who had run away as children as compared to those patients who had not. The sample of 246 patients included 96 patients with a runaway history. The criteria for measuring the patients' adult deviance were 1) arrest and prison records, 2) divorce rates, and 3) current psychiatric diagnosis. Findings from this study showed that those with a history of running away had more adult arrests and were incarcerated more often than those who had not run away; over half of the runaway subjects had been divorced at one time. In terms of psychiatric diagnosis, the runaway patients were most often diagnosed sociopathic personality, a diagnosis characterized by continuing anti-social behavior. The authors conclude:

. . . while running away does not predict adult adjustment when juvenile offense history is controlled, taken as a single index of adult adjustment, it is an excellent prognostic tool. Therefore, it would be useful in making predictions about the future of children for whom running away is a first offense, before the total juvenile offense pattern has unfolded.⁴⁰

In an intensive study of runaways by Robert Shellow, et. al,

(1967)⁴¹, the authors comment on previous studies that have attempted to designate running away either as an act of delinquency or as a result of personal psychopathology. They feel that this either/or position results from the type of agency from which the experimental group was selected. Whether the agency involved was a correctional institution, a mental health facility, or welfare services influenced the outcome of the research. In order to eliminate this bias in their study, the researchers chose a sample from a more general group--776 youths reported missing to the police over the period of one year. To further prevent bias, they made the contacts themselves with the youth and their parents rather than through police personnel. A summary concerning the runaway activity of these youth shows that they traveled a short distance, rarely getting beyond their own metropolitan area, stayed away only briefly (in two-thirds of the cases, the episode had ended within 48 hours), and returned frequently of their own volition. There was an equal number of cases in which children ran away alone or ran with companions; perhaps because of the dating situation, the researchers found that girls were somewhat more likely to run away with someone else.

Other factors of the runaways included a socioeconomic and educational background of their parents that was compatible with the general community in which they lived, but a greater proportion had broken homes than did nonrunaways. Two-thirds of the parents of the runaways stated that their children experienced trouble in school. A student questionnaire to a control group, however, showed the same proportion listing problems in school. The significance may have been in the

degree of these difficulties: ". . . school records show that runaways, in contrast to other adolescents, were absent more often, had lower grades, and were more likely to have been retained."⁴²

Those adolescents who had not run away were asked if they had ever seriously considered doing so. Of these, one out of three said yes. The authors caution, therefore, that it may be difficult to designate clear-cut differences between runaways and nonrunaways since a deciding factor may be the immediate circumstances of the adolescent which causes him to run away.

The authors did feel that from the data they gathered this runaway population could be separated into two groups. They state that the first group ". . . was a relatively small group for whom running away was intimately bound up with individual or family pathology."⁴³ The second group which was much larger included some repeaters, but mainly those who had run away only once. This group, although showing some differences, more closely resembled the nonrunaway group rather than the seriously disturbed of the first group. A recommendation from this study states that when planning treatment for runaway adolescents, both groups should be kept in mind--the first group being treated for the severity of their problem and the second group in ways similar to normally troubled adolescents.

In Larry Begg's Huckleberry's for Runaways (1969)⁴⁴, he cites as the primary reason for running away the adolescent's attempt to draw attention to the home situation; it is a plea for help. He further explains that what motivated the runaway is usually a family problem rather than just a personal problem. By running away, the adolescent challenges his parents' and the school's assumption that everything

is alright. In order to help parents and runaways work on the problems, intervention (as well as shelter for the runaway) is provided by the staff of this runaway house in San Francisco.

Another example of the same type of intervention is offered at Runaway House in Washington, D.C. In dealing with a portion of the 10,000 yearly runaways in this area, David Riley (1971)⁴⁵ found that an outstanding characteristic of these children was the high rate of family mobility. The author of this article feels that running away is basically a middle-class phenomenon. The runaways whom he serves usually left home because of fights or misunderstandings concerning their friends, the clothes they wear, or the style of their hair. Riley pursues underlying reasons, however, and asserts that the suburban syndrome is a life style that brings about many ill effects:

If we are to understand why our kids are running away and what they are running from, we will have to think about a lot more than just family problems, tortured and complex as they are. We will have to look at the status rat race of fancy cars and manicured lawns and we will have to create communities that break down the isolation felt by so many parents and children. We have to encourage human contact and warmth between families, as well as within them. We will probably have to transform the whole American ethos.⁴⁶

Two other articles in the popular press⁴⁷ are concerned with law enforcement contacts with runaways in metropolitan areas. Both articles point to a lack of parental guidance or inadequate values in the home as forces which push adolescents to seek another life style. These runaways, then, are viewed as leaving home in search of something, while several of the previous studies have suggested that running away is a temporary plan with the adolescent that he hopes will focus attention and perhaps change his home situation.

A summary of the studies reviewed shows that a variety of reasons have been cited for adolescents running away; some of these are incestuous threats, poor relationships within the family, the hope of drawing attention to troubles at home, a natural reaction to an uncomfortable situation, and a spirit of adventure. As the runaway studies have occurred since the 1920's and 30's to the present, the causes stated for running away have shifted from being primarily designated as economic to reasons with a more social and psychological emphasis. The more current literature shows that problems within the family are more often the cause of running away rather than the individual pathology of the adolescent. In terms of methodology employed in these studies, it appears that in the majority of instances data was either obtained through interviews with the runaway or from case histories from psychiatric clinics or other social service agencies. An important use of the runaway data for predicting future acting out behavior has been pointed out. That no one factor has been isolated as the prime determinant of running away appears quite evident from the material presented.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

SELECTION OF SAMPLE

Multnomah County Juvenile Court and Contact Center were selected to provide data from the runaway population because these agencies are two of the primary resources dealing with the runaway problem in the Portland Metropolitan Area. Furthermore, they represent a wide range of potential approaches to the runaway phenomena. Juvenile Court is representative of the traditional, law enforcement approach to handling delinquency, where the young offender is subject to detention, required counseling, and court intervention. Contact Center, on the other hand, represents the trend to more community-based social service to adolescents by young para-professionals. This new approach allows the young person more independence and operates in an advisory model, rather than a legalistic structure.

Multnomah County Juvenile Court is the major social agency handling runaways in the Portland area. Services include an intake section, a counseling section of about 30 staff, and a detention facility composed of three girls' units and four boys' units. Referrals come primarily from the police, with others coming from parents, schools, and other agencies. At the time of this research, a district office had been recently established in the Multi-Service Center in North Portland, with other district offices planned. Referrals to the court may be handled either formally or informally. The large majority of

runaway cases are handled informally; the disposition is usually warning and closing the case, or informal supervision. Some chronic runaways are required to have a formal hearing before a judge, and this results in formal probation or commitment to other institutions for some. Table II details the runaway referrals for the last five years, with 24% of the delinquency referrals for runaways in 1971.

Contact Center is a non-profit organization, known legally as the Portland Youth Advocates. Several members of the local community compose the P.Y.A. Board of Directors. Contact Center is located in the Koinonia House on the campus of Portland State University. Four programs comprise the Contact Center currently: the Drop-In Center/Street-work Program, Open Meadow (an alternative school), a Group Home for adolescents, and the Runaway Program. In July, 1971, the Runaway Program received funding from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration for counseling staff, a program director, and operational expenses to implement a treatment home for runaways. This crisis home, Out Front House, is located at 928 SE 18th. The runaway staff is a group of para-professionals with considerable experience in relating with adolescents. Prior to July, 1971, no formal data or records had been kept on the runaways which Contact was seeing. Thus there is no comparative data for earlier time periods. Referrals come primarily from the runaways themselves, either by phone or in person. No action is taken to help the runaway resolve the problem unless he/she wants Contact to intervene. This self-referral process and non-legalistic approach makes Contact Center a unique resource for runaways. Working agreements are established with Juvenile Courts and Children's Services Divisions in the Portland Metropolitan Area. Contact may work with

agencies which the runaway already has involvement, provide counseling and foster placement if needed, place in Out Front House for treatment, or simply give advice if the adolescent does not want formal help. Currently, the Runaway Program is seeing about 35 new runaway youths per month.

The non-runaway group was selected from Cleveland and Lincoln High schools on the preliminary survey, and only Cleveland High School on the final survey. It was felt that these two schools contained a good cross-section of adolescents in terms of race, socio-economic status, and family characteristics. Because of convenience, Lincoln was eliminated from the final survey without jeopardizing the cross-sectional sample significantly. Thus the control group for the final survey was comprised entirely of Cleveland High School students. Lincoln High School is located at 1600 S.W. Salmon in downtown Portland and has approximately 1,200 students. Cleveland High School is located at 3400 S.E. 26th and has approximately 1,875 students. Most high school students in grades 9-12 are from ages 14-18.

Preliminary Survey

In the sample of 25 from Contact Center, questionnaires were gathered from the time period of June 1 to September 15, 1971. In this 3-1/2 month time period, the majority of questionnaires received were used, with some being eliminated because of a lack of complete information, and not meeting our operational definition of runaway. Runaway counselors were instructed to administer the questionnaire as part of their intake session, but it was noted that some of the runaways completed the questionnaire themselves. It was felt that this inconsistency did not seriously affect the data. This population was

not a randomized sample, since most runaways for this time period were included.

The sample of 16 runaways from Juvenile Court was based on voluntary participation from 7 counselors, one of whom was based at the Multi-Service Center field office in North Portland. Only 6 of the original counselors actually provided questionnaires used in the sample, and the distribution of the 16 runaways was not proportionate to these 6 counselors. Although half of these 6 counselors were female and half were male, 75% of the runaways in this sample were handled by female counselors. Since girls are usually assigned to a female counselor, this affected the sex distribution of our runaway sample. Furthermore, these 16 runaways used in the sample were only a portion of the total runaway cases which the counselors had during the time period of July 1 to September 15, 1971. While we had projected about 49 runaways for 7 counselors in this time span, 56 were actually assigned to the selected counselors. Table I■ details the 1970 runaway referrals to the court, according to dispositional records and gives runaway data for the selected time period. A sample of at least 30 was advised to perform valid statistical tests. Needless to say, the projected sample fell considerably short of the goal. Counselors at the court are given cases by high school district; thus we had six districts represented. This population was not a random sample because of the uncontrolled exclusion of most runaways from the sample.

The sample of 45 non-runaway adolescents was surveyed in June, 1971, by the research group at Cleveland and Lincoln high schools.

TABLE I.
Runaway Dispositions in Multnomah County
Juvenile Court According to Residency
(1970)

Portland	714	
Multnomah County excluding Portland	<u>245</u>	
Total Multnomah County	959	959
Other Oregon counties		343
Out of State		332
Unknown		1
Temporary Welfare Commitment	<u>808</u>	
Other Geographical Areas	1484	<u>1484</u>
Total Runaway Dispositions		2443

(Since about 40% of the runaway dispositions were Multnomah County residents, we had projected that the total "in-county" runaways for 1971 would be about 800. Assuming small seasonal fluctuation in the number of referrals, it was anticipated that the counseling section would receive about 67 runaway referrals per/month. Each counselor at Juvenile Court should receive about two runaway referrals per/month for 1971.)

The students completed the questionnaire themselves, and forms were checked randomly as they were turned in. The sample was taken from English and Social Studies classes to be unbiased in terms of tract classes or interests and included 25 Freshman students and 20 Sophomores. All youths answering the question about prior running away as "Yes" were eliminated from the sample. Nearly half of the total questionnaires received were excluded because of prior running away or incomplete information. There were about twice as many girls in the total sample as there were boys; this tended to skew the sex distribution. This population was again not a random sample because of the uncontrolled exclusion of many students from the sample.

Final Survey

In the sample of 21 from Contact Center, questionnaires were gathered from the time period of December 1971 to February 1972. During this three month time period, many questionnaires had to be eliminated because of incomplete information. Runaway counselors were again instructed to administer the questionnaire, and this policy seemed to be followed. Because of the exclusion of many runaways, this population was not a random sample.

The sample of 50 runaways from Juvenile Court were taken in the months of January and February, 1972. Because of our earlier experience and difficulty in obtaining data from the court, we chose to sample the runaways coming to the intake section and detention, rather than the counseling section. This included out-of-county runaways in our final survey. Most of the runaways included in the sample had stayed in detention. Thus this sample of runaways were not necessarily Multnomah County residents, and not necessarily referred for counseling.

Because of the nature of this methodology there was not available any dispositional information so that this factor was eliminated. Questionnaires were administered by the intake staff and the research group, with the runaway filling out the questionnaire himself. The total of 50 runaways was a small percentage of the total runaway referrals to the court during this time. The sample was also not random because of the uncontrolled exclusion of many runaways from the population.

The sample of 34 non-runaways from Cleveland High School was surveyed in February, 1972. The students completed the questionnaire themselves, and forms were checked randomly as they were completed. The sample was again taken from a combined Social Studies and English class over two periods of the day to be unbiased in terms of tract classes or interests. As with the preliminary survey, freshman high school classes were chosen because of the age distribution. 13 of the total questionnaires received were excluded because of prior running away or incomplete information. This population was again not strictly randomized because of the uncontrolled exclusion of many students from the sample.

COLLECTION OF DATA

Data was collected by the use of a two-page research questionnaire in all phases of the practicum. Appendices A, B, C, D, E, F detail the six questionnaires used. Generally, the preliminary survey was used as a pre-test for the questionnaire. It was felt that a better research instrument could be achieved if a preliminary sampling were done. Also, by using a preliminary survey, significant factors concerning runaways and non-runaways could be identified and more attention given to these

factors in the final survey. Open-ended questions were mainly the focus of the preliminary survey since all possible responses were needed to develop a more specific questionnaire in the final survey. It was decided after assessing the preliminary survey that attitudinal questions (ones which described feelings) would be better treated by the use of a numerical scale. Some questions were completely eliminated from the final questionnaire, while others were expanded in much more detail.

The preliminary questionnaire was developed by the research group and the participating agencies' staff. Approval and cooperation of the Juvenile Court administration was obtained initially. Following this, meetings were held by the research group with Contact Center staff and Juvenile Court counselors to gain input from the agencies in deciding the format and nature of the research instrument. Once the questionnaire was developed, additional meetings were held to orientate the participating staff members in the composition of the questions and the manner of administering it. It was planned that the questionnaire would be completed by the counselor as an integral part of the intake process rather than having the runaway confronted by the research group at a time of crisis. Much attempt was made to have a questionnaire which was easy to administer and would generally gain information needed in the interview process. In the final survey, the composition of the final questionnaire was developed exclusively by the research group.

It should be noted that a few inconsistencies appear in the collection of data. First, on the preliminary survey, court runaways were not asked about the nature of previous referrals to the court,

while other sample groups were. Also in the preliminary survey, there were several questions asked of Contact Center runaways which were unique to that agency and were done mainly at the request of the agency. Finally, the question about welfare on the final survey was inadvertently left off the Juvenile Court questionnaire.

DATA PROCESSING

Data in the preliminary survey was not processed by data cards. The research groups hand-sorted and compiled all information since many open-ended questions did not lend themselves well to data processing. In the final survey, questionnaires were collected and a code sheet developed. Once the code sheet was typed (See Appendix G), all questionnaires were coded on an IBM Coding Form, and organized into the three population groups. Then coding forms were given to the Portland State Computer Center for key punching and proofreading. This resulted in 105 computer cards representing all questionnaires. The research group then sorted the cards for a count of all frequencies for each question by the use of an IBM Card Sorter. After looking at the data, the idea of setting up a chronic and non-chronic runaway study was formulated. We split the runaway population in half as nearly as possible in terms of the number of times they had run away. This resulted in our operational definition of chronic (3 to 9 times) and non-chronic (0 to 2 times). The runaway cards were then sorted again for all pertinent questions, and frequency counts made. This made a total of five population groups of data. Other card sorts were done when certain comparisons required isolating some factors. No further data processing or programming was necessary because of the relatively simple statistical testing which our data

required. The majority of statistical testing consisted of Chi-square analysis, with some F-tests and t-tests performed on continuous variables and population means. Data processing techniques and statistical testing required appropriate research consultation.

CHAPTER FOUR
PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA
FROM PRELIMINARY QUESTIONNAIRE

In this section the results of the preliminary survey of runaways at Contact Center and Juvenile Court, and the non-runaway control group are discussed in terms of:

1. demographic characteristics,
2. previous referrals to Juvenile Court,
3. school experiences,
4. family and other significant relationships,
5. the runaway experience,
6. service wanted from the respective agencies, and
7. the final or anticipated disposition of the case at the time the interview was conducted.

As the preliminary survey was designed as an open-ended probe for dependent relationships that would distinguish runaways from non-runaway youth, standard statistical testing was not performed on the data. Percentage figures that identified areas of considerable difference in responses of the three sample groups were included in the discussion.,

Sex

Usable responses from the first questionnaire were obtained from a significantly larger number of females than males in both the control and experimental groups. The predominance of females in the runaway group can be attributed to several factors:

1. A bias in the sample reflecting a distortion resulting from the fact that this phase of the study was completed in a limited time period.

2. An upward trend in the number of females being referred to Juvenile Court for runaway behavior. The slight increase in the total runaway referrals for 1971 (.8% greater than 1970) is due to an increase of 109 female referrals; in the same year male runaway referrals dropped by 93.

3. A sampling procedure at Juvenile Court which relied upon counselors wishing to volunteer their assistance in the research project also contributed to the bias in sex distribution. Four of the seven counselors who volunteered to administer questionnaires were women. The Juvenile Court policy, in most instances, is to refer runaway girls to women counselors and boys to men counselors within the high school districts to which they are assigned. Therefore, it could have been anticipated from the constraints of our sampling procedure alone that a larger number of females would be included. In addition, two of the male counselors at the court remarked that during the sampling period referrals to them had in general dropped and, in particular, runaway referrals.

In regard to the control group, an effort was made to draw a high school sample that would avoid bias associated with special tracking and elective courses. However, the general required classes that were selected for the control population had over twice as many females as males in attendance when the questionnaire was administered. Of the 87 questionnaires that were returned about half were eliminated

from the sample because of incompleteness or previous runaway experiences. It should be noted that of the four high school classes which supplied the non-runaway control group, almost 20% (16 out of 87) of the youngsters were eliminated because they had run away from home before.

Sex:	Contact	JDH	Control
Males	10	4	7
Females	<u>15</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>38</u>
Total	25	16	45

Age

The mean age of youth in both the control and the two experimental groups was approximately 15 years. Runaways at Juvenile Court averaged 14.75 years, Contact Center runaways averaged 14.76 years, and the non-runaway subjects' mean age was 14.96. Seventy-five percent of the total sample of runaways were 15 years of age or younger. Contact Center and Juvenile Court runaways were compared in terms of the ages at which runaway rates were highest. Runaways from Contact Center peaked in frequency at age 15 while Juvenile Court referrals were most numerous at age 14 and declined rapidly thereafter.

Age:	Contact	JDH	Control
12 years old	2	0	0
13	1	2	0
14	7	6	14
15	9	4	19
16	3	2	12
17	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	25	16	45

FIGURE III
Age Groupings of Juvenile Court and Contact Center
Runaways in Preliminary Survey

Ethnic Grouping

The runaway sample for the initial questionnaire was predominantly Caucasian. Contact Center had 21 or 84% Caucasian runaways, plus two American Indians and one Spanish-American youngster. No information was available on one subject. The majority of runaways at Juvenile Court were also Caucasian: 13 out of 16 runaway referrals or 81% of the sample. Two court runaways were Black and one was of mixed racial background. Of the 45 high school students in the control group, 44 were Caucasian and one was Oriental.

<u>Race:</u>	<u>Contact</u>	<u>JDH</u>	<u>Control</u>
White	21	13	44
Indian	2	0	0
Black	0	2	0
Oriental	0	0	1
Chicano	1	0	0
Indian/French	0	1	0
Unanswered	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	25	16	45

Marital Status

In less than half of the homes of both runaway samples were natural parents married and still living together. Sixty-five percent of the runaways at Contact Center reported that their parents were divorced or widowed. None were separated and there was no information available on two subjects. Fifty-six percent of the Juvenile Court runaways had parents who are now separated, or divorced, or who were unwed at

the time of the child's birth.

The marital status of the control group's parents contrasted markedly with that of the runaways' parents. Only 24% of the non-runaway subjects reported that their parents were separated or divorced. Thus, our preliminary data tends to counter the findings of a Utah study which claimed that problems which could precipitate and cause a youth to run away from home are just as likely to occur in a home with both parents present as they are in other living arrangements.

Parents' Marital Status	Contact	JDH	Control
Married	8	7	34
Separated	0	1	3
Divorced	12	7	8
Widowed	3	0	0
Unmarried	0	1	0
Unanswered	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	25	16	45

Legal Custody

The correlation between a disrupted home situation and running away that was suggested in the question regarding parents' marital status was further supported by data concerning legal custody of youths. Of the combined runaway sample (N=39), approximately 35% of the youngsters were not in the custody of either one of their natural parents.

In contrast to the runaway sample, all but one member of the control group was in the custody of either one or both of their natural parents. It was decided to continue inquiry as to the legal custody

of subjects in the second phase of the study because of the potential value of the data as an additional indicator of the nature of family structure and relations.

Legal Custody Of Child	Contact	JDH	Control
Parents	15	10	44
Court	7	5	0
Welfare	1	0	0
Relative	0	0	1
Children's Farm Home	0	1	0
Unanswered	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	25	16	45

Siblings and Position in Family

All subjects were questioned in regard to the number of brothers and sisters in their family as well as the total number of siblings presently living at home. This question was included on the assumption that stress leading to a youngster's decision to leave home might be associated with the total number of siblings in his family. It was reasoned that in large families a child would face more competition for attention and affection from his parents. The frustration resulting from such sibling rivalry could contribute to runaway behavior.

It was found that the total number of siblings was considerably larger in the families of runaway youth as compared to non-runaways. The average number of siblings for Contact Center runaways was 4.00; Juvenile Court runaways averaged 3.13; while the control

group had a low of 2.80 siblings. It was hoped that an increased sample size for the second questionnaire would support and clarify the possible correlation between family size and runaway behavior.

No. of Siblings	Contact	JDH	Control
# Brothers			
0	3	3	4
1	7	4	27
2	6	2	8
3	2	3	2
4	3	3	2
5	2	1	1
Unanswered	2	0	1 (2 half bros.)
Total	25	16	45
# Sisters			
0	3	6	12
1	7	3	16
2	7	3	7
3	3	2	9
4	1	0	0
5	1	0	1
6	1	0	0
Unanswered	2	2 (half sister)	0
Total	25	16	45
Total # Siblings			
0	0	1	0
1	2	3	13
2	4	5	10
3	4	1	7
4	1	1	9
5	6	1	3
6	2	2	2
7	1	2	0
8	2	0	1
Unanswered	3	0	0
Total	25	16	45

Data on the subjects' approximate ordinal position in the family suggested that the youngest child might be less prone toward running away.

Child's Position In Family	Contact	JDH	Control
Oldest	4	6	7
Middle	10	8	18
Youngest	9	1	20
Unanswered	2	1 (only child)	0
	—	—	—
Total	25	16	45

Family on Welfare

Investigation of a possible correlation between the socioeconomic status of the parents and youth running away from home was attempted in a very general manner with the inquiry as to whether the family was receiving welfare or not. It was decided that this question would yield a gross indication of the family income and probably would be more reliable than the youth's own estimate of his family's income. However, it is possible that younger subjects might be unaware that their parent(s) were receiving public assistance or that some subjects would be reluctant to acknowledge this fact on a questionnaire.

Is The Family On Welfare?	Contact	JDH	Control
Yes	6	4	1
No	15	12	44
Unanswered	4	0	0
Total	25	16	45

The results of our relatively small first sample pointed to an

association between low family income and a youngster leaving home. ~~Forty-six~~ ^{Twenty-nine} percent of the Contact Center runaways were on public assistance (N=21; no information on four subjects). One-third of the runaways referred to Juvenile Court were on welfare. Only one subject out of 45 in the control group reported that their family was receiving public assistance.

Previous Juvenile Court Referral

The vast majority of identified runaways for whom information was available stated that they had previously been referred to Juvenile Court. Sixteen out of 23 runaways at Contact Center reported that they had been to Juvenile Court before. (No information available on two subjects.) Ten of these 16 previous court clients had been referred because of runaway or runaway in combination with other offenses such as breaking and entering, drug use, shoplifting, and truancy. Thirteen of the sixteen runaway subjects from Juvenile Court also had prior court referrals. However, no information was gathered on the nature of the previous referral with the initial questionnaire. In contrast to the experimental sample no members of the control group reported previous court contacts.

<u>Previous Juvenile Court Referrals</u>	<u>Contact</u>	<u>JDH</u>	<u>Control</u>
Yes	16	13	0
No	6	3	45
Unanswered	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	25	16	45

Previous Juvenile Court Referrals	Contact	JDH	Control
If yes, why?			
runaway	4	(not	(not
foster home	1	avail.)	applic.)
burglary	1		
incorrigible	1		
combination	6		
unanswered	<u>3</u>		
Total	16		

At least for this limited sample of 29 runaways it would appear that court intervention had little effect in deterring subsequent anti-social behavior or in relieving the emotional, interpersonal, or situational stress from which the youngster fled.

School Information

Responses from the Contact Center runaway group were not complete enough to make a definite determination of whether most of these youngsters were regularly attending school or had dropped out before they left home. As the first schedule was administered during the summer, some of the responses to the school attendance question may have been confused because of summer vacation.

Was Child Attending School When He Ran Away?			
	Contact	JDH	Control
Yes	7	13	(not applicable)
No	6	3	
Unanswered	<u>12</u>	<u>0</u>	
Total	25	45	

It is assumed that some of the subjects who failed to answer the question were in school, then approximately half of the combined experimental groups were still in school before they ran.

In an effort to explore a possible link between school problems and runaway behavior, all subjects were questioned as to whether they had ever been in any serious trouble at school. Over a third of the Contact Center runaways and about half of the youngsters referred to Juvenile Court reported that they had been "in trouble" at school.

Has Child Been In Serious Trouble in School?			
	Contact	JDH*	Control
Yes	8	7	7
No	14	8	38
Unanswered	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	25	16	45
If yes, what?			
truancy	3	5	0
smoking	0	0	2
marihuana	1	0	0
teacher conflict	1	0	0
"bad attitude"	0	2	0
fighting	0	2	0
breaking rules	0	1	2
combination	2	0	0
unanswered	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>
Total	8	10	7

*Some subjects answered more than one response.

By comparison, only 15% of the non-runaway control group noted school trouble. In general, the type of behavior which got youngsters into trouble at school was of a more serious nature for runaways than for the non-runaway control group. Lincoln and Cleveland High students reported behavior such as skipping study halls, smoking cigarettes, and water fights. However, runaway subjects listed truancy, fighting, marijuana, assault, teacher conflict, etc. as causing difficulty at school. Truancy was the behavior most often noted as the reason for trouble at school.

An open-ended question directed at probing the general feelings of the subject toward his school experience was included in the first questionnaire. Interviewers (counselors) were instructed to solicit the nature of the attitudes as well as the degree of emotion accompanying the response. The answers that were obtained to this question encompassed such a variety of situation-specific or, alternately, extremely vague statements that categorization for the purposes of analysis was quite difficult. Interpretation of the question was attempted by assigning the responses to an approximate scaling system ranging from DISLIKE to LIKE.

The Contact Center runaways were proportionately the most dissatisfied with school; almost half of the subjects indicated a definite dislike for school. Juvenile Court subjects demonstrated a somewhat more positive attitude toward school. Very few members of the high school control group had strong positive or negative feelings regarding school. Approximately 70% of the control responses fell into the middle ground of liking school with various

qualifications, i.e., it was "necessary," "OK," or "alright except for certain aspects," etc.

	How Child Feels About School		
	Contact	JDH	Control
Like	4	2	6
Like w/qualifications	2	2	13
Okay	5	7	9
Necessary	1	0	9
Dislike	11	4	8
Unanswered	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	25	16	45

Family Relations: Feelings and Perceptions

Included on the first schedule was a second series of open-ended questions that focused on the subject's feelings toward his parents and other family members as well as his perception of their feelings toward him. Because considerations of time and confidentiality prevented a more extensive analysis of family interpersonal relations, we felt that it was particularly important to begin probing this area although, initially, in a very impressionistic manner.

The high school control group expressed proportionately the most positive attitudes toward their parents with almost half of the subjects stating explicitly that they "loved" or "liked" them. Another 20% of the control group expressed satisfactory but less enthusiastic attitudes, such as "they're OK." The Contact Center runaways, by and large, were more negative in their expression of feelings toward their parents. A further indication of family discord was the fact that responses from this group were often divided between parents, e.g.,

warm emotions directed toward the mother and open hostility or resentment toward the father.

In contrast to the sample from Contact Center, runaways at Juvenile Court were markedly more positive in their feelings toward their parents. Almost 70% indicated that they "loved" or "liked" their parents. Several factors were considered as possible contributors to the difference between the two runaway groups on this question:

1. The JDH group of youngsters was more actively repressing negative feelings toward their parents and/or idealizing their relationship. It should be noted that several subjects were committed to institutions and, therefore, were separated from their families.

2. The authority of the Juvenile Court and its representative (the counselor-interviewer) inhibited the expression of less socially acceptable feelings toward one's parents or guardian, i.e., anger or hostility.

3. Other situational or personal problems were more significant for this group than dislike of parents in the decision to run away.

	How Child Feels Toward Parents		
	Contact	JDH	Control
Positive attitude	6	11	21
Attitude split between parents	7	0	3
Negative attitude	9	1	7
Varied attitude toward parents	2	2	3
Don't know	1	0	2
Satisfactory	0	0	9
Unanswered	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	25	16	45

Juvenile Court responses to the inquiry about parents' feelings toward the children tended to strengthen our speculation that these subjects may have been reluctant to acknowledge the extent of conflict between their parents and them. It may be that Juvenile Court run-aways found it easier to express emotional conflict with parents by attributing negative feelings to their parents rather than to themselves. At any rate, the court group showed a definite increase in negative feelings (hostility, rejection, criticism) over the previous question.

How Child Thinks His Parents Feel Toward Him	Contact JDH Control		
Positive attitude	6	6	22
Negative attitude	10	6	6
Parents have varied attitude	3	0	7
Parents are split in attitude	1	0	0
Satisfactory	0	0	9
Don't know	3	2	1
Unanswered	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	25	16	45

Responses from the Contact Center and control group were, in general, consistent with answers to the previous question. Although highly tentative, this finding seemed to support an interpretation that running away is an indication of a lack of harmony and warmth in a youngster's relationship with his parents.

Answers to the pair of questions about the subject's feelings

toward other family members and his perception of their feelings about him were fairly consistent with the preceding set of questions in that the non-runaways tended to express and identify more positive feelings between family members. The Juvenile Court group again had fewer subjects than Contact Center who expressed or perceived negative or mixed feelings in regard to other family members.

Child's Feelings Toward Other Family Members	Contact	JDH	Control
Positive attitude	9	9	24
Negative attitude	4	1	3
Mixed feelings	7	0	5
Satisfactory	0	2	11
Jealous	1	0	0
"Mothering"	0	1	0
Don't know	1	0	0
Unanswered	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>
Total	25	16	45

How Child Thinks Family Members Feel Toward Him	Contact	JDH	Control
Positive attitude	10	8	21
Negative attitude	4	5	7
Neutral	1	0	0
Satisfactory	0	1	9
Mixed	4	0	3
Don't know	1	0	5
Unanswered	<u>5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	<u>25</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>45</u>

As with the attitudinal questions about school, the advantages of a scaled response over an open-ended response in soliciting information about family relations was clear from the preliminary study. It was hoped that with the assignment of numerical values to content areas that probed attitudes and feelings that significant correlations and differences would be more readily identifiable.

Decision-Making Process

The Juvenile Court and control groups were questioned as to who made the major decisions in matters important to the youngster. Most of the subjects felt that the decision-making power was in their parents' hands. But nearly half of the control group as compared to 25% of the JDH subjects claimed that issues were decided on a democratic basis in their home. The extent to which the authority and responsibility of decision-making is shared within a family may be another index of whether certain families are more likely to encounter runaway behavior in their children.

Who Makes Major Decisions Re: Child?		JDH	Control
Contact			
Parents	(wasn't on	7	23
Child	question-	4	1
Democratic basis	naire)	4	20
Unanswered		<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
Total		16	45

The staff at Runaway House in Washington, D.C. reported that the "reasons" kids give for running away are usually that their parents didn't like their hair, their clothes, or their friends,

and they just got "tired of hassling it."⁴⁹ In view of this observation, all subjects on our study were asked to indicate if these areas and others were a source of conflict in their family and, if so, who usually decided the issue. Answers to this inquiry were difficult to interpret on the questionnaire and/or were incomplete. However, available data suggested some trends in the areas of child conflict and decision-making.

Youngsters in the control group felt that they were generally able to decide questions about their clothes, friends, hair, smoking, and school. Parents of control subjects tended to make the decisions about where their child could go and the hours he kept. The parents of Contact Center runaways had most decision-making power about the hours their child kept, his friends, where he could go, and drugs. Areas of greatest conflict for Juvenile Court subjects seemed to be where they went, their friends, hours, and drugs. Although no accurate tabulation could be made about decision-making authority in these conflict areas for the Juvenile Court sample, it was noted that four of the subjects claimed to be making their own decisions on all issues.

On the basis of the limited data, we could speculate that the amount of decision-making responsibility given to the child influences their adjustment in the family. Since the control group tended to make most of the decisions, and the runaways had either conflict or their parents deciding issues, perhaps a child who is able to exercise his own judgment about matters which concern him is less susceptible

to running away.

Significant Other Adults

All subjects were asked what adults (they) would talk to about important things in order to determine if the existence of a person in whom they could trust and confide would mitigate against the impulse to run away from home. Approximately 40% of the control group identified one or both of their parents as the person(s) with whom they discuss important matters. Only 3 out of 44 control subjects stated that they had no one to talk with seriously. Seven of 14 (two did not answer) members of the Juvenile Court group listed one or more adults. But a surprising one-third of the Contact Center runaways indicated that they had no one with whom to discuss things that were important to them.

	What Adults Does Child Have To Talk To		
	Contact	JDH	Control
Parents	4	3	17
Friends	3	4	6
Relative	4	2	2
Professionals	2	1	3
Combination	1	2	13
None	7	0	3
Anyone but parents	0	1	0
Don't know	0	1	0
Unanswered	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
Total	25	16	45

Friendships

The majority of subjects in both the experimental and control

groups stated that they had at least one close friend. However, a much higher proportion of the non-runaway group answered this question affirmatively. Nearly half of the Juvenile Court runaways had no close friendships.

The combined data from the questions concerning parents, other family members, and adult and peer friendships lends itself to a picture of runaway youth as having more difficulty with close interpersonal relationships than non-runaway adolescents. It appears that a runaway's family relationships may be more turbulent and that friendships with adults and peers outside the family are likely to be fewer as compared with non-runaways.

	Does Child Have Any Close Friendships?		
	Contact	JDH	Control
Yes	21	11	42
No	3	5	3
Unanswered	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	25	16	45
If yes, how many?			
1	7	4	3
2	7	1	8
3	1	3	10
many	6	3	19
undetermined	0	0	1
unanswered	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
Total	21	11	42

The Runaway Experience

The preliminary study also included a series of questions regarding the runaway incident that brought the youth to one of the two agencies and his opinions about some aspects of the experience. It should be noted that 70% of the high school control group had previously considered leaving home. The most frequent reason listed for abandoning the plan to leave was that they had given this option more careful thought and decided that it wouldn't resolve the problem for them.

If Child Has Never Run Away, Has He Considered It?			
	Contact	JDH	Control
Yes	not	not	31
No	applic.	applic.	13
Unanswered			<u>1</u>
Total			45
If yes, why'd you change your mind?			
thought it out			11
fear of unknown			7
worry/hurt parents			6
punishment			5
nowhere to go			<u>2</u>
total			31

Almost all of the experimental group had left home before, and over half of each group had run away at least twice before. This data would indicate that once a youngster has tried running away as a method of coping with his problems, he is likely to repeatedly

leave home.

	Has Child Run Away Before?		
	Contact	JDH	Control
Yes	22	13	Not Applic.
No.	2	3	
Unanswered	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	
Total	25	16	

How many times?

once	7	3
twice	5	5
3	1	1
4	2	1
many	6	2
unanswered	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
total	22	13

Although 75% of the runaways in this study were 15 years of age or younger, most of these youth left home alone rather than with companions. Eighty-six percent of the Contact Center runaways and 62% of the court sample were away from home less than four weeks. A majority of both runaway groups had no specific destination in mind when they left home.

	Did Child Run Away Alone or W/Others?		
	Contact	JDH	Control
Alone	17	10	Not Applic.
Others	<u>8</u>	<u>6</u>	
Total	25	16	

How Long Was Child Away From Home Or Guardian?	Contact	JDH	Control
Less than week	11	5	Not Applic.
Less than 4 weeks	8	5	
1 to 6 months	1	6	
6 to 12 months	1	0	
Over a year	1	0	
Unanswered	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	
Total	28	16	

Where Was Child Going When He Ran?	Contact	JDH	Control
Relative's	3	1	Not Applic.
Portland	3	0	
Friends'	2	4	
Contact	2	0	
Home (from Institution)	1	0	
Find Sister	0	1	
Rock Festival	0	1	
Didn't know	13	9	
Unanswered	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	
Total	25	16	

A fight or argument with their parents was the precipitating incident most often identified by runaway youth of both groups. Such responses are consistent with data showing "freedom" as the aspect of running away that was most frequently liked by both groups. However,

five Contact Center subjects stated that they liked "nothing" about running away.

What Happened Just Before Child Ran Away?			
	Contact	JDH	Control
Fight w/parents	12	6	Not Applic.
Fight w/siblings	1	0	
Severe restrictions	2	0	
"Fed Up"	3	0	
Ran from institution	1	2	
Disappt. w/parents	1	0	
Impulse	0	2	
Seeking people	0	1	
Other	2	5	
Unanswered	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	
Totals	25	16	

What Did Child Like About Running Away?			
	Contact	JDH	Control
Freedom	11	10	Not Applic.
People they met	3	2	
Interrupted problem situation	2	0	
Travel	1	0	
Change of Circumstances	1	0	
Living w/boyfriend	0	2	
Relatives' concern	0	1	
Finding sister	0	1	
Nothing	5	0	
Unanswered	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	
Total	25	16	

Sixty-one percent of the Contact Center sample stated that paranoia, fear and legal hassles were the things that they did not like about running away. None of these problems were singled out by the Juvenile Court group. By comparison, 75% of the Juvenile Court sample identified basic survival, loneliness, and getting caught as the aspects of running away they did not like.

What Did The Child Not Like About Running Away?	Contact JDH Control		
Paranoia/fear	8	0	Not Applic.
Legal hassle	6	0	
Survival/loneliness	4	6	
Everything	2	0	
Nothing	1	3	
Getting caught	0	6	
Other	2	1	
Unanswered	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	
Total	25	16	

When asked specifically how they felt about returning home, 25% of the Contact Center runaways as compared to 62% of the Juvenile Court sample wanted to return home at the time they were completing the questionnaire. Seventy-one percent of the group at Contact Center, as opposed to 38% of the Juvenile Court runaways, did not want to return home at that time. (There was no "home" available as an option for one subject in each group.)

When asked what kind of help they wanted from the agency, one-third of the runaways at Contact Center said that they would like

counseling services.

How Child Felt About Going Home When Doing Questionnaire.	Contact	JDH	Control
Want to	6	8	Not Applic.
Don't want to	17	5	
No "home" available	1	1	
Unsure	1	0	
Unanswered	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	
Total	25	16	

Almost half of the subjects wanted assistance in finding a foster home or other housing arrangement. None of the Contact Center run-aways specifically requested help in returning to the home situation that they had left.

What Kind Of Help Did Child Want From Agency?	Contact	JDH	Control
Counseling	8	1	Not Applic.
Foster Home	6	4	
Housing	5	0	
Information	1	0	
None	2	3	
Out of institution	1	0	
To go home	0	4	
Emancipation	0	1	
Protect from running	0	1	
Doesn't know	1	2	
Combination	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	
Total	25	16	

On the other hand, only one Juvenile Court runaway specifically stated that he wanted counseling. Twenty-eight percent of this group want a foster home placement and an equal number of youngsters wanted help in returning to their homes. Over 20% of this runaway sample did not want any help from the court. The sizeable portion of runaways who expressed "resistance" to receiving social services from Juvenile Court is probably indicative of the barriers to effective intervention that a non-voluntary agency with an authoritarian image must overcome.

An additional series of five questions was included in the schedule administered to the Contact Center sample in order to obtain information that was of particular interest to the agency staff. Non-traditional youth-serving agencies, such as Contact Center have occasionally been a focus of criticism actually contributing to the runaway problem by providing services to runaway youngsters. Our finding that 72% of the runaways did not know about Contact Center before they left home would tend to counter the argument that youngsters leave home because they know they can receive assistance from certain agencies.

Our data showed that 17 out of 24 subjects first heard about Contact Center from their friends. Seventy-two percent of the youngsters stated their reasons for coming to Contact Center in very general terms, i.e., "to get help." Sixty percent of the group did not have any immediate plans, wished to return home (or to foster home), or simply wanted to "work out their problems." The remaining 40% of the sample wanted a different living situation (usually

foster care) or wished to travel.

In regard to future plans, approximately half of the Contact Center runaways intended to continue with school or to find employment. The remaining subjects were unsure of long-range objectives or else responded with a variety of highly individualized plans for the future.

Disposition

Information on the actual or expected disposition of each case was solicited from the counselor-interviewer at both of the agencies.

Disposition	Following Agency Contact		
	Contact	Court	Control
Returned home	5	6	Not Applic.
Foster care	8	1	
Placed in or returned to institution	3	6	
Lived on their own	1	1	
Remained "on the street"	8	0	
Unanswered	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	
Total	25	16	

At the time the questionnaire was administered, Contact Center staff anticipated that a substantial 36% of their runaways would remain "on the street" or otherwise manage to live on their own. Nearly 50% of the runaways were returned to their own homes or placed in foster care. Only 12% of the runaways from Contact were committed to or returned to an institution. Within the Juvenile Court sample an equal percentage of the subjects (38 percent) were returned to their

own homes or placed in or returned to institutions. The remaining subjects either lived on their own, went into foster care, or had not formulated a plan at the time the questionnaire was administered.

Summary

As a result of the findings of the preliminary survey, certain content areas were revised, eliminated, or expanded in more detail on the final questionnaire. Questions relating to the demographic characteristics of the subjects were altered in three areas. The sibling question was enlarged so as to allow for more possibilities than simply "sisters" and "brothers." The section on living arrangement of the child before running away was made more explicit. Finally, the question concerning the child's legal custody was made specific to those subjects who were not living with either natural parent. Information on the frequency of visits with the absent parent was also added to the final questionnaire.

All open-ended "feeling" or attitudinal questions were transferred to a ten-point continuum scale so that appropriate data for statistical testing could be derived. Due to the shift in sampling procedures at Juvenile Court, i.e., interviews were conducted by the intake unit rather than the field counseling staff, information on case disposition was not available on the second questionnaire. The final schedule for Contact Center was shortened considerably by the deletion of several questions that pertained to only their clients' knowledge and use of the agency's services.

The results of preliminary questions relating to parents' marital status, total number of siblings in the family, previous runaway experience and Juvenile Court referrals, trouble in school, dislike of

school, and relationships with parents and other adults seemed to be statistically different between runaways and non-runaways. These areas hold the most promise for statistical significance with a larger experimental sample in the final survey.

CHAPTER FIVE
PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA
FINAL SURVEY
INTRODUCTION

Evaluation of data collected on the final survey was accomplished by subjecting fourteen independent variables to Chi-square analysis. This testing determined if frequency distributions were compatible with theoretically expected ratios due to chance alone. In the case of five continuous variables offering interval data, analysis of variance was completed to examine whether the population means differed significantly from each other. A 5% level of significance was accepted for all statistical tests conducted.

It was necessary to subgroup many of the independent variables to insure cells of sufficient numerical magnitude for Chi-square analysis. In addition, two runaway subgroups (chronic and non-chronic runaways) were included in the testing and analysis of selected variables. The tables presented in this segment of the study represent the subgroups utilized for purposes of statistical testing. A more definitive compendium containing actual frequencies and percentages prior to subgrouping is furnished in the Appendix.

Sex

There were substantially more females than males in the runaway sample, 61 percent as compared to 39 percent. This sex distribution could be explained by (1) a bias in the sample reflecting a distortion resulting from the fact that the study was completed in a limited

period; or, more likely, (2) an upward trend in the frequency of females running away. As noted in the discussion of the preliminary study, the increase in the total number of runaway referrals to Juvenile Court in 1971 over 1970 was due to an increase in female referrals and a decrease in male runaway referrals during the same time period. Therefore, our data from both Contact Center and Juvenile Court as well as the statistics on total runaway referrals to Juvenile Court would indicate that females are more likely to be involved in runaway behavior.

TABLE II

Frequency and Distribution of Sex

SEX	Contact No.	Contact %	Court No.	Court %	Control No.	Control %	Non-chronic No.	Non-chronic %	Chronic No.	Chronic %
Male	6	26	22	44	22	66	14	40	14	38
Female	15	74	28	56	12	34	21	60	22	62
Total	21	100	50	100	34	100	35	100	36	100

Based on the 1971 Juvenile Court statistics for total runaway referrals, the sex distribution of our combined runaway group was judged to be an approximate representative sampling of runaways identified in Multnomah County.⁵⁰

Separation of the total runaway group into chronic and non-chronic runaways for selected testing resulted in two nearly identical groups in terms of sex distribution. In contrast to the preliminary study, the non-runaway control group was predominantly male. Thus, the possibility was introduced that the final survey's failure to substantiate

preliminary trends may be due to the high male representation in the high school group.

Race

As in the preliminary study, both the control and experimental groups were predominantly Caucasian. Insufficient representation in racial minority categories precluded the use of Chi-square analysis.

TABLE III

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Race

RACE	Contact		Court		Control		Non-chronic		Chronic	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Black	0	0	3	6	0	0	NO COMPARISONS			
Indian	0	0	2	4	0	0				
Caucasian	19	90	38	76	31	91				
Oriental	0	0	1	2	3	9				
Mixed	0	0	2	4	0	0				
Other/ N.A.	2	10	4	8	0	0				
Total	21	100	50	100	34	100				

The ethnic grouping of Portland Public School enrollment for 1970-71 was 87.1% Caucasian; 9.8% Black; 1.5% Oriental; 1.0% Spanish-American; 0.6% American Indian.⁵¹ Effort was made to select high schools for the control sample which were known to have a mixture of ethnic groups enrolled. In spite of this, our almost exclusively Caucasian control sample clearly is not representative of the expected ethnic distribution in the public schools.

Examination of frequency distributions would indicate that the

runaway program at Contact Center is not being utilized by minority youth. The apparent lack of knowledge about and motivation to use the services of Contact Center on the part of non-white runaways may be influenced by a tendency of law enforcement agencies to identify and refer to Juvenile Court runaways with "higher visibility." Also, the southwest Portland, core-area location of Contact Center does not lend itself to easy accessibility for many east-side minority youth.

Age

Previous investigations of the runaway phenomenon have identified various "peak" or "high risk" ages for runaway behavior. Hildebrand's study in 1963 reported that the rate for girls increased with age and was highest at age 17; boys peaked at age 14 and 15, and then declined sharply.⁵² Research conducted in Salt Lake County, Utah found that females peaked at age 14, decreased at age 15, and increased at ages 16 and 17. The male runaways in this study peaked at age 16 and then declined rapidly.⁵³ Comparison of the peak runaway ages for the combined experimental sampling of males and females in this study differed from the findings of the research cited above, but was generally more consistent with the results of the Utah project in 1969. The female runaways peaked at age 15 and then declined sharply. On the other hand, male runaways peaked at age 14, declined slightly at age 15, and reached the highest incidence at age 16. Over half of the total sample of runaways were 15 years of age or younger. This finding supports a conclusion that runaways are "shockingly young" as reported in 1967 by a national magazine.⁵⁴ (See Figure IV.)

FIGURE IV
Age Grouping of Male and Female Runaways
in Final Survey

TABLE IV

Frequency and Means of Subjects' Ages

AGE	Contact No.	%	Court No.	%	Control No.	%	Non-chronic No.	%	Chronic No.	%
12-13	1	5	4	8	0	0	1	3	4	11
14-16	16	76	37	74	33	98	27	77	26	72
17-18	4	19	9	18	1	2	7	20	6	17
Total	21	100	50	100	34	100	35	100	36	100
Means	15.4		15.3		14.8		15.7		14.9	
n=105		p>.05	X ² =8.20		d.f.=4		n=71 t=2.41		p<.05 d.f.=69	

The mean age of all runaways in this study was 15.3 years. Female runaways had the lowest average age (15.0 years) while male runaways tended to be older (15.8 years). A sampling procedure for the control group (limited to 9th and 10th grade classes) resulted in a lower mean age of 14.8 years for non-runaways. Contrary to what one might expect, a t-test of the chronic and non-chronic groups showed that the chronic runaways are significantly younger than their less experienced counterparts. Perhaps this is because kids are running away at earlier ages and in more frequency than other youth in previous times. The computed Chi-square value for the Contact, Juvenile Court, and Control groups was not sufficient to establish a statistically significant difference between the ages of the three populations.

School Grade Level

Data on school grade level found 52% of the runaways from Contact Center and Juvenile Court in the 9th and 10th grades, more than any other grade level. This frequency distribution corresponds to the expected level of school attainment for a predominantly 14-15 year old sample group. At this age in school, a young person is usually entering a larger, more sophisticated school setting (high school) that provides greater opportunity for social independence. Certainly much peer pressure is exhibited during this age for the adolescent to try new behaviors such as dating and learning to drive a car. We have speculated that the change in educational and social milieu may intensify the normal struggles of adolescents to establish their identity and autonomy, and thus lead to more serious conflicts with parents that often result in running away.

TABLE V

Frequency and Distribution of School Grade Levels

GRADE LEVEL	Contact		Court		Control		Non-chronic		Chronic	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
7th-8th	5	24	13	26	0	0	NO COMPARISONS			
9th-10th	7	33	27	54	33	97				
11th-12th	5	24	9	18	1	3				
No answer	4	19	1	2	0	0				
Total	21	100	50	100	34	100				

Area of Residency

As noted in the discussion of research methodology, our sampling

procedure for the second phase of the study drew from the general population of runaways referred to the intake unit of Multnomah County Juvenile Court from January to February 1972. This runaway population differs from that obtained from field counselors in the preliminary survey in that it is not limited to Multnomah County residents. The difference in the sample populations of the two surveys is reflected in the fact that 40% of the subjects who completed the second questionnaire were not from the Tri-County area. We have no evidence to indicate that the inclusion of out-of-county residents biased the research findings.

TABLE VI

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Residency Area

RESI- DENCY	Contact		Court		Control		Non-chronic		Chronic	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Portland area	18	85	30	60	34	100	NO COMPARISONS			
Oregon (not Portland)	2	10	7	14	0	0				
Out of State	1	5	13	26	0	0				
Total	21	100	50	100	34	100				

Our sample from Contact Center suggests that youth seeking runaway counseling from this agency are nearly all Portland area residents. It is probably the case that out-of-county runaways are more likely to request emergency assistance with food, housing or transportation rather than intensive counseling services.

Welfare

The question regarding whether or not the subject's family was receiving public assistance was inadvertently omitted from the questionnaires administered to the Juvenile Court and control samples. Data from Contact Center showed that only one subject out of 18 reported that his family was on welfare. (Three subjects did not answer the question.) Due to the fact that data was incomplete, no conclusions were reached in regard to a possible correlation between runaway behavior and approximate family income.

Marital Status of Natural Parents

Subgrouping of parents who were married with parents who were separated (although, not necessarily legally separated) was compared with all other possible marital outcomes. The value yielded from Chi-square testing of the Court, Contact Center, and control group was not sufficient to establish a dependent relationship between marital status of natural parents and their children's runaway behavior. However, the control group did have the highest percentage of parents married or separated (62%) when compared to Contact Center (57%) and Juvenile Court (46%).

Chi-square analysis of chronic and non-chronic runaways did result in a statistically significant relationship between parents' marital status and recurrent runaway behavior, with 73% of the chronic runaways having natural parents not married or separated.

Statistical testing was also performed on married parents versus all other categories for Contact Center and Juvenile Court samples. Although the Chi-square value was not sufficient to establish a distinction between these two groups, the data suggested that the natural

parents of Contact Center runaways were more likely to be still married than the parents of Juvenile Court subjects. Nearly 60% of the parents of Contact Center runaways were still married as compared to approximately 40% of the parents of Juvenile Court runaways.

TABLE VII

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of
Marital Status of Natural Parents

MARITAL STATUS	Contact No.	Contact %	Court No.	Court %	Control No.	Control %	Non-Chronic No.	Non-Chronic %	Chronic No.	Chronic %
Married, Separated	12	57	23	46	22	62	19	54	16	27
Divorced, Widowed, Never Married, Don't Know	9	43	27	54	12	38	16	46	26	73
Total	21	100	50	100	34	100	35	100	36	100
n=106		p>.05	X ² =2.94		d.f.=2		n=71		p<.05	
							X ² =5.46		d.f.=1	

Chi square testing of the combined runaway populations versus the control group in terms of married parents as distinguished from all other possibilities did not result in a statistically significant relationship between runaway behavior and parents' marital status. Data from the final survey did not conclusively support the findings of the preliminary survey which suggested a definite correlation between parents' marital status and running away. Percentage comparisons of all runaways versus the control group does suggest a tendency for

marital discord to be associated with running away. Only forty-four percent of the natural parents of runaways were still married, in contrast to 65% of the non-runaway control group.

TABLE VIII

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of
Marital Status of Natural Parents
Married Compared to All Other Categories

MARITAL STATUS	Contact		Court		All Runaways		Control	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Married	12	57	19	40	31	44	22	65
Other (Divorced, Separated, etc.)	9	43	31	60	40	56	12	35
Total	21	100	50	100	71	100	34	100
n=71 p>.05 $\chi^2=2.20$ d.f.=1					n=105 p>.05 $\chi^2=3.45$ d.f.=1			

Available demographic data on divorce and separation in Multnomah County did not allow for a direct comparison of either our experimental or control group with the characteristics of the general population. Data from the 1970 Census indicates that 10.8% of all persons in Multnomah County who were ever married are divorced.⁵⁵ In 1971 there were 3,543 divorces in Multnomah County, or 6.3 divorces per 1000 population.⁵⁶ It could be concluded that the breakdown of nuclear families is not specialized to the runaway population, but is common among the general community.

TABLE IX

Length of Time Parents Have Been Separated or Divorced

	Contact		Court		Control		Non-chronic		Chronic	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Less than 1 yr.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1 to 5 yrs.	2	10	5	10	2	6	3	8	4	11
More than 5 yrs.	1	5	10	20	5	15	4	11	7	19
Not applic- able	14	65	22	44	22	64	21	61	15	42
No answer or Don't Know	4	20	13	26	5	15	7	20	10	28
Total	21	100	50	100	34	100	35	100	36	100

Subjects who reported that their parents were divorced or separated were asked to specify the length of time since the divorce or separation had occurred. Current marital breakup did not appear as a contributing factor in the subject's probability of running away since no respondents (both runaway and non-runaway) listed marital breakup as occurring within the last year.

No statistical testing was applied to this data. However, frequencies for both runaway and non-runaway populations did indicate high percentages of marital break-up occurring more than five years from the time of the interview. This finding is no doubt indicative of marital breakdown occurring early in most marriages when the child is younger. The stress one would expect upon the child when his/her

parents are experiencing severe conflict (i.e., divorce or separation) does not appear related to runaway behavior.

The twelve possibilities for living arrangements of the subjects were grouped for the purpose of analysis into the three categories shown in Table X. Eight-five percent of the non-runaway control group was living with one or both of their natural parents, whereas, only 45% of the combined runaway group was living with one or both of their natural parents at the time they left home.

TABLE X

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Living Arrangement
of Child Prior to Running Away

LVNG.	Contact		Court		Control		Non-chronic		Chronic	
ARRANGE.	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
One or both natural Fa.-Mo.	21	42	29	85	11	53	21	59	11	30
One or both Step-Fa. or Mo. &/ or Nat. Fa. or Mo.	13	26	5	15	6	28	8	27	11	30
Foster Parents, Reltives, Inst., Other	16	32	0	0	4	19	6	14	14	40
Total	50	100	34	100	21	100	35	100	36	100
<hr/>										
n=105	p<.05		$\chi^2=19.07$		d.f.=4		n=71. $\chi^2=6.78$		p<.05 d.f.=2	

The computed Chi-square value for the question significantly related running away to a child's living arrangement and further substantiated the distinctions found in percentage comparisons. Test results clearly indicated a dependent relationship for both the runaways samples and the sub-grouping of chronic and non-chronic runaways between this variable and running away. (See Table X)

Our data tends to counter the findings of a study on runaways in Salt Lake County, Utah, which suggested that "problems which could precipitate and cause a youth to run away from home are just as likely to occur in a home with both parents present as they are in other living arrangements."⁵⁷ On the contrary, the results of our study show a strong association between families that are not intact and runaway behavior.

Intact Families.

Differences between the runaway and control groups were also noted in comparing the respective numbers of youth living in "intact families." A family with both natural parents present or one natural parent and one step-parent was operationally defined as an "intact family," as opposed to single parent families, foster care, or institutional arrangements. The following percentages of subjects were found to be living in intact families: 82% of the control group; 71% of the Contact Center subjects; 52% of runaways at Juvenile Court; 60% of the non-chronic runaways; 55% of the chronic runaways.

Chi-square analysis of the runaway sample as compared to the control group resulted in a statistically significant relationship between running away and the lack of an intact family. Testing of

the chronic and non-chronic runaway subgroups did not establish a dependent relationship between this variable and chronic runaway behavior. (See Table XI)

TABLE XI
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Intact Family

FAMILY TYPE	Runaway		Control		Non-chronic		Chronic	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Intact Family	41	58	28	82	21	60	20	55
All Other Categories	30	42	6	18	14	40	16	45
Total	71	100	34	100	35	100	36	100
n=105 p<.05 $\chi^2=6.18$ d.f.=1					n=71 $\chi^2=.14$ p>.05 d.f.=1			

Legal Custody

Data on the legal custody of children who are not living with their natural parents showed 50% of the combined runaway population had legal custody with welfare, JDH, or other institutions. It should be noted that about one-third of the total runaway population was living with both their natural parents, and thus did not respond. Also, two court subjects and three non-runaways responded inappropriately, i.e., they were probably living with only one natural parent. All of the non-runaway population were in the legal custody of their natural parents, providing a striking contrast to the runaway group. When comparing the runaway subgroups, 38% of the non-chronic runaways and 68% of the chronic runaways were not in the legal custody of their

natural parents. A Chi-square grouping of "institutional custody" (welfare, JDH, other institutions) vs. "parental and relative" custody showed no significant difference between chronic and non-chronic runaways, although chronic runaways were more likely (62% vs. 40%) to be in the custody of an institution. This same analysis was done between runaways and non-runaways resulting in a significant difference.

TABLE XII

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Person Having Legal Custody if Subject Not Living With Natural Parents

LEGAL CUSTODY	Contact No.	Contact %	Court No.	Court %	Control No.	Control %	Non-chronic No.	Non-chronic %	Chronic No.	Chronic %
Natural Parent or Relative	4	19	19	38	8	25	13	36	10	28
Welfare, JDH, Other	7	33	16	32	0	0	8	27	15	41
Not Applicable	10	48	15	30	26	75	14	37	11	31
Total	21	100	50	100	34	100	35	100	36	100

n=71

p<.05

* $\chi^2=6.96$

d.f.=1

n=46

 $\chi^2=2.19$

p>.05

d.f.=1

*Chi-square value pertains to comparison of all runaways versus the control group.

Visitation of Subject Not Living With Natural Parents

Because there was only one subject within the control group for which visitation with either the natural mother or natural father applied, it is evident that the vast majority of these youth were living

with their natural parents; this is supported by the responses to the question regarding living arrangement. In determining frequency of visitation with the natural mother for the Contact sample (n=5), it was found that 40 percent of the subjects visited often or occasionally while 60 percent visited seldom or not at all. Within the juvenile court sample (n=20), 70 percent visited often or occasionally with the natural mother and 30 percent visited seldom or not at all. Visitation with the natural father was overwhelmingly found to occur seldom or not at all (100 percent for the Contact sample and 63 percent for the court sample). There was no significant difference between the Contact Center and the court sample or between chronic and non-chronic runaways regarding the frequency of visits with their natural parents.

TABLE XIII

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Visitation With Absent Father

VISITS FATHER	Contact		Court		Control		Non-chronic		Chronic	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Often or Occasion- ally	0	0	7	31	1	100	2	20	5	38
Seldom or not at all	4	100	12	63	0	0	8	80	8	62
Total	4	100	19	100	1	100	10	100	13	100

n=23

p>.05

* $\chi^2=2.11$

d.f.=1

n=23

 $\chi^2=.91$

p>.05

d.f.=1

*Chi-square value pertains to comparison of Court and Contact Center only; "not applicable or no answer" frequencies were not included in test.

TABLE XIV

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Visitation With Absent Mother

VISITS MOTHER	Contact No.	%	Court No.	&	Control No.	&	Non-chronic No.	&	Chronic No.	&
Often or Occasion- ally	2	40	14	70	0	0	4	50	12	71
Seldom or not at all	3	60	6	30	1	100	4	50	5	29
Total	5	100	20	100	1	100	8	100	17	100

n=25	p>.05	* $\chi^2=1.56$	d.f.=1	n=25	p>.05
*Chi-square value pertains to comparison of Court and Contact Center only; "not applicable or no answer" frequencies were not included in the test.				$\chi^2=1.00$	d.f.=1

Subject's Feeling Toward Parent(s) (or Institution)

Interval data was obtained on this question from scaled responses which ranged from "dislike" to "love." Analysis of variance was completed on the group means of the Court, Contact, and Control samples; a separate computation was made for the chronic and non-chronic run-aways.

Analysis of variance of the Court, Contact Center, and control group means indicate that a youngster's feelings toward his parents (or the institution in which he has been placed) have a statistically significant influence on runaway behavior. This finding would tend to counter the claims of earlier writers that running away is a natural phenomenon or youth, motivated by a spirit of adventure rather

than any particular conflict in life.⁵⁸

Contact Center runaways, with a low group mean of 3.76, held the most negative attitude toward their parents or foster parents. Since the majority of the court runaways had been held, at least briefly in detention, it was speculated that the experience of apprehension and incarceration may have temporarily altered their attitude toward the home or institution which they had left.

TABLE XV

Analysis of Variance: Subject's Feelings Toward
Parents (or Institution) He Was Living With

Sample Group	Number of Subjects	Total Score	Mean Average	Analysis of Variance
Court	50	311	6.22	n=105
Contact	21	78	3.76	p<.05
Control	34	301	8.85	F ₁₀₂ ² =10.63
Non-chronic	35	200	5.71	n=71
Chronic	36	190	5.28	p>.05 F ₆₉ ¹ =.39
$t = \bar{y} \text{ Contact} - \bar{y} \text{ Control} = 3.54$ $p < .05 \quad d.f. = 102$				
$t = \bar{y} \text{ Court} - \bar{y} \text{ Control} = 4.43$ $p < .05 \quad d.f. = 102$				

Variance in the group means of the chronic and non-chronic runaways in relation to the variability between each group was not greater than that expected by chance.

A comparison of the Contact Center group mean versus the control

group showed a significant difference between the two sample groups. Likewise, analysis of the control group and Juvenile Court subjects established that the court group was significantly more negative in their attitude toward their parents.

How Subject Thinks Parent(s) Feel Toward Him

Interval data on this variable was obtained from the same type of hate-love scale used in the preceding question on the subject's feeling toward his parent(s).

TABLE XVI

Analysis of Variance: How Subject Thinks
Parent(s) Feel Toward Him

Sample Group	Number of Subjects	Total Score	Mean Average	Analysis of Variance
Court	50	329	6.58	n=105
Contact	21	113	5.38	p<.05
Control	34	311	9.10	F ₁₀₂ ² =18.28
Non-chronic	35	209	5.97	n=71
Chronic	36	227	6.31	p>.05 F ₆₉ ¹ =.24

Analysis of variance of the Juvenile Court and Contact Center samples showed that a youngster's perception of how his parents feel toward him bears a statistically significant relationship to running away. It should be noted that the high school control sample's group mean was 9.1 on a 10-point scale. Contact Center runaways with a low mean of 5.38, held the most negative opinion of the nature of their relationship with their parents or guardian.

The group means for chronic and non-chronic runaways were very similar for this question and, therefore, statistical testing did not establish a relationship between this variable and chronic runaway behavior.

Number of Siblings

The average number of siblings for the two experimental samples, the control subjects, and the two runaway sub-groupings was calculated from the total number of siblings belonging to each respective group. The averages shown on Table 17 indicate that Contact Center runaways tend to have the smallest number of siblings in their families. This finding supports the observations of the agency staff that the runaway program is utilized primarily by middle and upper-middle class youth who tend to come from smaller families.

TABLE XVII

Frequency Distribution of Total Number of Sibling and Percentage Distribution of Unnatural Siblings

Sample Group	Total Subjects	Total Siblings	Average # Siblings	Unnatural Siblings	% Unnat. Siblings
Contact	21	50	2.4	18	.36
Court	50	159	3.2	52	.33
Control	34	104	3.1	20	.19
Non-chronic	35	101	2.9	21	.21
Chronic	36	109	3.0	49	.45

n=71 p<.05 *z=3.89

*z score applies only to the comparison of the percentage of unnatural siblings in the chronic and non-chronic categories.

Statistical testing on the sibling data focused on the difference between groups in regard to the number of unnatural siblings. An "unnatural sibling" was operationally defined as a step-brother or sister, a half-brother or sister, or foster sibling. Our supposition was that the frequency of unnatural siblings occurring in each group would serve as an approximate measure of deviation from an undisturbed nuclear family structure.

Percentage comparisons of chronic versus non-chronic runaways showed that chronic runaway had a significantly higher ratio of unnatural siblings in their families. This finding may correlate with the earlier data on marital status which showed that 73% of the parents of chronic runaways were divorced, widowed, or never married.

Ordinal Position

Chi-square analysis of the oldest and youngest children in the combined runaway group and in the two subgroups did not establish a statistically significant relationship between ordinal position in the family and runaway behavior.

TABLE XVIII
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Ordinal Positions

Ordinal Position	Combined Runaways		Control		Non-chronic		Chronic	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Oldest	25	35	7	21	10	28	15	42
Youngest	14	20	9	26	8	23	6	16
Middle Or Not Applicable	32	45	18	53	17	49	15	42
Total	71	100	34	100	35	100	36	100

n=105 $p > .05$ $*\chi^2 = 1.93$ d.f.=1

n=71 $\chi^2 = 1.27$ $p > .05$
d.f.=1

*Chi-square value pertains only to a comparison of the oldest and youngest ordinal positions.

Preliminary data suggesting a tendency for the youngest child in a family to be more ^{less} ~~prone~~ to running away ^{was} ~~could not be~~ ^{iated} substantiated by the larger samples responding to the final questionnaire.

Percentage distributions did suggest that chronic runaways were not likely to be the youngest child in the family. Consideration of the combined runaway group versus the control subjects indicated that runaways are more often the oldest rather than the youngest child in the family.

Parental Treatment of Subject in Relation to Siblings

The computed Chi-square value for Contact Center, Court, and control subjects who stated that their parents treated them either better or worse in relation to siblings significantly related perceived parental treatment and runaway behavior. Forty-four percent of the total runaway sample as compared to only 6% of the control group felt that their parents treated them worse in relation to siblings.

Furthermore, the issue of equitable treatment from parents is undoubtedly an important factor in a youngster's general feelings toward his parents. Data from this question, when viewed in conjunction with the findings from the inquiry about subjects' feelings toward his parents, would strongly suggest that a poor relationship with parents is a major contributor to running away. This phenomena of differential treatment may be enhanced by the finding of more unnatural siblings occurring in runaway families.

The Chi-square value for chronic and non-chronic runaways was not sufficient to establish a dependent relationship between the

subjects' perception of parental treatment of self in relation to siblings and chronic runaway behavior.

TABLE XIX

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Parental Treatment
Of Subject In Relation To Siblings

PARNTL TRTMT	Contact		Court		Control		Non-chronic		Chronic	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Same	6	29	27	54	27	79	16	46	17	47
Better	0	0	3	6	3	9	1	3	2	6
Worse	12	57	19	38	2	6	14	40	17	47
Different or not Applic.	3	14	1	2	2	6	4	11	0	0
Total	21	100	50	100	34	100	35	100	36	100

n=99 p<.05 * $\chi^2=20.59$ d.f.=4 n=67 p>.05
d.f.=1 $\chi^2=.29$

*Chi-square value pertains only to the comparison of same, better, or worse categories.

Trust Between Parent and Child

Another variable that was believed to be an important factor in family relationships is the amount of trust between parent and child. In many respects, a continuum response scale focusing on trust was thought to be a more comprehensive measure of conflict regarding decision-making authority than data about how specific issues are decided. Subjects were asked to indicate both how much they felt their parents trusted them as well as how much they trusted their parents. Possible responses ranged from "distrust" to "trust completely."

TABLE XX

Analysis of Variance: How Subject Feels Parent(s) Trusts Him

Sample Group	Number of Subjects	Total Score	Mean Average	Analysis of Variance
Court	50	187	3.59	n=105
Contact	21	62	2.95	p<.05
Control	34	259	7.60	F ₁₀₂ ² = 31.66
Non-chronic	35	118	3.69	n=71
chronic	36	110	3.36	F ₆₉ ¹ p>.05 =.26

Analysis of variance on the question of parental trust showed a statistically significant relationship between the variable and run-away behavior. Contact Center subjects perceived their parents as trusting them far less than the non-runaway control group thought their parents trusted them. The Juvenile Court runaways rated parental trust only slightly higher than did the Contact Center group. Variance in the group means of chronic and non-chronic runaways was not sufficient to establish a dependent relationship between parental trust and running away.

The importance of mutual trust between parent and adolescent was further substantiated by testing of interval data showing how much the young person trusts his own parents. Analysis of variance of group means from Contact Center, control group and Juvenile Court showed that variability between groups was far greater than could be expected by chance. Contact Center subjects placed far less trust in their parents than did the control group; Juvenile Court

runaways trusted their parents somewhat more than the Contact Center subjects. Test results on the chronic and non-chronic runaway groups again did not establish a statistically significant relationship between a youngster's trust in his parents and running away.

TABLE XXI

Analysis of Variance: Subject's Trust of Parent(s)

Sample Group	Number of Subjects	Total Score	Mean Average	Analysis of Variance
Court	50	281	5.62	n=105
Contact	21	91	4.30	p<.05
Control	34	300	8.80	$F_{102}^2=22.94$
Non-chronic	35	182	5.20	n=71
Chronic	36	192	5.33	$F_{69}^1 p>.05$ $=.03$

As with the pair of questions concerning the general tenor of feelings between parents and child, the testing of trust between parents and child was able to distinguish significant variables between the total runaway sample and non-runaways. However, analysis of variance of the two subgroup means did not result in the identification of a statistically significant relationship between trust or feelings and chronic runaway behavior.

Significant Other Adults

A majority of both the runaway and non-away subjects stated that they did have an adult with whom they could discuss important matters. However, a higher percentage of the control group (68%), as compared to the combined runaway sample (56%) answered the question affirmatively.

Chi-square testing of only the chronic and non-chronic runaways (excluding subjects who responded in the "other" category) established a statistically significant relationship between this variable and repetitive running away. Youngsters who do not have a trusted adult to talk with were more likely to engage in chronic runaway behavior.

TABLE XXII

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Adults With Whom
Important Matters Are Discussed

ADULTS TO TALK TO	Contact		Court		Control		Non-chronic		Chronic	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	11	52	29	58	23	68	24	68	16	45
No	8	38	19	38	11	32	9	26	18	50
Other (non- adult)	2	9	2	4	0	0	2	6	2	5
Total	21	100	50	100	34	100	35	100	36	100

*n=67 p<.05 $\chi^2=4.58$ d.f.=1

*Chi-square value pertains to subjects answering "yes" or "no" in non-chronic and chronic groups only.

How Long Was Subject on the Run

Our data on the length of time that a youngster stays on the run from his home (or institution) tends to support the findings of other researchers that such episodes are poorly planned and of brief duration.⁵⁹ Another interpretation of the short time away from home implies that runaway behavior is more an attempt to call attention to an unsatisfactory home situation than a desire to leave home.⁶⁰

Two-thirds of the Contact Center sample and nearly 60% of the court runaways were on the run for one week or less.

TABLE XXIII

Frequency and Percentage Distribution For How Long Subject
Was On The Run

TIME	Contact		Court		Non-chronic		Chronic	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Less than one week	14	67	29	58	21	60	22	61
One - Two weeks	2	10	7	14	3	11	6	17
Two - Four weeks	2	10	6	12	6	17	2	6
Four weeks or more	1	3	3	6	1	3	3	8
Other or no answer	2	10	5	10	4	9	3	8
Total	21	100	50	100	35	100	36	100

The undetermined number of runaways who do not seek help from voluntary social service agencies or who are not referred to Juvenile Court may comprise a group of youngsters with greater resources and more sophistication in their plans to run away. We have speculated, therefore, that it may be this unidentified population of runaways who are the youth that stay away from home for longer periods or fail to return home at all.

Previous Runaway Experiences

Juvenile Court subjects had an average of 3.12 previous runaway episodes as compared to an average of 2.00 prior runaway experiences for the Contact Center group. However, the analysis of variance was not sufficient to establish a statistically significant difference in the group means. Fifty-eight percent of the Juvenile Court runaways

were chronic as compared to only 33% of the Contact Center runaways. This would imply that Contact runaways have had less runaway experience than kids who are referred to Juvenile Court.

TABLE XXIV

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Previous Runaway Experiences

Number of Previous Runs	Contact		Court		Non-chronic		Chronic	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
None - two	14	66	21	42	35	100	0	0
Three - Five	5	24	21	42	0	0	26	72
Six - Eight	1	5	5	10	0	0	6	17
Nine or More	1	5	3	6	0	0	4	11
Total	21	100	50	100	35	100	36	100
Means	2.00		3.12		--		--	
n=71		p>.05	F ₆₉ ¹ =2.09		d. f. =69			

Thirty-eight percent of the Contact Center runaways in contrast to 16% of the court group had not previously run away from home. Since a majority of the subjects from both agencies had had at least one other runaway experience, it would appear that once running away has been tried, it is likely to be a recurrent method of coping with problems.

Although our research was not designed to evaluate the effectiveness of service from either agency, this data does draw attention to the question of the efficacy of social services in deterring repeated runaway behavior. The finding of a study of runaways in Salt Lake

County, Utah, clearly indicated that "youth who are running away from home are not aware of services which are available to them."⁶¹ Furthermore, it was found that of "those youth who had contact with a social agency offering personal counseling services almost two-thirds (63 percent) stated that they had not been helped with their problems."⁶² Therefore, a dual problem confronts those who wish to help runaways develop alternate ways of handling their difficulties: 1) a lack of awareness of services on the part of youth, and 2) a lack of service-effectiveness once help is sought.

Event That Precipitated Runaway

In assessing the reasons for the subject running away, no significant difference occurred between court and Contact; and chronics vs. non-chronic runaways.

TABLE XXV

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Event That Precipitated Runaway

EVENT	Contact		Court		Non-chronic		Chronic	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Fight with parents, sibling, or change in marital status of parents	10	48	28	56	18	52	20	56
Kicked out, law violation, nothing specific.	2	9	12	24	6	17	8	22
Other, no answer	9	43	10	20	11	31	8	22
Total	21	100	50	100	35	100	36	100
<hr/>								
n=71	p>.05	x ² =4.65		d.f.=2		n=71 x ² =1.24		p>.05 d.f.=2

Thus, the actual result of this particular question is that a majority of the runaways (55%) ran away from home because of a family fight or conflict--(Category 1, 2, 4). Furthermore, exactly 50% of the court runaways gave "fight w/parents" as the reason for running away, while 38% of the Contact runaways gave that reason. These findings are representative of other questions concerning the runaway's attitude toward his family. Certainly the family adjustment is critically important in determining whether a child will run away from home.

Has Subject Ever Been to Juvenile Court

Statistical testing of the Court and Contact runaways resulted in no significant difference between the populations. However, 72% of the Court runaways had been to Juvenile Court versus 57% of the Contact sample.

TABLE XXVI

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Previous Juvenile Court Contacts

Been to Juvenile Ct. Bfr.	Contact No.	%	Court No.	%	Control No.	%	Non-chronic No.	%	Chronic No.	%
Yes	12	57	36	72	0	0	16	46	32	89
No	9	43	14	28	34	100	19	54	4	11
Total	21	100	50	100	34	100	35	100	36	100

n=71 p>.05 * $\chi^2=1.49$ d.f.=1

n=71 p<.05
 $\chi^2=15.10$ d.f.=1

*Chi-square refers only to Contact and Court sample.

This may suggest that the recidivism to Juvenile Court agencies is quite high for runaways. Certainly a majority of the runaways sampled

had been to a social agency before, and had apparently not received effective intervention. Comparison of the chronic vs. non-chronic runaways resulted in a high significant difference in terms of previous Juvenile Court contact. While less than half of the non-chronics had been to Juvenile Court, an overwhelming 89% of the chronic runaways had previous Court contact. Even more conclusive is that all of the non-runaway population denied any previous Court contact. This finding generally supports the premise that runaways have a high probability of referral to Juvenile Courts as opposed to non-runaways.

Why Referred to Juvenile Court

In assessing the reasons for referral to Juvenile Court, a comparison was made between non-status versus status offenses (running away, truancy, curfew, and drinking). Between Court and Contact Center, there was a significant difference among status offenses, with 72% of the Court population being referred for status offenses and only 33% of the Contact population referred for this reason. It appears that Contact runaways may have more serious delinquent involvement than the Court runaway population. Perhaps the reporting accuracy of Juvenile Court referrals varied greatly between the two runaway populations. In comparing the chronic versus non-chronic groups, no significant difference was found, although 44% of the non-chronic and 72% of the chronic runaways had been referred for status offenses. This supports the recurrent behavior pattern of runaways tending to run away more than once, and furthermore not being likely to become involved in serious delinquency. Sixty-nine percent of the Court runaways had been referred for runaway while only 33% of the

Contact population for this reason. No data was applicable on the control group and thus we did not compare runaways and non-runaways in this question. Several authors, such as Robins and O'Neal,⁶³ and Nye and Short,⁶⁴ have stressed the relationship between running away and other anti-social behavior. On the basis of our research, running away is not a valid predictor of serious delinquency, although since running away is presently labeled delinquent behavior, runaways are likely to have previous and future delinquency.

TABLE XXVII

Frequency and Percentage of Status Offense Referrals
To Juvenile Court

REASON FOR REFERRAL	Contact No.	&	Court No.	&	Non-chronic No.	&	Chronic No.	&
Status Offense	4	33	26	72	7	44	23	72
Non-Status Offense	8	67	10	28	9	56	9	28
Total	12	100	36	100	16	100	32	100
n=48 p<.05 $\chi^2=5.80$ d.f.=1					n=48 $\chi^2=3.60$ p>.05 d.f.=1			

Trouble in School

Statistical testing was done to determine if a runaway was more likely to become in trouble in school than non-runaways, and this hypothesis was substantiated. Forty-one percent of the runaway population had been in trouble in school, while only 15% of the non-runaways responded positively to the question. Comparison was done on the chronic versus non-chronic runaways and this resulted in no significant difference. Fifty percent of the chronic runaways had

been in "trouble." This seemed to follow the trend of chronics versus non-chronics having little difference in character.

TABLE XXVIII

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Subject Having
Been In Trouble At School

Trouble in School	Contact		Court		Control		Non-chronic		Chronic	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	8	38	21	42	5	15	12	34	17	47
No	12	57	28	56	29	85	23	66	17	47
Not Applic. (out of school)	1	5	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	6
Total	21	100	50	100	34	100	35	100	36	100

n=71 p<.05 * $\chi^2=7.69$ d.f.=1

n=69 $\chi^2=1.75$ p>.05
d.f.=1

*Chi-square value pertains to a comparison
of all runaways versus non-runaways.

If Yes, What Kind of Trouble

No statistical testing was done on this particular question because of the wide variance in the responses and relative lack of applicability to the control group. It should be noted that over 50% of the Court runaways were in minor trouble (1, 3), and exactly 50% of the Contact runaways were in minor trouble. This pattern was not changed between the chronic and non-chronic groups, with nearly 50% of the non-chronic runaways and over 50% of the chronic runaways being in "minor trouble." Thus, the kind of trouble in school seemed constant throughout all groups of runaways.

TABLE XXIX

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Type
of Trouble in School

Type of Trouble	Contact No.	Contact %	Court No.	Court %	Control No.	Control %	Non-chronic No.	Non-chronic %	Chronic No.	Chronic %
Truancy	3	14	2	4	1	3	3	9	2	6
Assault	0	0	4	8	0	0	1	3	3	8
Breaking School Rules	1	5	9	18	1	3	3	9	7	19
Expelled	4	19	3	6	1	3	4	11	3	8
Drugs	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	3
Other	0	0	1	2	2	6	0	0	1	3
Not Applic.	13	62	30	60	29	85	24	68	19	53
Total	21	100	50	100	34	100	35	100	36	100

How Subject Feels About School

Comparison was done between Court, Contact and the control group and a significant difference was found. Clearly the runaway populations exhibited more negative feelings than the control group and thus accounted for the statistical difference. No statistical test was done on the chronic versus non-chronic groups because of the minimal difference between means. It can safely be asserted that no difference in attitude toward school occurs between chronics and non-chronics. However, while 18% of the non-chronic group stated they absolutely "hate" school, 40% of the chronic group gave this response. This signifies a readiness for the chronic runaways to admit intensely

negative feelings toward school.

TABLE XXX

Analysis of Variance: How Subject Feels Toward School

Sample Group	Number of Subjects	Total Score	Population Mean	Analysis of Variance
Court	50	211	4.22	n=105
Contact	21	98	4.67	p<.05
Control	34	216	6.35	$F_{102}^2=4.63$
Non-chronic	35	162	4.25	No test
Chronic	36	173	4.30	

CHAPTER 6
CONCLUSIONS
RESULTS

This study has been concerned with determining significant characteristics between runaway and non-runaway populations, and the agencies which serve them. Data was recorded in both a preliminary and a final survey using different population samples. A combined runaway population of 71 subjects from Multnomah County Juvenile Court and Contact Center was utilized on the final survey; thirty-four non-runaway Portland Public High School students served as the control population.

Three basic questions were established for consideration at the outset of this research study. These questions, given in the Introduction, are listed below with the findings from the final survey.

1. Are runaways significantly different from non-runaways in terms of the selected independent variables? The following 15 variables were found to identify characteristics that occurred statistically more often (*) in runaways or that showed a greater tendency to be associated with runaway behavior:

- A. Sex--Runaways were likely to be female.
- B. Parents' marital status--Runaways were likely to have natural parents not married to each other.
- C. *Living Arrangement--Runaways not living with natural parents.
- D. *Intact Family--Runaways not members of intact families.
- E. *Legal Custody--Runaways were in institutional custody.

- F. *Feeling Toward Parents--Runaways had negative attitudes toward parents/or institution with whom they are living.
- G. Siblings--Runaways were likely to have more "unnatural" siblings.
- H. Ordinal Position--Runaways tended to be oldest child in family.
- I. *Parental Treatment--Runaways felt they received worse treatment from parents in relation to other siblings.
- J. *Subject's Trust in Parents--Runaways felt less trust toward parents.
- K. *Parental Trust in Subjects--Runaways felt less trust from their parents.
- L. Significant Other Adults--Runaways had fewer adults to talk to about important matters.
- M. *Previous Court Referrals--Runaways had more Juvenile Court referrals.
- N. *Trouble in School--Runaways experienced more "trouble" in school.
- O. *Attitude Toward School--Runaways were likely to have a more negative attitude toward school.

2. Are Contact Center runaways significantly different from Juvenile Court runaways in terms of the selected independent variables?

The following 10 variables were found to identify characteristics that occurred statistically more often (*) in Contact Center runaways or that showed a greater tendency to be associated with runaways from

Contact Center.

- A. Race--Contact Center runaways are pre-dominantly Caucasian.
- B. Area of Residency--Contact Center runaways are more likely to be Portland area residents.
- C. Parents' Marital Status--Contact Center runaways' natural parents are more likely to be married.
- D. Visitation with Absent Parent--Contact Center runaways, if not living with natural mother, tend to visit natural mother infrequently.
- E. *Feelings Toward Parents--Contact Center runaways had more negative attitudes toward parent/or institution.
- F. Siblings--Contact Center runaways tend to have fewer siblings.
- G. *Parental Treatment--Contact Center runaway felt that they received worse treatment from parents in relation to other siblings.
- H. Previous Runaway Experiences--Contact Center runaways were likely to have had fewer prior runaway experiences.
- I. Previous Juvenile Court Referrals--Contact Center runaway tended not to have previous Juvenile Court referrals.
- J. *Nature of Previous Juvenile Court Referral--Contact Center runaways were not referred for status offenses.

The combined data from three scaled response questions relating to parent-child relationships appears to support a trend for Contact Center runaways to hold considerably more negative attitudes toward their parents than did Juvenile Court runaways. For questions concerning how much the child trusted his parents, how much the child thought his parents trusted him, and how the child perceived his

parents feeling toward him, our computed population means showed that Contact Center subjects were much less trustful of their parents and, in turn, generally believed that they were trusted and loved less than did the subjects at Juvenile Court.

3. Are chronic runaways significantly different from non-chronic runaways in terms of the selected independent variables? The following 10 variables were found to identify characteristics that occurred statistically more often (*) in chronic runaways or that showed a greater tendency to be associated with chronic runaway behavior:

A. *Age--Chronic runaways were younger.

B. *Parents' Marital Status--Chronic runaways' natural parents were not married or were separated.

C. *Living Arrangements--Chronic runaways were living with foster parents, relatives, or in institutional settings.

D. Legal Custody--Chronic runaways were likely to be in the custody of an institution.

E. *Siblings--Chronic runaways had more "unnatural siblings."

F. Ordinal Position--Chronic runaways were not the youngest child in the family.

G. *Significant Other Adults--Chronic runaways had fewer adults to talk with about important matters.

H. *Previous Juvenile Court Referrals--Chronic runaways had more previous Juvenile Court referrals.

I. Reason For Previous Juvenile Court Referral--Chronic runaways were more often referred for "status offenses."

J. Feelings About School--Chronic runaways had more negative

attitudes toward school.

Furthermore, additional characteristics unique to the runaway population included the following:

1. Female runaways peaked at age 15, while male runaways peaked at age 16 (See Table IV).
2. Runaways were predominately in the freshman and sophomore classes in high school.
3. The precipitating event for running away was most often "family conflict."
4. Running away from home is a pattern of behavior likely to be repetitive.
5. When not living with natural father, runaways visited infrequently.
6. Runaways experienced "serious" trouble in school.

Information that was specific to Contact Center runaways based on the Preliminary Survey included the following:

1. Seventy-two percent of the runaways did not know about Contact Center before they left home.
2. Most of the runaways later learned of the agency from friends.
3. Reasons for coming to Contact Center were stated in very general terms, i.e., "to get help." (A previous comparative question found that the specific kind of help most often requested was assistance in finding a foster home or other living arrangement.)
4. Sixty percent of the group did not have any immediate plans, wished to return home (or to foster care), or simply wanted to "work out their problems,"

5. The future plans of 50% of the Contact Center subjects were either to continue with school or to find employment. Other runaways were unsure of their future plans or reported a highly individualized plan for the future.

Impact For The Community

With respect to the previously cited results, numerous implications can be drawn for runaways and the agencies which serve them. Using the differences between runaways and non-runaways, early identification of runaway-prone youth may be implemented. This would increase the effectiveness of prevention which typically has not been a focus for social service agencies. Particular attention must be given to family characteristics, relationship with parents, and school adjustment when considering preventative and treatment alternatives. The effect of the public school system upon a child's potential to run away appears to be significant. Youth who experience difficulty in adjusting to the school system have increased probability that they will become a runaway. Therefore, the runaway's family is not the only causal factor within the total environment of the runaway youth.

Using the differences between Contact Center and Juvenile Court, it becomes apparent that different social agencies receive client populations with differing characteristics, even when the "presenting problem" is identical. This phenomena suggests that prevention and treatment planning must consider the agency context rather than focusing only upon the social problem. General cross-agency differences between Contact and Juvenile Court occurred in areas of runaway's area of residency, race, family characteristics, relationship with

parents, and previous runaway referrals and experience. Speculation of the research group that Contact Center is serving a more middle-class population than Juvenile Court, based on a number of siblings, economic information, and previous Court referrals was only substantiated in the final survey. It should be noted that this impression is far from conclusive; data in the preliminary survey suggested contradictory results. This inconsistency could be attributed to a non-representative sample in one or both of the surveys, or a changing characteristic in the client population.

The larger number of chronic runaways at Juvenile Court may suggest that, for the most part, Contact's runaways are less experienced in running away and manage to escape the juvenile justice system. Certainly the likelihood of being referred to court increases as a kid runs more times. Perhaps para-professional community agencies such as Contact Center offer more potential for reaching adolescents earlier in their anti-social and problematic behavior. The focus of efforts to develop preventative services for runaways and youth experiencing interpersonal conflict should be directed at highly accessible points in the community, i.e., the public schools.

The characteristics which distinguish chronic from non-chronic runaways bear a striking similarity to the variables which differentiate runaways from non-runaways. Eight out of the ten variables (80%) resulting in differences between the chronic and non-chronic runaway were also common to the characteristics of runaways. These results show that chronic runaways are experiencing poorer family situations, and more negative attitudes toward school, than their non-chronic counterparts. Characteristics significant to runaways are qualitatively

and quantitatively similar in their cumulative effect upon determining the extent of runaway involvement. Also the high frequency of chronic runaways in our runaway population suggests the recurring pattern of runaway behavior. While no conclusive remarks can be given about the treatment of this behavior, it can certainly be assumed that effective intervention is not being accomplished. Runaways are for the most part not a "delinquent" group of adolescents who become involved in behavior destructive to the community.

Implications For Future Research

On the basis of the findings of this study, several recommendations can be made for further research on the problem of runaway youth. As noted in the discussion of delimiting features of this study, our sampling procedure did not allow for a comparison of services provided to runaways at Juvenile Court and Contact Center. Information on the nature of current services and/or treatment is essential if we are to begin to address the difficult question of service effectiveness.

A longitudinal study of runaways would allow for a more thorough review of individual dispositions. Patterns of superficial adjustment to a troubled living situation, evidence of later serious anti-social behavior, and treatment methods and placements that proved to be inappropriate as well as ineffective could be more readily identified.

This study did not approach the problem of service effectiveness from the point of view of the client. Future research should take into account the opinion of runaway youth and their families concerning the type of services that were available or, in many cases,

mandatory for runaway youth.

Development of a more definitive typology of runaway youth would require research with greater attention to socioeconomic variables, e.g., specific family income, educational levels of parents, etc. Furthermore, if theories which link runaway behavior to emotional instability are to be affirmed, discarded or modified, selected psychological testing should be performed with various runaway populations.

At the same time, the possibility should be investigated that cultural trends in social organization and shifts in value orientations may influence runaway behavior. Measures of value divergence or conflict between parent and child, when combined with other significant variables, could serve as a predictor of runaway prone youth. Earlier identification of potential runaways would enable truly preventative intervention.

It is our hope that this study and future research on runaways and other status offenders will initiate a reassessment of the concept of delinquency. A more complete understanding of these youth and all juvenile offenders is contingent upon removing the stigma of delinquency from behavior which is not criminally destructive. Even when dealing with seriously deviant youth, the juvenile justice labeling process may have effects which are, in the long range, detrimental to the healthy adjustment of adolescents. Probably more important is the total community response to helping troubled individuals achieve their full potential.⁶⁵

. . . We will have to create communities that break down the isolation felt by so many parents and children. We have to encourage human contact and warmth between families as well as within them. We will probably have to transform the whole American ethos.⁶⁵

FOOTNOTES

1. David Riley, "Runaways: And Then There Were Thousands," The Washingtonian, November, 1971, p. 64.
2. Statistical Report 1971--Multnomah County Juvenile Court and Donald E. Long Home, Portland, Oregon.
3. George E. Outland, "Determinants Involved in Boy Transiency," Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. II, No. 6, February, 1938, pp. 371-72.
4. Ibid, pp. 366-67.
5. Thomas Minehan, Boy and Girl Tramps of America, Farrer and Rinehart, New York, 1934.
6. August Aichhorn, Wayward Youth, Viking Press, New York, 1935.
7. Ibid, p. 38.
8. Ibid, p. 41.
9. Douglas A. Thom, M.D., Normal Youth and Its Everyday Problems, D. Appleton-Century Co., New York, 1932.
10. Ibid, p. 245.
11. Amos Robey, M.D., Richard T. Rosenwalf, M.D., John E. Snell, M.D. and Rita E. Lee, "The Runaway Girl: A Reaction to Family Stress," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Vol. XXIV, No. 4, July, 1964, pp. 762-767.
12. Ibid, p. 763.
13. Dorothy C. Wylie and Joseph Weinreb, "The Treatment of a Runaway Adolescent Girl Through Treatment of the Mother," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Vol. XXVIII, No. 1, January 1958, pp. 188-195.
14. Dr. Frederick Rosenheim, "Techniques of Therapy," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, October, 1940, Vol. X, pp. 651-65.
15. Ibid, p. 657.
16. Herbert Staub, "A Runaway from Home," Psychoanalytic Quarterly, 12 (1): 1943, pp. 1-22.
17. Lawson G. Lowrey, "Runaways and Nomads," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Vol. XI, No. 4, October, 1941, pp. 775-783.
18. Ibid, p. 781.
19. Ibid, p. 777.

20. Leo Kanner, M.D., Child Psychiatry, Charles C. Thomas, publisher, 2nd ed., 1950.
21. Ibid, pp. 697-98.
22. Morris D. Reimer, "Runaway Children," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Vol. X, July, 1940, p. 522.
23. Ibid, pp. 522-23.
24. Ibid, p. 523.
25. Ibid, p. 525.
26. Randall M. Foster, M.D., "Intrapsychic and Environmental Factors in Running Away from Home," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Vol. XXXII, No. 3, April, 1962, pp. 486-91.
27. Ibid, p. 491.
28. Theodore Leventhal, "Inner Control Deficiencies in Runaway Children," Archives of General Psychiatry, Vol II, August, 1964, pp. 170-76.
29. Ibid, p. 170.
30. Ibid, p. 175.
31. Ibid, p. 175.
32. Ibid, p. 172-173.
33. Joseph E. Paull, "The Runaway Foster Child," Child Welfare, July, 1956, pp. 21-26.
34. Lawrence S. Bradshaw, et al, Runaway Youth in Salt Lake County, unpublished Masters Thesis, University of Utah, June, 1969.
35. James A. Hildebrand, "Why Runaways Leave Home," The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, Northwestern University School of Law, Vol. 54, No. 2, June, 1963, pp. 211-16.
36. Ivan Nye and James F. Short, Jr., "Scaling Delinquent Behavior," American Sociological Review, June 1957, pp. 326-31.
37. Lee N. Robins, "Mental Illness and the Runaway--A 30 Year Follow-up Study," Human Organization, Winter, 1958, pp. 11-15.
38. Ibid, p. 13.
39. Lee N. Robins and Patricia O'Neal, "The Adult Prognosis for Runaway Children," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Vol. XXIX, No. 4, October, 1959, pp. 752-61.

40. Ibid, pp. 760-61.
41. Robert Shellow, Julianna R. Schamp. Elliot Liebow, and Elizabeth Unger, Suburban Runaways of the 1960's, Society for Research in Child Development, Chicago, 1967.
42. Ibid, p. 21.
43. Ibid, p. 28.
44. Rev. Larry Beggs, Huckleberry's for Runaways, Ballantine Books, New York, 1969.
45. David Riley, "Runaways: And Then There Were Thousands," The Washingtonian, November, 1971, pp. 64-73.
46. Ibid, p. 123.
47. Jane Whitbread, "Runaways: Greenwich Village Case Histories," Look, July 25, 1967, pp. 26-32.
48. Lawrence Bradshaw, et al, Runaway Youth in Salt Lake County, University of Utah, June, 1969, p. 41.
49. David Riley, "Runaways: Then There Were Thousands," The Washingtonian, November, 1971, Vol. 7, No. 2, p. 66.
50. Male referrals, 761; female referrals, 1204; total runaway referrals 1,965. 1971 Multnomah County Juvenile Court Statistical Report, p. 8.
51. Portland Public Schools' Annual Report, 1970-71, (unpublished at the time of this study; data provided by administrative staff.)
52. James A. Hildebrand, "Why Runaways Leave Home," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, LIV, June, 1963, pp. 221-226.
53. Lawrence S. Bradshaw, et. al., Runaway Youth in Salt Lake County, University of Utah, June, 1969, p. 36.
54. "Runaway Kids," Life, LXIII, November, 1967, p. 18.
55. Census Population & Housing, CRAG, June, 1971, p. 1.
56. Vital Statistics, Oregon State Health, 1971.
57. Lawrence S. Bradshaw, et. al., Runaways in Salt Lake County, p. 41.
58. Douglas A. Thom, 1932, Normal Youth and Its Everyday Problems, D. Appleton-Century Co., New York, 1932.

59. Robert Shellow, et al, Suburban Runaways of the 1960's, Society For Research in Child Development, Chicago, 1967, p. 19.
60. Rev. Larry Beggs, Huckleberry's for Runaways, Ballantine Books, New York, 1969, p. 12.
61. Lawrence S. Bradshaw, et al, Runaway Youth in Salt Lake County, University of Utah, June, 1969, p. 65.
62. Ibid, p. 57.
63. Lee N. Robins and Patricia O'Neal, "The Adult Prognosis for Runaway Children," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Vol. XXIX, No. 4, October, 1959, pp. 752-761.
64. Ivan Nye and James F. Short, Jr., "Scaling Delinquent Behavior," American Sociological Review, June, 1957, pp. 326-333.
65. David Riley, "Runaways: Then There Were Thousands," The Washingtonian, November, 1971, p. 71.

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW FORM

1st COURT QUESTIONNAIRE

Court # _____ Date _____

Sex _____ Race _____ Birthdate _____ Age _____

Are you living at home? Yes _____ No _____ If not, with whom? _____

Check () parents' marital status: Married _____ Divorced _____ Separated _____

Check () who has legal custody: Parents _____ Court _____ Relative _____

Other _____

Number of siblings: Brothers _____ Sisters _____ No. at home _____

Your position in family: Oldest _____ Middle _____ Youngest _____

Is family receiving welfare? Yes _____ No _____

How were you referred to the court? Parents _____ Police _____ School _____

Other _____

Have you been referred to court before? Yes _____ No _____

What kind of help would you like to receive from the court? _____

School _____ Grade level _____ Have you ever been in any trouble at school? If so, what? _____

Were you attending school at the time you ran away? Yes _____ No _____

If not, were you: expelled _____ suspended _____ dropped out _____

How do you feel about school? _____
(indicate attitude and degree of emotion)

Have you ever run away before? Yes _____ No _____ If yes, how many times? _____

Did you run away alone or w/others? _____ If w/others, how many? _____

How long have you been away from home, guardian, or foster home? _____

What happened just before you decided to run? _____
(probe for critical incident)

What did you like most about running away? _____
(probe for single thing liked most)

What did you dislike most about running away? _____
(probe for single thing disliked most)

How do you feel about your parents/guardian? _____
(indicate attitude & degree of emotion)

How do you think your parents/guardian feel toward you? _____

How do you feel toward other family members? _____
(indicate attitude & degree of emotion)

How do you think other family members feel toward you? _____

What adults would you talk to about important things? _____
(parents, relatives, etc.)

Do you have any close friendships? _____ If so, how many? _____
(Not family)

Where were you going when you ran away? _____

How do you feel about going home? _____

Indicate with * next to subject which is of greatest conflict between yourself and parents. Write next to each subject whether you decide it or your parents.

Clothes _____ * Hair _____ Where to go _____ Hours _____

Friends _____ Drugs _____ Cigarettes _____ School _____

How are conflicts usually settled? Parents decide _____ You decide _____
_____ Decided on democratic basis _____

Disposition: _____(appropriate code) Placement: _____(appropriate code)

01 Remand
(CHGE NOT SUBSTNTD)	(CHARGE SUBSTNTD AT HEARING)
02 Found not inv by cnslr	15 Handled cocrntly/other refrl
03 Dismissed at ct hearing
(CHARGE SUBSTNTD NO HEARING)	16 Dismissed
04 Handled concrntly/other refrl	17 Place on forml probn
05 Warn/close or child disaprd	18 Cont on forml probn
06 Place on informl suprvision	19 Suspnd commt
07 Cont on informl suprv	20 Revoke suspnd cmmt (spcfy via
item 10)
08 Cont on forml probn	21 Commtd to (spcfy via item 10)
09 Ret to (spcfy via item 10)	22 Rtrnd to (spcfy via item 10)
10 Ret to other jrsdn	23 Rtrnd to other jrsdn
11 Rfrd to other court, agency/
indiv	24 Suprvn, ct, dep
12 Suprvn, ct. dep	25 Suprvn, wlfr, dep
13 Suprvn, wlfr, dep	26 Suprvn, other, dep
14 Suprvn, other, dep	(SPECIAL PROCEEDINGS)
	27 Term/prntl rights
	28 Perm commt/prntl rights (via
item 10)
	29 Other

Counselor's comments: (Please specify who made the dispositional plan
and what type of treatment or service was given.)

Counselor _____

APPENDIX B

PRELIMINARY SURVEY

CONTACT INTERVIEW FORM

Name _____ Date _____

Home address _____ Phone _____
city, stateParents address _____ Phone _____
city, state

Sex ____ Birthdate _____ Age ____ Birthplace _____ Race _____

Parents Marital Status _____ Your Legal Custody _____
(Married, Divorced, etc.) (Parents, Court, etc.)

Number of siblings: Brothers _____ Sisters _____ No. living at home _____

Your position in the family: Oldest ____ Youngest ____ Middle ____

Is family receiving welfare? Yes ____ No ____ If yes, caseworker _____

Have you ever been to Juvenile Court? Yes ____ No ____ If yes, why? _____

If applicable, why did you come to Portland area? _____
(Friends, Relatives, City action)How did you hear about Contact Center? _____
(Friends, Paper, Other agency, etc.)Why did you come to Contact Center? _____
(To get help, curiosity, etc.)What kind of help do you want from Contact? _____
(Housing, counseling, information, etc.)School last attended _____ Grade level _____ Have you
ever been in any serious trouble at school? ____ If so, what? _____Were you attending school at the time you ran away? Yes ____ No ____ If no,
were you expelled ____ suspended ____ dropped out ____How do you feel about school? _____
(Indicate attitude and degree of emotion)

What are your immediate plans? _____
(Return home, find foster care, travel,
etc.)

What are your future plans? _____
(Find job, travel, go to school, etc.)

Interviewer _____

RUNAWAY INFORMATION

Have you ever run away before? Yes___ No___ If yes, how many times? ___

Did you run away alone or with others?___ If with others, how many? _

How long have you been away from home? _____ From guardian? _____
(parents home) (if applicable)

What happened just before you decided to run? _____
(fight with parents, kicked out, etc.)

What did you like about running away? _____
(freedom, travel, no fights, etc.)

What don't you like about running away? _____
(loneliness, no economic support, etc.)

How do you feel toward your parents/guardian? _____
(indicate attitude and degree of emotion)

How do parents/guardian feel toward you? _____
(indicate attitude and degree of emotion)

How do you feel toward other family members? _____
(indicate attitude and degree of emotion)

How do other family members feel toward you? _____
(indicate attitude and degree of emotion)

What adults would you talk to about important things? _____
(parents, relatives, etc.)

Do you have any close friendships?___ If so, how many? _____
(not family)

Where were you going when you ran away? _____
(to see friends, didn't know, etc.)

Did you know about Contact Center before you ran away? Yes___ No___

Why don't you want to go home now? _____
(indicate factors runaway wants changed)

Who usually decides questions about the following matters? Indicate
with * next to subject which is of greatest conflict.

Clothes _____ Hair _____ Where you go _____ Hours _____ Friends _____

Drugs _____

Interviewer's comments: any information regarding impressions, recommendations for helping this person, and reason for the runaway.

DISPOSITION AND REFERRAL SHEET

Client Status (runaway, crasher, street person, etc.) _____

Phone clearance with _____ Date _____
(name of person)Outcome of parent/guardian contact _____
(indicate general response and attitude)

Legal waiver sent _____ By _____ Date _____ Received _____

<u>Services Provided</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Agencies Involved</u> (List Rep. if possible)
Housing _____		Juvenile Court _____
Information _____		Court Counselor _____
Counseling _____		School _____
Medical _____		Other _____
Family session _____		<u>Referrals</u> _____ <u>Date</u> _____
Legal _____		Outside-In _____
Food _____		Psychiatric _____
Financial _____		Legal Aid _____
Transportation _____		Other _____
Other _____		_____

Disposition (returned home, foster home, community agency, remained on street, etc.): _____

Client impression of help received from Contact (indicate attitude and emotion): _____

Client departure date _____ Client destination _____

Worker comments (Please include any follow-up or information about client):

Worker _____

APPENDIX C
PRELIMINARY SURVEY
CONTROL QUESTIONNAIRE

Date_____

Sex____ Race_____ Birthdate_____ Age _____

Check () parents' marital status: Married____ Separated____ Divorced____

Check () who has legal custody: Parents____ Court____ Other____

No. of siblings: Brothers____ Sisters____ No. at home____

Your position in the family: Oldest____ Middle____ Youngest____

Is your family receiving welfare? Yes____ No____

Have you ever been to juvenile court? Yes____ No____

If yes, why?_____

School_____ Grade level_____ Have you ever been in any trouble at
school? Yes____ No____ If yes, what?_____

How do you feel about school?_____

How do you feel toward your parents/guardian?_____

How do you think your parents/guardian feel toward you?_____

How do you feel toward other family members?_____

How do you think other family members feel toward you?_____

What adults would you talk to about important things?_____

Do you have any close friendships?_____ If so, how many?_____

Indicate with * next to subject which is of greatest conflict between
yourself and parents: write next to each subject whether you decide it
or your parents.

Clothes_____ Hair_____ Where you go_____ Hours_____

Friends_____ Drugs_____ Cigarettes_____ School_____

How are conflicts usually settled? Parents decide___ You decide___

Decided on democratic basis___

Have you ever been away from home for 24 hours or more without parental consent? Yes___ No___

If you have been away from home for more than 24 hours, was there an agency involved? Yes___ No___

What agency? Welfare___ Juvenile Court___ Contact Center___

If you have never been away from home without parental consent, have you ever considered it? Yes___ No___

If yes, why did you decide against it?_____

APPENDIX D

MULTNOMAH COUNTY JUVENILE COURT

RUNAWAY FORM

Name _____ Date _____

Home Address _____ Phone _____
(City, State)

Sex ____ Birthdate _____ Age ____ Race _____

Check the status of your natural (biological) parents;

1. Still Married _____	4. Widowed _____
2. Separated _____	5. Never Married _____
3. Divorced _____	6. Don't Know _____

If #3 or #4 above, approximately how many years ago did this occur? ____

Check the people you were living with before you ran away; and specify the number of brothers and sisters present:

Natural Mother _____	Natural Brothers _____
Natural Father _____	Natural Sisters _____
Stepmother _____	Step-Brothers _____
Stepfather _____	Step-Sisters _____
Foster Parents _____	Half-Brothers _____
Relatives _____	Half-Sisters _____
Institution _____	Foster Siblings _____

If not living with natural parents, who has your legal custody?

Natural Mother _____	Welfare _____
Natural Father _____	Juv. Court _____
Relatives _____	Other _____

If not living with either natural parent, check the frequency which you generally visit them:

Mother: Often___ Occasionally___ Seldom___ Not at all___

Father: Often___ Occasionally___ Seldom___ Not at all___

How long have you been on the run?

What happened just before you decided to run? _____
(fight w/parents, kicked out, etc.)

Have you ever run away before? Yes___ No___ If yes, how many times?___

Have you ever been to Juvenile Court? Yes___ No___ If yes, why?_____

School last attended_____ Grade Level___ Have you ever been
in any serious trouble at school?_____ If yes, what?_____

Circle the number which most closely represents your feelings about
school:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
(Dislike) (Neutral) (Like a Lot)

Circle the number which most closely represents your feelings about
the parents (or institution) that you are living with:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
(Hate) (Neutral) (Love)

Circle the number which most closely represents how much YOU TRUST your
parents:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
(Distrust) (Trust Sometimes) (Trust Completely)

Circle the number which most closely represents the feelings of your
parents (whom you lived with) toward you:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
(Dislike) (Neutral) (Love)

Circle the number which most closely represents how much YOUR PARENTS
TRUST you:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
(Distrust) (Trust Sometimes) (Trust Completely)

If applicable, how do your parents treat you in relation to your brothers
and/or sisters whom you live with?

About Same___ Better___ Worse___

Your position is the family: Oldest___ Youngest___ Middle___

Are there any adults with whom you can discuss important matters and
problems privately?

Yes___ No___

APPENDIX E

CONTACT CENTER RUNAWAY FORM

Name _____ Date _____

Home Address _____ Phone _____
(City, State)Parents Name _____ Father Occupation _____
(Parents you live with) (If no father, list mother)Parents Address _____ Phone _____
(City, State)

Sex _____ Birthdate _____ Age _____ Race _____

Check the status of your natural (biological) parents:

1. Still married _____	4. Widowed _____
2. Separated _____	5. Never married _____
3. Divorced _____	6. Don't know _____

If #3 or #4 above, approximately how many years ago did this occur? _____

Check the people you were living with before you ran away; and specify the number of brothers and sisters present:

Natural Mother _____	Natural Brothers _____
Natural Father _____	Natural Sisters _____
Step-Mother _____	Step-Brothers _____
Step-Father _____	Step-Sisters _____
Foster Parents _____	Half-Brothers _____
Relatives _____	Half-Sisters _____
Institution _____	Foster Siblings _____

If not living with natural parents who has your legal custody?

Natural Mother _____	Welfare _____
Natural Father _____	Juv. Court _____
Relatives _____	Other _____

Is the family you were living with receiving welfare? Yes___ No___

If yes, list County and Caseworker: County _____

Caseworker _____

If not living with either natural parent, check the frequency which you generally visit them:

Mother: Often___ Occasionally___ Seldom___ Not at all___

Father: Often___ Occasionally___ Seldom___ Not at all___

How long have you been on the run? _____

What happened just before you decided to run? _____
(Fight w/parents, kicked out, etc.)

Have you ever run away before? Yes___ No___ If yes, how many times?___

Have you ever been to Juvenile Court? Yes___ No___ If yes, why? _____

School last attended _____ Grade Level _____ Have you ever

been in any serious trouble at school?___ If yes, what? _____

Circle the number which most closely represents your feelings about school:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
(Hate) (Neutral) (Like a lot)

Circle the number which most closely represents your feelings about the parents (or institution) that you are living with:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
(Dislike) (Neutral) (Love)

Circle the number which most closely represents how much you trust your parents:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
(Distrust) (Trust cometimes) (Trust completely)

Circle the number which most closely represents the feelings of your parents (who you lived with) toward you:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
(Dislike) (Neutral) (Love)

Circle the number which most closely represents how much your parents trust you:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
(Distrust) (Trust Sometimes) (Trust Completely)

If applicable, how do your parents treat you in relation to your brothers and/or sisters who you live with?

About Same _____ Better _____ Worse _____

Your position in the family: Oldest _____ Youngest _____ Middle _____

Are there any adults who you can discuss important matters and problems with privately?

Yes _____ No _____

APPENDIX F
QUESTIONNAIRE
CONTROL

Date _____ Age _____ Birthdate _____

Sex: Male _____ Female _____ Race: White _____ Black _____ Oriental _____

Check the status of your natural (biological) parents:

1. Still Married _____	4. Widowed _____
2. Separated _____	5. Never Married _____
3. Divorced _____	6. Don't know _____

If #3 or #4 above, approximately how many years ago did this occur? _____

Check the people you are presently living with; and specify the number of brothers and sisters present:

Natural Mother _____	Natural Brothers _____
Natural Father _____	Natural Sisters _____
Stepmother _____	Step-Brothers _____
Stepfather _____	Step-Sisters _____
Foster Parents _____	Half-Brothers _____
Relatives _____	Half-Sisters _____
Institution _____	Foster Siblings _____

If not living with natural parents, who has your legal custody?

Natural Mother _____	Welfare _____
Natural Father _____	Juv. Court _____
Relatives _____	Other _____

If not living with either natural parent, check the frequency which you generally visit them:

Mother: Often _____ Occasionally _____ Seldom _____ Not at all _____

Father: Often _____ Occasionally _____ Seldom _____ Not at all _____

Have you ever run away from home? Yes _____ No _____

If yes, how many times?___

Have you ever been to Juvenile Court? Yes___ No___

If yes, why?_____

School attending _____ Grade _____ Have you ever been in any serious trouble at school? Yes___ No___ If yes, what?_____

Circle the number which most closely represents your feelings about school.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
(Dislike) (Neutral) (Like a Lot)

Circle the number which most closely represents your feelings about the parents (or institution) that you are living with:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
(Hate) (Neutral) (Love)

Circle the number which most closely represents how much YOU TRUST your parents.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
(Distrust) (Trust Sometimes) (Trust Completely)

Circle the number which most closely represents the feelings of your parents (whom you live with) toward you:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
(Dislike) (Neutral) (Love)

Circle the number which most closely represents how much YOUR PARENTS TRUST you:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
(Distrust) (Trust Sometimes) (Trust Completely)

If applicable, how do your parents treat you in relation to your brothers and/or sisters whom you live with?

About Same___ Better___ Worse___

Your position in the family: Oldest___ Youngest___ Middle___

Are there any adults with whom you can discuss important matters and problems privately?

Yes___ No___

APPENDIX G

Frequency Tabulation Tables of Independent Variable for

Second Questionnaire

Independent Variable	Contact	Court	Control	Non-Chronic	Chronic
<u>Sex</u>					
1. Male	6	22	22	14	14
2. Female	15	28	12	21	22
Total	21	50	34	35	36
<u>Race</u>					
1. Black	0	3	0	Not Computed	
2. Indian	0	2	0		
3. Caucasian	19	38	31		
4. Oriental	0	1	3		
5. Mixed	0	2	0		
6. Other or no answer	2	4	0		
Total	21	50	34		
<u>Age</u>					
1. 12	1	4	0	1	4
2. 13	4	13	12	4	13
3. 14	7	11	18	9	9
4. 15	5	13	3	14	4
5. 16	2	6	1	5	3
6. 17	2	3	0	2	3
7. 18	0	0	0	0	0
Total	21	50	34	35	36
<u>Grade Level in School</u>					
1. 7-8	5	13	0	Not Computed	
2. 9-10	7	27	33		
3. 11-12	5	9	1		
4. No answer	4	1	0		
Total	21	50	34		
<u>Address</u>					
1. Portland area	18	30	34	Not Computed	
2. Oregon	2	7	0		
3. Out of State	1	13	0		
Total	21	50	34		

Independent Variable	Contact	Court	Control	Non-Chronic	Chronic
----------------------	---------	-------	---------	-------------	---------

Parents' MaritalStatus

1. Still Married	12	19	22	17	14
2. Separated	0	4	0	2	2
3. Divorced	6	20	9	10	16
4. Widowed	0	4	2	1	3
5. Never Married	2	3	0	4	1
6. Don't Know	1	0	1	1	0
Total	21	50	34	35	36

Length of TimeSeparated or
Divorced

1. Less than 1 year	0	0	0	0	0
2. 1 to 5 years	2	5	2	3	4
3. More than 5 years	1	10	5	4	7
4. Not applicable	14	22	22	21	15
5. No answer or don't know	4	13	5	7	10
Total	21	50	34	35	36

Who Subject Was
Living With Be-
fore Running
Away

1. Natural Mother	1	5	5	5	1
2. Natural Father	0	3	1	2	1
3. Both 1 and 2.	10	13	23	14	9
4. Stepmother	0	0	0	0	0
5. Stepfather	0	0	0	0	0
6. Both 4 and 5.	1	0	0	1	0
7. Natural Mother and stepfather	4	9	4	6	7
8. Natural Father and stepmother	1	4	1	1	4
9. Foster Parents	4	6	0	5	5
10. Relatives	0	3	0	1	2
11. Institutions	0	7	0	0	7
12. Other	0	0	0	0	0
Total	21	50	34	35	36

Legal Custody if
not Living with
Either Natural
Parent

1. Natural Mother	4	9	6	9	4
2. Natural Father	0	6	2	3	3
3. Both 1 and 2	0	2	0	1	1
4. Relatives	0	2	0	0	2

<u>Independent Variable</u>	<u>Contact</u>	<u>Court</u>	<u>Control</u>	<u>Non-Chronic</u>	<u>Chronic</u>
5. Welfare	1	2	0	2	1
6. Juvenile Court	5	13	0	4	14
7. Other	1	1	0	2	0
8. Not Applicable	10	15	26	14	11
Total	21	50	34	35	36

How Subject Feels
About Parents (or
Institution He is
Living With

1 (Hate)	7	5	0	7	5
2	2	2	0	2	2
3	2	4	0	2	4
4	2	4	0	2	4
5	3	8	2	6	5
6	1	5	3	2	4
7	1	2	1	1	2
8	2	4	4	2	4
9	2	4	4	2	4
10 (Love)	1	14	18	11	4
Total	21	50	34	35	36

No. of Siblings
Subject Living With
Before Running Away

1. Natural Brothers	17	47	46	43	22
2. Natural Sisters	15	60	38	37	38
3. Step Brothers	4	10	6	3	8
4. Step Sisters	1	13	12	1	13
5. Half-Brothers	3	3	1	2	6
6. Half-Sisters	0	2	1	0	1
7. Foster Siblings	10	24	0	15	21
Total	50	159	104	101	109

Ordinal Position

1. Oldest	8	17	7	10	15
2. Middle	8	23	18	16	15
3. Youngest	4	10	9	8	6
4. Not Applicable	1	0	0	1	0
Total	21	50	34	35	36

How Subject Views
Parental Treatment
Twd Self in Rltn
to Siblings

1. About the Same	6	27	27	16	17
2. Better	0	3	3	1	2
3. Worse	12	19	2	14	17
4. Not Applicable	3	1	2	3	0
5. Different	0	0	0	1	0
Total	21	50	34	35	36

Independent Variable	Contact	Court	Control	Non-Chronic	Chronic
<u>How Subject Feels That His Parents Trust Him</u>					
1(Mistrust)	7	16	0	11	12
2	4	4	0	4	4
3	4	9	2	4	9
4	1	3	2	3	1
5	3	5	2	6	2
6	1	4	6	1	4
7	0	3	3	3	0
8	0	3	2	1	2
9	0	1	8	0	1
10(Trust)	0	1	9	1	0
No answer	1	1	0	1	1
Total	21	50	34	35	36

How Subject Trusts Parents

1(Mistrust)	4	9	0	7	5
2	3	2	0	3	3
3	2	3	0	1	4
4	2	3	0	2	3
5	6	8	0	7	7
6	0	5	3	2	3
7	0	3	3	2	1
8	1	5	7	5	1
9	1	4	5	3	2
10(Trust)	2	8	16	3	6
No answer	0	0	0	0	1
Total	21	50	34	35	36

How Subject Views the Parents' Attitude With Whom He Lived Twd Himself

1(Hate)	3	3	0	2	4
2	0	1	0	1	0
3	2	2	0	3	1
4	3	5	1	5	3
5	4	6	2	4	6
6	2	10	0	4	7
7	2	4	2	4	2
8	1	4	0	2	3
9	2	2	7	2	2
10(Love)	2	13	22	7	8
Total	21	50	34	34	36

<u>Independent Variable</u>	<u>Contact</u>	<u>Court</u>	<u>Control</u>	<u>Non-Chronic</u>	<u>Chronic</u>
-----------------------------	----------------	--------------	----------------	--------------------	----------------

Any Adults With Whom Important Matters Can be Discussed

1. Yes	11	29	23	24	16
2. No	8	19	11	9	18
3. Other (someone other than an adult)	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>
Total	21	50	34	35	36

How Long Was Subject on the Run

1. Less Than 1 Week	14	29	Not	21	22
2. 1 to 2 Weeks	2	7	Applic.	3	6
3. More Than 2 But Less Than 4 Weeks	2	6		6	2
4. One Month or More	1	3		1	3
5. Other or no answer	2	5		4	3
Total	<u>21</u>	<u>50</u>		<u>35</u>	<u>36</u>

Has Subject Ever Run Away Before

No	4	8	34	Not Computed	
Yes, # of Times					
1	2	9			
2	3	4			
3	0	10			
4	2	6			
5	1	5			
6	0	3			
7	0	1			
8	1	1			
9 (or more)	8	3			
Total	<u>21</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>34</u>		

Has Subject Ever Been To Juvenile Court

1. Yes	12	36	0	16	32
2. No	9	14	34	19	4
Total	<u>21</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>36</u>

If Subject Has Been to Juvenile Court, Why

1. Runaway	3	24	0	5	22
2. Truancy	0	0	0	0	0
3. Drugs	0	1	0	0	1
4. Curfew	1	1	0	1	1

Independent Variable	Contact	Court	Control	Non-Chronic	Chronic
5. Theft or Shop-lifting	0	3	0	1	2
6. Drinking	0	1	0	1	0
7. Variety	4	2	0	1	5
8. Other (Includes no answer)	4	4	0	7	1
9. Not Applicable	9	14	34	19	4
	<u>21</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>36</u>

What Happened to Subject Before Decision to Run

1. Fight With Parents or Unhappy Home Situation	8	25	Not Applic.	16	17
2. Fight With Siblings	1	2		1	2
3. Change in Marital Status of Prnts.	1	1		1	1
4. Kicked Out	1	2		1	2
5. Law Violation	1	3		1	3
6. Nothing Specific	0	7		4	3
7. Other	5	9		9	5
8. No answer	4	1		2	3
Total	<u>21</u>	<u>30</u>		<u>35</u>	<u>36</u>

Has Subject Been in Trouble at School

1. Yes	8	21	5	12	17
2. No	12	28	29	23	17
3. Not Applicable (out of school)	1	1	0	0	2
Total	<u>21</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>36</u>

If Trouble in School, What Kind of Trouble

1. Truant	3	2	1	3	2
2. Assault	0	4	0	1	3
3. Bkg. School Rules	1	9	1	3	7
4. Expelled	4	3	1	4	3
5. Drugs	0	1	0	0	1
6. Other	0	1	2	0	1
7. Not Applicable	13	30	29	24	19
Total	<u>21</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>36</u>

How Subject Feels About School

1 (Dislike)	3	17	2	6	14
2	2	1	0	3	0
3	4	2	0	5	1

Independent Variable	Contact	Court	Control	Non-Chronic	Chronic
4	3	5	2	4	4
5	3	9	7	7	5
6	1	7	9	3	5
7	1	3	3	4	0
8	1	1	5	0	2
9	0	1	4	1	0
10(like)	2	3	2	1	4
No answer	1	1	0	1	1
Total	21	50	34	35	36

If Not Living With
Natural Parents, How
Often Visits Mother

1. Often	0	7	0	1	2
2. Occasionally	2	7	0	3	3
3. Seldom	3	4	0	2	4
4. Not at all	0	2	1	2	4
5. Not Applicable or no answer	16	30	33	27	23
Total	21	50	34	35	36

If Not Living With
Natural Parents, How
Often Visits Father

1. Often	0	3	1	1	2
2. Occasionally	0	4	0	1	3
3. Seldom	4	6	0	6	4
4. Not at all	0	6	0	2	4
5. Not Applicable or no answer	17	31	33	25	23
Total	21	50	34	35	36

Is Family Receiving
Welfare

1. Yes	1	Not Computed		Not Computed	
2. No	17				
3. No answer	3				
Total	21				

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aichhorn, August, Wayward Youth, Viking Press, New York, 1935.
- Beggs, Larry Rev., Huckleberry's for Runaways, Ballantine Books, New York, 1969.
- Bradshaw, Lawrence Stuart, et al, Runaway Youth in Salt Lake County, unpublished Masters Thesis, University of Utah, June 1969.
- Census Population and Housing, CRAG, June 1971, p. 1.
- Foster, Randall M., M.D., "Intrapsychic and Environmental Factors in Running Away from Home," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Vol. XXXII, No. 3, April 1962, pp. 486-491.
- Hildebrand, James A., "Why Runaways Leave Home," The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, Northwestern University School of Law, Vol. 54, No. 2, June 1963, pp. 211-216.
- Kanner, Leo, M.D., Child Psychiatry, Charles C. Thomas, publisher, 2nd Edition, 1950.
- Leventhal, Theodore, "Inner Control Deficiencies in Runaway Children," Archives of General Psychiatry, Vol. II, August 1964, pp. 70-76.
- Lowrey, Lawson G., "Runaways and Nomads," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Vol. XI, No. 4, October 1941, pp. 775-783.
- Minehan, Thomas, Boy and Girl Tramps of America, Farrer and Rinehart, New York, 1934.
- 1971 Multnomah County Juvenile Court Statistical Report, p. 8.
- Nye, F. Ivan, and James F. Short, "Scaling Delinquent Behavior," American Sociological Review, June 1957, p. 326-331.
- Outland, George E., "Determinants Involved in Boy Transcency," Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. II, No. 6, February 1938, p. 361-372.
- Paull, Joseph E., "The Runaway Foster Child," Child Welfare, July 1956, pp. 21-26.
- Portland Public Schools' Annual Report, 1970-71 (unpublished).
- Reimer, Morris D., "Runaway Children," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Vol. X, July 1940, pp. 522-526.

Riley, David, "Runaways: And Then There Were Thousands," The Washingtonian, November 1971, pp. 64-73.

Robey, Amos, M.D.; Richard J. Rosenwald, M.D.; John E. Snell, M.D.; and Rita E. Lee, "The Runaway Girl: A Reaction to Family Stress," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Vol. XXXIV, No. 4, July 1964, p. 762-767.

Robins, Lee N., "Mental Illness and the Runaway--A 30-Year Follow-Up Study," Human Organization, Vol. 16, No. 4, Winter 1958, p. 11-15.

Robins, Lee N., Ph.D., and Patricia O'Neal, M.D., "The Adult Prognosis for Runaway Children," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Vol. XXIX, No. 4, October 1959, pp. 752-761.

Rosenheim, Dr. Frederick, "Techniques of Therapy," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, October 1940, Vol. X, pp. 651-665.

Shellow, Robert; Juliana R. Schamp; Elliot Liebow; and Elizabeth Unger, Suburban Runaways of the 1960's, Society for Research in Development Monography, Vol. 32, No. 3, Chicago, 1967.

Staub, Herbert, "A Runaway From Home," Psychoanalytic Quarterly, Vol. 12, No. 1, 1943, pp. 1-22.

Thom, Douglas A., M.D., Normal Youth and Its Everyday Problems, D. Appleton-Century Co, New York, 1932.

Vital Statistics, Oregon State Board of Health, 1971.

Whitbread, Jane, "Runaways," Look, July 25, 1967, p. 26-32.

Wyllie, Dorothy C. and Joseph Weinreb, "The Treatment of a Runaway Adolescent Girl Through Treatment of the Mother," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Vol. XXVIII, No. 1, January 1958, p. 188-195.