1975

A study of runaways from six residential treatment agencies

Loris Colbath
Portland State University

Carolyn Krugel Graf
Portland State University

Carol McKinnon
Portland State University

Jean NewComb
Portland State University

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

Part of the [Child Psychology Commons](#), [Social Welfare Commons](#), and the [Social Work Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Colbath, Loris; Krugel Graf, Carolyn; McKinnon, Carol; and NewComb, Jean, "A study of runaways from six residential treatment agencies" (1975). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 1762.
<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.1761>

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 RUNAWAYS FROM SIX RESIDENTIAL
TREATMENT AGENCIES

by

Loris Colbath
Carolyn Krugel Graf
Carol McKinnon
Jean Newcomb

A Report Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the degree of

Master
of
Social Work

Portland State University
1975

The members of the committee approve the report of
Loris Colbath, Carolyn Krugel Graf, Carol McKinnon and
Jean Newcomb, June 2, 1975.

Jack C. Finley
Research Advisor

Gordon Hearn
Dean of the School of Social Work

ABSTRACT

The purposes of this study were: (1) to examine a select sample of both runaways and nonrunaways at six Oregon residential treatment facilities; (2) to determine the amount and type of preplacement visitation and counseling done within these agencies; (3) to determine the effect preplacement visitation and counseling has upon the studied sample of runaways and nonrunaways in decreasing or controlling the number of runs from the agencies involved; and (4) to determine significant characteristics between runaway and nonrunaway populations.

Testing materials included a two-part questionnaire, part of which was developed with girls from one of the participating agencies.

Running, which today is looked upon as a status offense, is costly in the effect it has upon the mind and emotions of the young runners, as well as the effect it has upon the budgets of the agencies involved. Running from a residential treatment program is also disruptive to the treatment plan which has been set up for that particular youth.

The work which has been done to date in this area is sketchy and incomplete. It does not clearly tell us whether

or not preplacement counseling actually reduces the desire to run and helps to create a more comfortable atmosphere for the teen-ager.

Our sample consisted of both runners and a random sample of nonrunners from the participating agencies for the month of October.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Narrative	1
Objectives and Expected Significance of Research	2
Purposes of the Study	2
Definitions	3
Delimitations	4
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	5
III. METHODOLOGY	19
Subjects	19
Instrument	20
Procedure	20
Data Processing	22
IV. DESCRIPTION OF PARTICIPATING AGENCIES	23
V. PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA	34
Summary	59
VI. SUMMARY OF RESULTS	72
Summary of Methodology	75
Implications and Recommendations	76
FOOTNOTES	79
BIBLIOGRAPHY	81
APPENDICES	85

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Number of Subjects Who Ran October, 1974 According to Agency	35
2. Choice in Placement	36
3. Similarity of Placement to Expectations	38
4. Preplacement Visitation	39
5. Preplacement Counseling	40
6. Mean Age in Years According to Agency	42
7. Males and Females in Sample According to Agency	43
8. Mean Heights and Weights According to Agency	44
9. Place of Residence According to Agency	45
10. School Achievement	46
11. School Attendance	47
12. Marital Status of Parents	48
13. Adoption	49
14. Mean Number of Placements Per Agency	50
15. Average Number of Weeks Spent in Place- ments Other than Home	51
16. Who Accompanied Subjects to Placement	52
17. Family's Attitude Toward Placement	52
18. How Subjects Felt About Placement	53
19. Who Subjects Talked With First	54

TABLE

PAGE

20.	How Welcome Subjects Felt	54
21.	Existence of a Buddy Program	55
22.	How Often Caseworkers Have Visited Subjects	56
23.	How Often Subjects Would Like Case- workers to Visit	57
24.	Subjects Runs From Their Homes	58
25.	Other Family Member Runaways	59
26.	Mean Responses to Questions of When Subjects are Most Likely to Run and Where They are Most Likely to Run to	68

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Narrative

This practicum is an outgrowth of a request made by Orville Garrison, M.S.W. of Catholic Children's Services for research concerning teen-age runaways. Catholic Children's Services has, since 1971, been conducting a program dealing with acutely delinquent children who have been referred to them by court commitment. Runaways are felt to be a problem of real importance to the agency. This same condition exists in the other participating agencies and is considered by each of them to be a major problem.

Six Oregon residential treatment agencies agreed to cooperate in this research project. They include:

1. Louise Home
2. Villa St. Rose
3. Christie School for Girls
4. St. Mary's Home for Boys
5. Children's Farm Home
6. Catholic Children's Services

For the purposes of this study, a runner shall be defined as absent from the agency for a period of more than twelve hours without the permission of the staff.

Objectives and Expected Significance of Research

The research will attempt to fulfill the following purposes and objectives:

1. To determine the effect precounseling and pre-placement visitation to the agency has on the rate of youths running from the agencies after placement.
2. To assist in developing criteria by which future runners can be identified.
3. To publish and distribute to the appropriate residential treatment agencies the results of this research.

It is anticipated that this research will:

1. Provide a base of information for the development of socially significant programs to deal with both past and future runaways.
2. Provide information from runaways themselves which heretofore has not been shared with counselors and social work agencies.
3. Assist in reducing the actual dollar amount presently being expended by the participating agencies in handling the runaway problem.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study were:

1. To examine a select sample of both runaways and nonrunaways at six Oregon social work agencies.
2. To determine the amount and type of preplacement visitation and counseling done within these agencies.
3. To determine the effect preplacement visitation and counseling has upon the studied sample of runaways and nonrunaways in controlling or decreasing the number of "runs" from the agencies involved.

Definitions

The following definitions are to clarify the meaning of specific terms that are used throughout the study:

Runaway.--A youth between the ages of eleven and seventeen who was absent from the agency for a period of more than twelve hours without the permission of the staff.

Nonrunaway.--A youth in residential care between the ages of eleven and seventeen who did not run from the agency during October, 1974.

Agency.--A residential social service organization providing programs to meet the social and emotional needs of persons within a community. These organizations have community sanction for their operation.

Significant difference.--A statistical difference which results in a .05 level of probability.

Delimitations

This study was exploratory and, therefore, primarily descriptive with respect to the problem of the amount and type of preplacement visitation and counseling done when placing a teen-ager in an agency, and its effect upon the runaway rate.

The primary focus of this study was to look at six residential treatment agencies within Oregon and their services to teen-agers prior to placement within these agencies.

The study primarily involved geographic boundaries of the Portland, Oregon area, with the exception of the Children's Farm Home which is located some eighty-five miles south of Portland, Oregon in a rural setting near Corvallis, Oregon. Specifically, the sample population of this study consisted of fifty children from age eleven to seventeen who were residents at the participating social work agencies. They were court committed to these agencies. The study was confined to teen-agers who ran during the month of October, 1974.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

While there is much research in the literature relating to runaways, most of it is not directly relevant to this study. Children in residential facilities, such as the participating agencies, have already come to the attention of the authorities. Most of the literature is concerned with the runaway from home, and the cultural, social and psychological dynamics of his/her running. Nonetheless, we have done a brief survey of the literature because of the overlapping nature of the population, showing common factors attributed to the phenomenon of running away.

We shall first discuss some of the research material from the literature, more in view of its general rather than direct relevance to our study.

Most notable among contributing factors to the phenomenon of running away is the aspect of cultural change since the late sixties. From U.S. News & World Report (1972),¹ a feature article reporting on runaways in the country's major cities states that more than ten thousand children run away weekly. The patterns and numbers had markedly changed by the early seventies: many more girls were included in the numbers (almost equal to boys), the average age had

diminished (between thirteen and seventeen years old, though some as young as ten), and the destination was no longer to the distant large urban areas but now often to the closest metropolitan center.

Three important cultural conditions seem to have been responsible for the decision of more and more young people to run. First, the "youth culture" influenced by television and youth oriented publications has made running away a socially acceptable alternative. These media have as much as included "do-it-yourself" instructions of how to run and where to go. Secondly, with the shift of focus away from the largest cities to smaller towns nearby, the opportunity has become more available to the less daring. Now every urban center has sheltering communes or public agencies that accommodate the runner, offering "instant fellowship and protection." Lastly, we have seen a continuing loosening of the family ties. The young have had to depend entirely upon the nuclear family which has become increasingly less stable as a result of divorce and mobility.

Many researchers have attempted to measure the relationship of running with social deviancy. The social implications of running away from home are discussed in a study by Bradshaw, et al. (1969)² in Salt Lake County, Utah. They found that 60 per cent of their runner sample (referrals from juvenile court) had had previous juvenile records.

Notable events preceding the runs were: trouble with parents, problems with school or conflicts with other relatives. In 75 per cent of the incidents, difficulties within the home were named as the major problem. Although a very large part of the sample reported having been troubled with personal problems for a period of six or more months, 63 per cent said that they had received no help in solving them. Hildebrand (1963)³ asserts that runaways represent young persons who have a problem but have usually not yet developed a definite antisocial attitude. He goes on to conclude that running is a strong indication of family problems and that with intervention, the young person may be deterred from more serious acting out behavior.

Another study that attributes running behavior as predictive of future delinquency is that of Ivan Nye and James Short (1957).⁴ Their sample population (2,350) was derived from normal high school students from several sections of the country and from residents of boys' training schools. They constructed a twelve item scale of antisocial and criminal behaviors. Running away was found to be the first item to occur in less than 10 per cent of high school population, while it occurred in 61 per cent of the training school population. This then provided a cut-off point between the populations and appeared to be a significant behavior that was related to more serious delinquency.

Shellow, et al. (1967),⁵ comment that previous studies have defined running away as either socially deviant or personally pathological. They felt that such definitiveness resulted from the kinds of agency or group from which the sample was selected. Since they were anxious to choose a sample from a more general group, they selected 776 young people reported missing to the police over the period of a year. The resultant characteristics were noted as follows: they traveled short distances, rarely beyond their own metropolitan area, returning within forty-eight hours of their own volition, and ran as often with others as they did alone. Two-thirds had experienced trouble in school, and a greater proportion had come from broken homes. ". . . school records show that runaways . . . were absent from school more often and had lower grades."⁶ Of those questioned who had not run, when asked if they had seriously thought of doing so, one out of three said yes.

As a result, these authors advise caution in designating specific characteristics to runaways. They concluded that often the deciding factor in the decision to run may very well be the immediate circumstance. They do draw some conclusions from their data. Dividing the runaways into two groups, they are able to characterize the first "as being relatively small . . . for whom running away was intimately bound up with individual or family pathology";⁷ and the

second, much larger group, most of whom had run only once. This group, with some differences more closely resembled the nonrunners, rather than being similar to the seriously disturbed population of the smaller group. The recommendation coming from this data was in the treatment plan: For the first group they prescribed special care for the severity of their personal pathology, and for the second group they suggested treating them in ways similar to normally troubled adolescents.

This brings us to consider some of the psychodynamic factors that have been projected by a number of writers. Both of the studies executed by Amos Robey, et al. (1964),⁸ and Vedder, et al. (1970),⁹ perceived the oedipal conflict as being the precipitant factor in girls' running away. It has been hypothesized that they are resisting the domination of the mother and are fearful of an incestuous relationship with the father. Randall Foster (1962)¹⁰ concurs, saying "sublimation of incestuous wishes . . . for the child with limited abilities to cope with dangerous impulses, can lead her to run to escape temptation and search for safer gratification."

Robey concludes from his study of forty-two runaway girls taken from court cases, that "running away is a complex neurotic interaction between the parents and the daughter in a triangle situation."¹¹ Fredrick Rosenheim

(1940)¹² regards the oedipal conflict as present in the reasons for boys running as well. He says that it is a form of "self-banishment" from the home, away from the dangerous impulse toward the mother and the struggle with the father.¹³

Robey goes on to say that placement in foster homes or in an institution is usually not adequate to control the girl's behavior, unless it is combined with treatment in consideration of the dynamics and needs of the girl,

. . . severe acting out in terms of further running away attempts, flouting of authority despite disciplinary action may continue to occur . . . often a return home (from the placement) will reactivate the situation.¹⁴

Theodore Leventhal (1964)¹⁵ saw a measure of difference between the capacity for "inner control" of the runner as compared to the nonrunner. His study of forty-two runners and a like number of nonrunners was judged on those manifestations of uncontrol. His rating criteria for uncontrol was: (1) discharge type of behavior; e.g., bed wetting, impulsivity and temper tantrums, (2) deficient mechanisms regulating behavior, such as judgement, cognition and mobility, and (3) a self-image of helplessness and inability to control.¹⁶ His results indicated that runaways manifested these characteristics to a greater extent than nonrunners. Other behaviors found to be associated with running away were: stealing, truancy, demanding behavior,

irresponsibility about time, suspiciousness and poor physical coordination. Also significant was the fact that one-third of the runaways verbalized their feelings of lack of control, and that in therapy sixteen of them said that their main concern was the lack of control of their impulses and their feelings of helplessness over external events.

Repeated throughout the literature are the problems of the adolescent with his/her family. In many cases the stability of the home has already been interrupted and the child feels rejected, helpless and angry. His/her way of coping is to flee. The other situation which he/she may view as dangerous is the incestuous impulse of the opposite sexed parent and the domination by the like sexed parent. Again, if he/she does not have the coping devices to deal with his/her fear, anger or frustration, his/her recourse is flight or fight. The findings of Blood and D'Angelo (1974),¹⁷ confirm this phenomenon: "Whenever significant areas of conflict arise . . . and confrontation ensues between the adolescent and the parent, the adolescent may resort to flight."¹⁸ Major issues and conflict are considered to come from difficulties arising from the frustration of the basic needs; viz., acceptance, achievement, recognition, affection, belongingness, conformity to peers and attainment of worthy goals. Affection and acceptance proved to be the key issues of conflict but the authors

suggest that the issues can be reduced to noncommunication; without the ability to express one's self and to be listened to, there is no real sense of acceptance, love or worth. They further make the point from the findings of the Ohio State's Teen-age Flight Project,¹⁹ that runaways experience almost three times as much physical abuse, suggesting that there is an avoidance of communication on the part of their parents.

Moving now to the literature that is directly associated with the runner who has been institutionalized, Street, et al. (1966)²⁰ did a comparative study on the effects of different organizational models and treatment modalities on the inmates of six boys' correctional institutions. Records were kept on the proportion of inmates who had run one or more times. The two institutions where the treatment model was structured for obedience and conformity with strong internal sanctions had 16 per cent and 20 per cent runners. The two facilities which were considered to be mental health treatment oriented--stressing a therapeutic milieu, a policy of frequent home visits (to let off steam), attending school away from the residence and using threats of transfer to a harsher facility--had only 10 per cent and 16 per cent runners. The remaining two residential facilities stressed neither custodial care nor treatment but were oriented to re-education and development, being struc-

tured to a full program of work, school and recreation. Here, running away was considered to be normally symptomatic and rather irrelevant. The proportion of their runners was the highest with 29 per cent and 50 per cent.

The overall consequences of the different organizations and modalities showed that none of the institutions was truly successful at "producing changes appropriate to the lives the inmates would lead outside."²¹ However, the treatment facility using the milieu therapy appeared to have the most positive effect, with greater development of personal and social controls, and some skills in problem solving and self-understanding.

McCorkle, reporting on the "Highfields," a unique treatment center in the New Jersey System of Corrections, says that troubled youthful offenders need an informal, easy learning experience in a certain type of social milieu.²² The basic values of such an atmosphere are security, flexibility and nonpunitive, nonaggressive attitudes on the part of the staff. In this small residential facility, housing twenty boys with serious delinquency records, there are only two imposed rules: that no boys shall speak to the women at the hospital in which they work part time, and secondly that no boy shall leave the grounds without being accompanied by a staff person. All other rules are made by staff

and boys together and enforced by both. Indoctrination is done entirely by the peer group in an informal way.

About the specific problem of running away: for marginal infractions; that is, occasional testing of the rule, the peer group is likely to handle the consequence or at worst, the offender gets a heavier work detail. For an actual escape the only recourse is the very strong sanction of going to a harsher security institution. By giving a boy the opportunity to test the adult role in such an informal flexible setting, he can with understanding and more knowledge, accept the adult as a less hostile and threatening figure. Consequently, his hostile and aggressive impulses toward both adults and peers are lessened. He is then able to turn willingly for guidance and the formality of rules and indoctrination is exchanged for learning by example. Therefore, acting out by running away is not a primary problem at the Highfields.

Gisela Konopka (1966)²³ expresses criticism of the workers in institutions for girls. She states that they are often naive, coming from sheltered backgrounds; they start out with unrealistic idealism and become thwarted and disillusioned, frightened and unsure of themselves. When this change takes place, from being ardent and well-meaning to hardened and distrusting, the worker often presumes that the girl is "fronting" or "doing a snow job." It then becomes

impossible for the girl to be accepted in her full potential. When workers are unprepared for the hostility and distrust that the girl brings with her, they are fearful themselves and retaliate by "hitting out" or "getting on a power trip." Such interaction only increases the anger, frustration and impulse to flee. The author recommends that services to young people in such facilities need re-examination and that a continuum of service should be undertaken, providing help and information while the troubled youth is still at home, at the foster home and small facility.

Suggestions from the National Conference of Superintendents of Training Schools on more successful ways of receiving and orienting the young person into the institution may be instrumental in cutting down the running rate.²⁴ Initially they suggest greeting and welcoming without laying down rules or searching the person, immediately providing some recreational activity to avoid physical idleness, and providing a place to maintain their personal property without its being interfered with by staff or peers.

They pose five ways in which orientation procedures may be made more successful: (1) giving the newcomer a favorable but honest impression of the program and its purposes, (2) enabling him/her to have all of the facts so that he/she may participate in planning for himself/herself, (3) allowing several weeks for adjustment, (4) using group

discussion methods in orientation, and (5) giving him/her an opportunity to question staff on the "whys" of what's happening.²⁵

They further recommend that rules and restrictions be constantly evaluated for their harshness and ineffectiveness. Such rules are often the sources of the acting out behavior (e.g., running) which interfere with the treatment of the deeper problem. Anger and frustration at what seems to be unreasonable rules may reactivate a deep-seated anxiety by re-creating the original conflict situation. Discipline should be with the understanding that frequently his/her psycho-social behavior pattern has led the child into conflict with authority. The school or institution represents the same hostile environment that he/she has had to fight against. The decision to flee or fight is ever present in his/her alternatives of coping behavior.

In summary, the literature as it relates to our study indicates several (or a combination of) reasons that may be responsible for young people running away. Communication through popular media of the new life styles has made running away an acceptable alternative. For those who are looking for a way out of their personal situation, the "how to" of running is readily available as is shelter and fellowship at their destination.

One of the social implications reviewed in the literature is that as the family has become dysfunctional, the child has sought a way out of the tension and conflict of the home. Running as an alternative becomes repetitious behavior whenever the young person finds himself/herself in a similar situation of helplessness and anxiety. Further discussed was the fact that running away is often the first act in the direction of delinquency, and is frequently associated with school problems, truancy and stealing.

The psychodynamic aspect of the young runaway is discussed in terms of the oedipal conflict. The reason for the young person's running is hypothesized as his/her inability to cope with his/her dangerous impulses toward the opposite sexed parent or the power struggle with the like sexed parent. Also prominently discussed is the individual whose inadequate impulse control leads him/her to use discharge behavior in lieu of judgment and cognition. Running away is his/her response to feelings of helplessness to control either internal or external events.

The research on placement facilities proposed the need for earlier help for those being placed; preparation and participation in the choices that are made for them. Recommendations were made for a ready source of information and help in problem solving in the first days and weeks of their

placement. The atmosphere needs to be less threatening and the workers more appropriate in background to be able to relate more realistically to their charges. Most importantly, programs and regulations should be continuously checked for their value and reasonableness toward encouraging growth and development of healthy adults.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Our design is a descriptive analysis. The hypothesis was tested by survey research.

Subjects

The subjects were drawn from Catholic Services, Children's Farm Home, Christie, Louise Home, St. Mary's Home for Boys, and Villa St. Rose. All are residential treatment facilities within the state of Oregon. The agencies were chosen for their appropriateness to our study and their interest and willingness in cooperating with the study. The agencies are concerned with the problem of runaways and are interested in information that might be produced from the study. All were given information on how the study would be administered and a copy of the questionnaire.

The runners were youth who were absent from the agency for a period of more than twelve hours without the permission of the staff during the month of October, 1974. The nonrunners were randomly chosen from youth who had not run during the month of October. The subjects included twenty-five runners and twenty-five nonrunners. The number of runners from an agency was matched with the same number of

nonrunners from each agency. The subjects ranged in age from eleven to seventeen years.

Instrument

The instrument used was a two-part questionnaire. Part I was designed with input from the staff and youth placed in these agencies, plus the assumptions of the researchers. Of Part II, pages three, four, seven and eight were designed by girls from Villa St. Rose. Pages five and six of Part II were constructed by the researchers. The questions asked on the first part of the questionnaire were either open ended, requiring a subjective answer, or closed ended requiring a specific choice or specific answers. Part II of the questionnaire was composed of closed ended questions. Part I contained eight additional questions answered by runners only regarding a description of the current run.

Some minor revisions were made in the questionnaire following the pretest. A copy of the pretest interview questionnaire is located in the Appendix, pages 86-88. A copy of the final questionnaire is included in the Appendix, pages 89-93.

Procedure

The original design included nine residential agencies; all but one were located in the Portland metropolitan area. These agencies were first contacted regarding their

interest in participating in our research and asked for input into the questionnaire's design. Three of the agencies declined to participate because their populations were not appropriate for the research.

Letters were sent to the six agencies requesting a record of their runners for the month of October, 1974. The following month we contacted each agency for the numbers of runners and attempted to set up schedules with those runners and a like number of randomly selected nonrunners from each agency.

The interviews were carried out by the authors with the exception of those at the Children's Farm Home. It was the preference of the staff that one of their members administer the questionnaires. St. Mary's Home for Boys chose not to have the second part of the questionnaire administered to their boys. Other than those two exceptions, all of the interviewing was done by the authors. Each interview was conducted alone with the interviewee; introductions were made, explanation of the purpose of the research was given and confidentiality was assured. In Part I the interviewer read the questions and wrote in the answers; in Part II the participant read and filled in his own answers. The questioner remained on hand to clarify when needed. The time to administer both parts of the questionnaire was approximately thirty minutes. Each interviewee was thanked and assured

that he/she would be able to see the final results of the research.

Data Processing

The following statistics were used in computing Part I of the questionnaire as reported in presentation and interpretation of data.

The difference between two sample proportions was computed for various questions and then a z score calculated. A chi-square was computed on appropriate questions using an alternate formula as follows:

$$X^2 = \frac{N \left\{ |AD - BC| - \frac{N}{2} \right\}^2}{(A + B)(C + D)(A + C)(B + D)}$$

A t score was calculated for appropriate questions.

Various questions were open ended, requiring subjective responses. This data was not dealt with statistically but was described in an interpretative manner.

Data from Part II of the questionnaire was computed on the Honeywell computer, using a BMD program for factor analysis with a preliminary transgeneration to replace blank responses with the mean. Two factor analyses were run: the first with twenty-two variables from Part II, pages 1 and 2 of the questionnaire, and the second with thirteen variables from Part II, pages 7 and 8 of the questionnaire.

CHAPTER IV

DESCRIPTION OF PARTICIPATING AGENCIES

The following are descriptions of the agencies involved in the instant study. The descriptions include environment, population, referrals, treatment program, controls, policy toward runaways, average length of stay, policy of visitation and school.

Carroll House (Catholic Services) is located at 3725 Southeast 80th Avenue, Portland, Oregon. The building is a one story L-shaped structure with seven individual bedrooms and a dormitory. A bedroom-sitting room-bath combination gives the houseparents private quarters. There is a large communal dining room, a recreation-library room, and a crafts room. A fence-enclosed patio provides a private recreation area.

The agency is licensed for ten girls between twelve and eighteen years of age. The girls are referred by the court through the Children's Services Division for runaway, beyond parental control, truancy, sex delinquencies, drinking, drugs, conflicts with family and other antisocial behavior. The girls remain at Carroll House for seven to nine months.

Twenty-four hour residential care is provided with schooling at Franklin High School, or a program individually planned. It is expected that the students will be involved in work experiences. If special school help is needed, it is arranged and may involve completion of the General Education program. While utilizing community recreational resources, the program also includes planned activities within the center.

Such community resources as psychiatric and psychological services as needed are paid for on an individual basis. The agency also has the services of a consulting psychiatrist who may consult with the caseworker and house-parents or see the girls on an individual basis.

Casework duties for individual and group counseling is the responsibility of the Catholic Services agency caseworker. Intervention in day by day living experiences is used to create a therapeutic situation. The girls' families become part of the caseworker's focus. The girls are put on a level system when they enter the program and receive privileges according to the level they achieve. When a girl runs away, she will be brought back until it is determined that the program is not meeting the needs of the child. Parents are invited to visit during the first two weeks. A day home visit can be planned on A level, weekend visits can be planned three weeks apart on B and C levels, every other

weekend on D level and every weekend on E level with possibly a week at home for a trial period before discharge.

Children's Farm Home is located at 4455 Northeast Highway 20, Corvallis, Oregon. Residences for boys and girls, a nondenominational chapel, school facilities, service buildings, and the administration building are built around an oval drive and cover ten acres. The farm operation includes a beef herd, horses and 4-H stock to meet the needs of children interested in an additional growth experience.

Forty-two boys and twelve girls live in four groups of ten to sixteen. Referrals are received from juvenile courts and Children's Services Divisions of each county. There are also private placements and referrals from other agencies such as Family Counseling, mental health clinics and school social service departments. The Farm Home responds to the needs of children for a residential center treating behavior problems of boys and girls between the ages of twelve and eighteen who are unable to live in their own homes because of family conflicts, emotional problems, or inability to function in the public schools. The average length of stay is thirty-two months for younger boys and eighteen to twenty-four months for older boys.

Most students attend the accredited junior or senior high school on the Farm Home grounds. The school program

stresses development of basic learning skills and adjustment of attitudes toward school. A large faculty enables the school program to be geared to the achievement level of each student. A few students attend Corvallis schools.

The treatment program includes group meetings regarding peer relationships and management problems. Four caseworkers are responsible for coordinating efforts of the staff, faculty, outside agencies and families. A psychologist meets one full day weekly, providing diagnostic services and consultation to staff. Some treatment and diagnostic services are available through Benton County Mental Health Clinic and the Corvallis school system. A psychiatrist administers a program that provides psychologically supportive drugs for those children who need temporary assistance to get them over a particularly traumatic period in their treatment. Basic to all treatment are the needs to create a secure, safe place for all students to live, an environment that reinforces appropriate social behavior, and an atmosphere in which to learn.

There is no regular policy for runaways. There are different policies for each of the four groups. The child's freedom might be limited within the home, he/she might have to be under constant supervision, or the child might have to sit on a chair in the living room for two or three hours.

Work is not used as a punishment and the goal is to have the children see work as a positive activity.

Christie School is located in Marylhurst, Oregon. The campus covers about sixteen acres and is in a semirural environment. There are two cottages, each with a capacity for twenty girls and another small unit for five girls. The agency is licensed for fifty girls, nine to eighteen years of age, and admits girls between the ages of nine to thirteen and/or who academically have not completed eighth grade.

The majority of children are referred by Children's Services Division; other referrals come from school social workers, mental health agencies and parents. It is designed to provide treatment for girls who are unable to live successfully at home or in foster homes because of emotional maladjustment problems in interpersonal relationships, and/or major social difficulties in school or in the community. If a girl remains in the program beyond three to six months, the usual length of stay may vary from nine to eighteen months.

The school program attempts to provide each girl with an optimal learning situation based upon individual needs. Attention is given to encourage successful approaches to learning, study habits, and rational thought processes so that the girls may become increasingly independent in the school setting.

Clinical services include counseling with child and family by social work staff. Psychiatric, psychological and medical services are also available on an ongoing basis appropriate to the needs of the child and the resources of the agency. The treatment approach involves the assignment of members of various disciplines to be responsible for planning and carrying out together the program and treatment for a specific child or specific group of girls. The process of the team approach involves a constant sharing and integration of contributions from the different disciplines.

In treatment of runaways the general policy is to help prevent runs as much as possible by working on establishing relationships with girls. When girls run, a contact is established with local police departments, parents are notified as well as the referral source. Treatment following return from runs is individualized, and there is no predetermined set of consequences applicable to all girls.

Visits with parents are encouraged whenever it appears these have positive meaning to the child. She can have weekly, biweekly, monthly, or no visits with family, depending upon the mutual planning with parental figures.

Louise Home (Albertina Kerr) is located at 722 Northeast 162nd Avenue in Portland, Oregon. The Kathryn Carlson Cottage contains three separate living units and houses

thirty-five girls. The James Lakin Cottage serves fourteen girls.

The agency serves as a residential treatment facility for emotionally disturbed and delinquent girls, ages twelve through seventeen years.

The girls attend Wynn Watts School which is located on campus and is an integral part of the treatment program. The school program offers courses to complete graduation requirements under both the previous and revised Oregon graduation standards. Classes are from ten to twelve students and many are individualized with each person working at her own rate.

The treatment program has been developed on the model of a therapeutic community utilizing the concepts of reality therapy. The program is arranged in such a way that it makes available for treatment purposes all relationships and all activities in the life of the girls in residence. The staff is able to adopt specific attitudes toward children and to shape their environment to cope with their particular problems.

Albertina Kerr uses a team approach composed of a social worker and six child care workers. An attempt is made to evaluate the needs of each girl at the time she is accepted for placement and assign her to the treatment team that can best deal with her specific problems. The team has

a choice of a variety of treatment modes, including: individual psychotherapy, peer group therapy, single family or multiple family group therapy. There are regular staff meetings and team meetings which make it possible to adjust or to reinforce treatment plans as they progress. Other agency resources such as the consulting child psychiatrist, may be utilized to assist, to evaluate and to adjust to on-going treatment procedures.

There are no locked doors or environmental controls at Louise Home. Home visits can be made after the first month in residence. The family can make visits to the Home and others can visit with the staff's approval.

Runaways are taken back until it is determined that the program is not meeting their needs. The policy toward runaways is varied with each individual, according to their treatment plan. They may be welcomed with open arms or put on restriction.

St. Mary's Home for Boys is a residential facility located about twelve miles from the center of metropolitan Portland. The home is bounded by a busy highway on the south and surrounded by 450 acres of undeveloped land on the remaining three sides. There are two living cottages, classroom modules, an administration building and a gymnasium. There are no locked areas or fences for the purpose of keeping or deterring the boys from leaving.

The school has an enrollment of forty-three boys. The official age range is from nine to seventeen years. However, the actual age is closer to ten to fourteen because it better fits the concept of the program. The cottages are divided by age; those under twelve years are placed together and those over twelve years are placed together. The length of stay is twelve to fourteen months.

The treatment modality used is behavior modification with a token economy. It is essentially based on a five phase target system, with target goals being initially set by the staff and progressing to personalized goals set by the boy, his advisors and peers. Data is being collected continuously throughout the day, computerized nightly so that every individual is aware of points accumulated toward his present target.

The only controls used are gain or loss of privilege; no punishment is meted out for infraction of rules. If a boy runs away, he may be reduced to an earlier phase or lose all accumulated points. Occasionally an out-of-control boy is placed in the time-out room for a very brief period (e.g., minutes). The assaultive boy may be handled by removal from the school.

Most of the schooling takes place within the facility. However, some of the youngest boys go to an adjacent

elementary school and the oldest, if academically successful, to the local junior high or high school.

Villa St. Rose is located at 597 North Dekum Street in Portland, Oregon. Villa is a large old building set up on a dormitory living basis. There are three units housing fifteen to seventeen girls each. Fifty-one girls of high school age are in residence. While the setting is basically open, there are some locked doors. The average length of stay is nine to twelve months.

The girls are referred to Villa by the Children's Services Division and most have had previous contact with other social agencies.

The school program is accredited and able to grant a high school diploma. Most girls entering Villa are two to four grades behind academically. The classes are small and geared to the individual's needs. A successful experience in the school setting is given high priority.

Basically the professional staff are social workers who provide individual, family and group treatment based on the needs of each girl admitted. A psychologist provides testing and consultation as needed. Psychiatric consultation as needed is provided by Delaney Mental Health Clinic. The basic treatment unit is a team approach (one for each living group). Teams are composed of the social worker,

child care staff and two teachers who individualize programs for each girl through continuous evaluation and planning.

Runaways are accepted back into the program and are treated as new girls. They must re-earn all privileges they may have had. Runs are dealt with by the teams and living groups as unacceptable behavior.

Families are required to come for a meeting prior to home visits being granted. Home visits and family involvement are encouraged. After an initial period of three to six months, girls may have two home visits a month.

CHAPTER V

PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

One of the main purposes of this study was to determine the amount and type of preplacement counseling and visitation received by runners and nonrunners. Besides questions relating specifically to counseling and visitation, a number of questions considered closely linked to preplacement counseling and visitation were explored. Among these tangential questions are month subjects were placed, amount of choice subjects had in being placed, what subjects had heard about placement, what subjects' expectations of placement had been, and how near the actual experiences were to the subjects' expectations.

The month of placement is an important bit of data in considering the basic hypothesis of this study. Part of the hypothesis being tested is that if adolescents are not given counseling that is directly concerned with their upcoming placement in an agency, they are more likely to run. A further assumption is that subjects are higher runaway risks immediately after placement if they do not receive adequate preplacement counseling and previsitation. Since our runners were subjects who ran the month of October, the number

of subjects placed during this month were tabulated and compared. Three runners and four nonrunners were placed in October. There is not a significant difference between these two groups for the variable of month of placement. Table 1 indicates the number of subjects from each agency placed in October, 1974.

TABLE 1
NUMBER OF SUBJECTS WHO RAN OCTOBER, 1974
ACCORDING TO AGENCY

	Louise	Villa	Christie	St. Mary's	Chil- dren's Farm	Cath- olic Chari- ties
Runners	2	1	1	0	0	0
Non- runners	0	0	2	0	0	1

The choice perceived by respondents in being placed in residential care was also considered a factor in preplacement preparation. It is assumed that adequate preplacement counseling would provide the counselor with some choice of agency or would increase subject's perception of having a choice in the decision-making process.

Table 2 indicates responses to the amount of choice subjects felt they had in being placed.

TABLE 2

CHOICE IN PLACEMENT

Number of Responses Per Category

	None	Very Little	Some	A Lot	Very Much	No Response
Runners	9	6	5	0	3	2
Non-runners	15	6	0	3	1	0

For statistical purposes, the data was combined in the following way:

	None → Very Little	Some → Very Much
Runners	15	8
Non-runners	21	4

A chi-square value of 1.363 was calculated with one degree of freedom and a total N of 48. This is below the critical value of 3.84 and is not significant at the .05 level of significance. Therefore, amount of choice subjects felt

they had in being placed is not a significant difference between runners and nonrunners.

Subjects were asked what they had heard about their placement and what they expected it to be like. The responses to these open ended questions will be described in a general, interpretative way that is not statistically significant. Overall, nonrunners' expectations were much lower and more negative than the runners'. Nonrunners' responses were predominantly very negative; e.g., "lesbian place," "fighting," "people really mean," "prison," or neutral; e.g., "boarding school," "no boys," "OK place," "strict." Runners' responses were generally extremely positive; e.g., "really good place," "horses and swimming pool," "pleasant place," "no work," "smoke any time," "a very good place for people like me." Several possible interpretations could be considered from these observations. Nonrunners appear to have a more negative or realistic picture of their upcoming placement. This could mean they are better prepared to deal with the realities of institutional living, and in fact may find their placements much better than anticipated. Runners appear to have extremely high "pollyannaish" expectations for their placements. The inevitable disappointment inherent in this overly idealized view could help trigger feelings associated with runaway behavior.

Subjects were asked whether the placement was similar to what they expected. This data is displayed in Table 3.

TABLE 3
SIMILARITY OF PLACEMENT
TO EXPECTATIONS
Number of Responses Per Category

	Yes	No	No Response
Runners	3	19	3
Non-runners	7	14	4

A chi-square was computed and a score of 1.362 was obtained with one degree of freedom and a total N of 43. This is below the critical value of 3.84 and is not significant at the .05 level of significance. Hence no significant difference was noted between groups for the variable of whether subjects' expectations matched the reality of their experiences in their placements.

Table 4 displays the responses to the question of whether subjects believed a preplacement visit would have helped them adjust to their new placement.

TABLE 4
PREPLACEMENT VISITATION
Number of Responses Per Category

	Yes	No	No Response
Runners	14	5	6
Non-runners	13	6	6

Of those that responded, 74 per cent of the runners and 68 per cent of the nonrunners believed that a preplacement visit did help them adjust to their new placement or would have helped them adjust if they had done so. Runners' and nonrunners' responses are nearly identical and no significant differences are noted for the two groups. However, a majority of the subjects affirmed the usefulness of a preplacement visit.

Table 5 presents findings for the variable of whether subjects received preplacement counseling. Eighty per cent of the nonrunners and 61 per cent of the runners had received counseling prior to placement. A difference between sample proportions was computed from this data and a z score of 1.461 was obtained. This is smaller than the critical

value of 1.96 and this result is not significant at the .05 level of significance. Preplacement counseling does not differentiate runners from nonrunners in this sample.

TABLE 5

PREPLACEMENT COUNSELING

Number of Responses Per Category

	Yes	No	No Response
Runners	14	9	2
Non-runners	20	5	0

Summary. No significant differences were noted between runners and nonrunners for the hypothesis, nor in regard to questions seen as closely related. Areas where differences were expected but not noted included the amount of choice subjects had in being placed, month of placement, what subjects had heard about the placement and expected it to be like, how near the experience fit subjects' expectations, the amount and type of preplacement counseling, and whether a preplacement visit had been made. The data does not support the expectation that any of these variables have an effect on runaway behavior.

In combining the runners and nonrunners, it is interesting to note that in the majority of cases the placement was not like the expectations and the subjects believed a preplacement visit would have helped them adjust to their new placement. The majority of runners and nonrunners combined did receive preplacement counseling; however, we did not ask them to specify whether the counseling was associated with this present placement.

A further purpose of this study was to explore input from various agencies regarding variables considered relevant to running away. Many of the questions included in the questionnaire were not directly related to the main hypothesis, but had been suggested by various agencies as possibly differentiating a runner from a nonrunner. The findings for these variables will be reported on a question-by-question basis.

Demographically the runners were surprisingly similar to the nonrunners. The mean age for each group was slightly under fourteen. Christie was the only agency in which the runners differed in age from the nonrunners. The Christie nonrunners were on the average one year younger. This cannot be considered a significant overall difference. Table 6 represents this data.

TABLE 6
MEAN AGE IN YEARS ACCORDING
TO AGENCY

Agency	Runner	Nonrunner
Louise	14.70	15.00
Villa	14.00	14.00
Christie	13.30	12.10
St. Mary's	13.00	13.00
Children's Farm	14.40	14.80
Catholic Charities	14.50	13.50
Mean of Total	13.97	13.74

Our samples were not chosen to equalize a male-female ratio. Each category contained eighteen females and seven males. Hence, there was no difference in our sample for this variable. The male-female breakdown for each agency is shown in Table 7. (See page 43.)

The racial makeup of the two groups was nearly identical. The runner category contained twenty-three Whites and two Indians. The nonrunner category contained twenty-four Whites and one Black.

TABLE 7
 MALES AND FEMALES IN SAMPLE
 ACCORDING TO AGENCY

Number in Each Category

Agency	Runners		Nonrunners	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Louise	0	6	0	7
Villa	0	1	0	1
Christie	0	9	0	8
St. Mary's	2	0	2	0
Children's Farm	5	0	5	0
Catholic Charities	0	2	0	2
Totals	7	18	7	18

Similarly the heights and weights of the two groups showed minimal difference. The mean weight for the runners was 123 pounds and for the nonrunners, 127 pounds. The mean height for the runners was sixty-four inches and for the nonrunners, sixty-five inches. Table 8 displays this information.

TABLE 8
MEAN HEIGHTS AND WEIGHTS
ACCORDING TO AGENCY

Agency	Height in Inches		Weight in Pounds	
	Runners	Nonrunners	Runners	Nonrunners
Louise	64.07	65.58	128.50	122.57
Villa	66.00	67.00	140.00	149.00
Christie	62.75	62.75	102.81	119.63
St. Mary's	61.50	63.50	118.50	113.50
Children's Farm	65.20	67.40	122.00	103.67
Catholic Charities	65.00	63.75	127.50	152.50
Mean of Totals	64.99	64.08	123.21	126.81

Place of residence was considered as a factor influencing runaways. Table 9 summarizes this data. Data for Children's Farm Home is included in this table, but is not included in determining significance because this agency is located outside the Portland area. Excluding Children's Farm Home, 65 per cent of the nonrunners and 30 per cent of the runners lived inside the Portland metropolitan area. This data is presented in Table 9 according to agency.

TABLE 9
PLACE OF RESIDENCE ACCORDING
TO AGENCY
Number of Responses Per Category

Agency	Nonrunners		Runners	
	Portland	Outside	Portland	Outside
Louise	4	3	1	6
Villa	0	1	0	1
Christie	6	2	3	5
St. Mary's	1	1	1	1
Children's Farm	1	4	1	4
Catholic Charities	2	0	1	1
Totals	14	11	7	18
Totals excluding Children's Farm	13	7	6	14

The difference between two sample proportions was computed and a z score of 3.134 was obtained. Since z was larger than 1.96, the probability that a result this unusual would happen by chance is less than .05. Hence, a significant difference is noted for this variable and place of residence is a factor affecting runaway behavior. Subjects

are more likely to run if they live outside the Portland metropolitan area where their placement is located.

School achievement and attendance were studied. Table 10 summarizes the data for the subjects' evaluation of their school achievement.

TABLE 10

SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT

Number of Responses Per Category

	Very Poor	Poor	Average	Good	Very Good
Runners	0	4	12	6	1
Nonrunners	0	2	14	4	5

For statistical purposes the data was grouped in the following way:

	Poor → Average	Good → Very Good
Runners	12	7
Nonrunners	16	9

A chi-square value of .0104 was calculated with one degree of freedom and a total N of 44. This is not significant at .05 level of significance.

Table 11 summarizes the data for subjects' reports of school attendance.

TABLE 11
SCHOOL ATTENDANCE
Number of Responses Per Category

	Drop- out	Skip Frequently	Skip Occasionally	Always Attend	No Response
Runner	0	3	11	10	1
Non- runner	1	1	10	13	0

The two groups are similar concerning this variable also. Therefore, for this population there is no association between school achievement, school attendance and runaway behavior.

The marital status of each group's parents showed no significant variation. Fifty-six per cent of the runners' parents were divorced versus 64 per cent of the nonrunners' parents. Twenty-four per cent of the runners' parents were

married versus 20 per cent of the nonrunners' parents. Twelve per cent of the runners' parents separated versus 8 per cent of the nonrunners' parents. Four per cent of the parents were widowed in each category. Table 12 summarizes this data.

TABLE 12
MARITAL STATUS OF PARENTS
Number of Responses Per Category

	Married	Sep- arated	Divorced	Wid- owed	Never Married	No Response
Runners	6	3	14	1	0	1
Non- runners	5	2	16	1	1	0

The runners' parents had been divorced an average of eight years while the nonrunners' parents had been divorced an average of 6.4 years. A t test was calculated to determine if this difference was significant. A t value of 1.696 was obtained with thirteen degrees of freedom. This is below the critical value of 2.16 that would be needed for significance at the .05 level. Therefore, length of time parents have been divorced does not appear to be associated with runaway behavior.

Adoption was another variable studied. Sixteen per cent of the runners and 4 per cent of the nonrunners had been adopted. Table 13 summarizes this data.

TABLE 13

ADOPTION

Number of Responses Per Category

	Yes	No	No Response
Runners	4	20	1
Nonrunners	1	24	0

The difference between two sample proportions was calculated to determine if this variable measured a significant difference. A z score of .358 was obtained. Since z was smaller than 1.96, this indicates that adoption does not appear to be a significant difference between runners and nonrunners in the current study.

Table 14 summarizes the data concerning subjects' previous placements.

TABLE 14
MEAN NUMBER OF PLACEMENTS
PER AGENCY

	Louise	Villa	Christie	St. Mary's	Chil- dren's Farm	Cath- olic Charities
Runners	1.57	2	1	.5	1.4	1.5
Non runners	2.14	1	.75	0	1.4	4

The average number of previous placements for runners was 1.33 and for nonrunners was 1.55. A *t* score of $-.810$ was calculated from this data. At ten degrees of freedom, 2.23 is the critical value indicating there is no significance between previous placements and runaway behavior at .05 level of significance.

Table 15 summarizes the data concerning total time out of the home subjects had spent in placements. (See page 51.)

Runners spent an average of 26.39 weeks in other placements that included juvenile detention centers, foster homes, group homes, and homes of relatives. Nonrunners spent an average of 64.46 weeks in other placements. A *t*

score of 1.97 was calculated. With ten degrees of freedom, 2.23 is the critical value. This data shows no significance between groups for the variable of time spent in other placements at the .05 level of significance.

TABLE 15
AVERAGE NUMBER OF WEEKS SPENT IN
PLACEMENTS OTHER THAN HOME

	Louise	Villa	Christie	St. Mary's	Chil- dren's Farm	Cath- olic Charities
Runners	22.28	3	42.28	8	50.80	32
Non- runners	61.57	12	18.88	0	21.30	273

No significant difference between the two groups was noted from the question of who accompanied them when they were first placed in their respective agencies. Fifty-six per cent of the runners were accompanied by their caseworkers versus 64 per cent of the nonrunners. Twenty per cent of the runners and 24 per cent of the nonrunners were accompanied by a caseworker and parents. Sixteen per cent of the runners were accompanied by parents only, versus 8 per cent of the nonrunners. Table 16 presents this data.

TABLE 16
WHO ACCOMPANIED SUBJECTS TO PLACEMENT
Number of Responses Per Category

	Caseworker	Caseworker & Parents	Parents	Other
Runners	14	5	4	2
Non- runners	16	6	2	1

A chi-square was used to test the data regarding family's attitude toward placement. For statistical purposes the data was grouped as shown in Table 17.

TABLE 17
FAMILY'S ATTITUDE TOWARD PLACEMENT
Number of Responses Per Category

	Very Poor → OK	Good → Very Good
Runners	14	7
Non- runners	13	10

A chi-square value of .145 was obtained with one degree of freedom and a total N of 44. This is below the critical value of 3.84 and is not significant at the .05 level of significance. Therefore, in this study family attitude toward the placement is not associated with runaway behavior.

Table 18 summarizes the responses of how subjects felt about their placement. This data has been grouped for statistical purposes.

TABLE 18
HOW SUBJECTS FELT ABOUT PLACEMENT
Number of Responses Per Category

	Very Bad → OK	Good → Very Good
Runners	17	6
Nonrunners	21	4

A chi-square value of .254 was calculated with one degree of freedom and a total N of 48. This is below the critical value of 3.84 and is not significant at the .05 level of significance. Subjects' feelings regarding their placement is not a differentiating factor in this study.

Table 19 summarizes the data regarding who subjects talked with first when arriving at their placement.

TABLE 19
WHO SUBJECTS TALKED WITH FIRST
Number of Responses Per Category

	Staff	Staff & Kids	Kids	No Response
Runners	18	1	4	1
Nonrunners	18	1	6	0

These responses are nearly identical and no significant difference was elicited from this variable.

Subjects were also questioned as to how welcome the person they first spoke with made them feel. Table 20 summarizes this data.

TABLE 20
HOW WELCOME SUBJECTS FELT
Number of Responses Per Category

	Not At All	Very Little	Some	A Lot	Very Much	No Response
Runners	1	1	10	7	4	2
Nonrunners	0	0	12	10	2	1

Again, the two groups are so similar that no significant difference is noted.

The existence of a buddy program (or big brother or big sister program) in the agencies was a variable questioned. The results are summarized in Table 21.

TABLE 21
EXISTENCE OF A BUDDY PROGRAM
Number of Responses Per Category

	Yes	No	No Response
Runners	8	15	2
Nonrunners	9	10	6

A chi-square value of .123 was computed from this data with one degree of freedom and a total N of 42. This is below the critical value of 3.84 and is not significant at the .05 level of significance. Hence, a buddy system is not a significant differentiating factor between the two groups.

Table 22 summarizes the data of how often caseworkers have visited subjects since their placement.

TABLE 22

HOW OFTEN CASEWORKERS HAVE
VISITED SUBJECTS

Number of Responses Per Category

	Not At All	Rarely	Some	Often	Very Often	No Response
Runners	1	10	10	2	0	2
Non- runners	7	5	6	3	2	2

Combining categories for statistical purposes, the following results were obtained:

	Not At All → Rarely	Some → Very Often
Runners	11	12
Nonrunners	12	11

These categories are too similar to contain a significant difference. Hence, the groups are not significantly different on the variable of how often their caseworkers have visited them.

Table 23 summarizes the data of how often subjects would have liked their caseworkers to visit.

TABLE 23

HOW OFTEN SUBJECTS WOULD LIKE
CASEWORKERS TO VISIT

Number of Responses Per Category

	Not At All	Rarely	Some	Often	Very Often	No Response
Runners	3	4	6	9	1	2
Non- runners	3	8	4	-8	1	1

Combining categories, the following results were obtained:

	Not At All → Rarely	Some → Very Often
Runners	7	15
Nonrunners	11	12

A chi-square value of .049 was computed from this data with one degree of freedom and a total N of 45. This is below the critical value of 3.84 and is not significant at the .05 level of significance. Therefore, the number of caseworker visits desired is not a significant difference between the runners and nonrunners.

Subjects were questioned as to whether they had run from their own homes. Table 24 summarized this data.

TABLE 24
SUBJECTS RUNS FROM THEIR HOMES
Number of Responses Per Category

	Yes	No	No Response
Runners	16	7	2
Nonrunners	13	11	1

From this data, a chi-square value of .617 was calculated with one degree of freedom and a total N of 47. This is below the critical value of 3.84 and is not significant at the .05 level of significance. Runs from subjects' own homes is not a significant differentiating factor between the two groups.

Similarly, no significant difference was noted for the two groups on the variable of whether other members of the subjects' families had run. Table 25 summarizes this data.

TABLE 25
OTHER FAMILY MEMBER RUNAWAYS
Number of Responses Per Category

	Yes	No	No Response
Runners	10	12	3
Nonrunners	10	15	0

Summary

Many variables were considered as possible differences between runners and nonrunners. Demographic data, school achievement and attendance, marital status of parents, time spent in other placements, subjects and subjects' families' attitude toward the placement, who subjects talked with first, the existence of a buddy program, adoption, caseworker visits, runs from own homes and runs by other family members, were variables studied. Of these, only place of residence elicited a significant difference between the two groups. Subjects are more likely to run if they reside outside the Portland metropolitan area. These results do not apply to Children's Farm Home which is outside the geographical area and was not considered in this question.

In order to compile a profile of a typical run, runners were asked a variety of open ended questions. (See

Questionnaire in Appendix B, Part I, page 5, questions 31 through 38.) This data is not statistically significant but does present a description of the most commonly described events, feelings and behaviors that were associated with running away.

Runners in this sample typically left their agency in the late afternoon or evening (with the exception of one subject who always ran in the morning because the night time was too scary). The common mode of transportation is walking to the nearest place to be picked up as a hitchhiker.

Although a few subjects ran due to boredom, the majority were involved in a hassle with a staff person, wanted to support a friend, were uptight with a family member, were anticipating detention, or were anxious regarding an upcoming home visit.

Most subjects reported being angry and upset at the time they ran. There were some reports of feeling sadness, shame, and fear. Although a few subjects stated they felt glad and happy to be getting away, hurt and anger were the prevailing moods.

Almost overwhelmingly, these runs were not planned but were impulsive decisions. Only four runners had planned their actions in advance and, of these, one had been planned only a half-hour before.

Subjects typically ran with a friend or two from their placement. Those who ran alone almost always ran to their homes or the home of a friend. Most subjects ran to a friend's home, or often to the home of a friend's friend. A few ran to their own homes. Only two respondents went to places where they didn't have an acquaintance--one to a motel and another to a boat on which to sleep.

Part II, pages 1-4, of the questionnaire were made up of questions presented by residents of Villa St. Rose. Runners and nonrunners were asked how important they considered each of twenty-two variables to be in running away. A factor analysis was calculated for this data, combining both samples. Runners and nonrunners were combined due to the small sample. A transgeneration was first performed, inserting means in categories where no response had been given. The total N was fifty and the number of variables twenty-two. Eight factors were obtained from this procedure. The eight factors will be described separately with the most highly correlated variables described.

In most cases a cutoff value of .50 was utilized in including variables in the factor. Some items with a correlation close to this value were included. This part of the questionnaire was headed by the question, "In your opinion, how much importance does this have in running away?"

The twenty-two variables followed and subjects were asked to check one of five possible answers--not at all, very little, some, a lot, or very much.

Factor 1 was named Conflictual Relationships With Staff. The variables and their correlation coefficient are listed below:

<u>Statement</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
Staff not taking enough time with kids.	.798
Staff not trusting kids.	.801
Staff not being honest with kids.	.578
Not getting help with problems.	.705
Feeling depressed.	.483

This factor may relate to Konopka's criticisms of workers in institutions. See Review of the Literature, Chapter II, page 14, for a more complete description of Konopka's ideas. She sees workers as coming from sheltered backgrounds with unrealistic idealism and as becoming disillusioned and hardened when dealing with the realities of institution work. When workers are unprepared for the hostility and resistance residents bring, they retaliate with discouragement and power trips. This in turn increases anger, frustration and the urge to flee. Factor 1 includes a dissatisfaction with the amount of attention and type of treatment subjects perceive they are receiving, as well as the quality of relationships subjects perceive as being offered.

Factor 2 was named Impulse Control. These variables and their correlation coefficients are listed below:

<u>Statement</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
When I am tempted to get loaded on drugs.	.637
When I feel a need to have sex.	.594
When I feel depressed.	.509
When I think I'll get to go home.	.802
When I have hassles with parents during home visits.	.498

This factor relates to Leventhal's idea of inner control that runners often lack (See Chapter II, Review of the Literature, page 10). This factor appears to define running away as a discharge type of behavior--an attempt to deal with uncomfortable feelings and conflicts. Lack of control over impulses was a dominant theme pursued during group therapy for runners in the Leventhal study.

Factor 3 was named Environmental Stress and was made up of the following variables:

<u>Statement</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
When I have an upsetting counseling session.	.803
When the living group is uptight and not caring.	.654
When I am tired of being told what to do.	.456

Each of the variables describe stress in the living situation and conflicted relationships within the living group.

This is another commonly described factor in the literature related to runaways. Noncommunication which frustrates basic needs of affection and acceptance, and conflict or confrontation in the living group, often leads to a flight reaction.

"Good" Parent Role Model was the name assigned to Factor 4 which was made up of the following variables:

<u>Statement</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
When I don't have close relationships with staff members.	.633
When the staff doesn't set limits for me.	.895
When the staff is not honest with me.	.620

The variables in this factor are interpreted as longing for an idealized parent figure--who is willing to be close, who sets limits (surely acceptable, fair limits), and who will be involved in an open, honest relationship with the youth. Affection and acceptance were key areas of conflict that led up to runaway behavior in the Blood and D'Angelo study (see Review of the Literature, Chapter II, page 11).

Factor 5 was named Isolation and is made up of the following variables:

<u>Statement</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
When I lose contact with the staff.	.849
When I am uptight or scared.	.521
When someone gets too close to my problems.	.732

These questions have in common a feeling of isolation and vulnerability. The subjects in this sample consider these stressful feelings as a precipitator of runaway behavior. Blood and D'Angelo developed a hierarchy of adolescents' needs. One is a need for total acceptance--to be understood, to communicate with other people, and to express inner thoughts and feelings without loss of status. This factor appears to reflect similar ideas to Blood and D'Angelo.

Factor 6 was named Disturbed Peer Relations. The variables are listed below:

<u>Statement</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
When I have hassles with other kids.	.734
When I lose contact with friends.	.809

Both these variables indicate that problems and isolation from the peer group are considered an influence in runaway behavior. The literature and findings in other parts of this study indicate conflict with family, staff, or other

authority figures are a factor in running away. These findings indicate disturbed peer relationships as another factor.

Authority was the name given to Factor 7 which is made up of the following variables:

<u>Statement</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
When the staff looks for problems that really don't exist.	.604
When I am having problems at school.	.852

This information coincides with much of the literature as well as other findings in this study. Pressure and conflict with authority figures is a commonly reported precipitation of runaway behavior.

Factor 8 was titled Helplessness. It consists of the following factors:

<u>Statement</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
When I am tired of being told what to do.	.695
When I feel locked in.	.839

This information is again related to Leventhal's findings in which helplessness and a feeling of lack of control over external circumstances is a prelude to running away.

Part II, page 5 of the questionnaire consisted of a number of possibilities of when youths are most likely to

run and where they are most likely to run to. Subjects were asked to choose from a range of responses from "disagree strongly" to "agree very much." These responses were rated from one to five and a mean score was calculated for each question and for each group. Table 26 displays this information. (See page 68.)

Several general observations can be gleaned from this data. Both runners and nonrunners have a high degree of agreement that youths are most likely to run during the summer. Both groups disagree somewhat that just before release time is a likely time to run. Running to a friend's house received strong agreement for each group. This agrees with findings from the open ended questions that runners were asked regarding their runaway behavior. This information also indicated that youths are most likely to run to a friend's house.

Runners generally scored from one-half to one point lower than nonrunners. One possible interpretation for this is that runners have stronger opinions regarding the details of runaway behavior.

Part II, pages 7 and 8 of the questionnaire were made up of thirteen statements that subjects were asked to agree with from a range of not at all to very much. A factor analysis was calculated with this data. Runners and nonrunners were combined for statistical purposes. A transgeneration was

TABLE 26

MEAN RESPONSES OF QUESTIONS AS TO WHEN SUBJECTS
ARE MOST LIKELY TO RUN AND WHERE THEY
ARE MOST LIKELY TO RUN TO

Kids are most likely to run during:	Runners	Non- Runners
Spring	2.3	3.3
Summer	4.1	4.2
Winter	2.8	2.8
Fall	2.6	3.1
Breaks (a) morning, (b) lunch, (c) evening	3.3	3.2
Group Outings	2.9	3.2
Home visits	2.4	3.3
During outside employment	2.0	2.8
Just before release time	1.8	2.0
At holiday time	2.4	3.2
Kids run to:		
Home	3.1	3.2
Seattle	1.9	2.8
California	2.3	2.8
Parks	2.1	3.1
Communes	1.9	3.1
Friends	4.5	4.8

first performed, inserting means where no response had been given. The total N was fifty and the number of variables was thirteen. Five factors were obtained from this procedure. These factors will be described separately with the variables most highly correlated described. In most cases the cutoff value was .50 for including variables in the factor. Some items with a slightly smaller correlation were included.

Factor 1 was named Support Group and included the following variables:

<u>Statement</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
I like getting to know the adults here.	.815
It helps to talk about my feel- ings in group.	.775
The group outings we have are fun.	.671
It's helpful to have someone around to talk with.	.825

These variables indicate acceptance of values and behaviors that are commonly considered part of any effective residential treatment program. An amenability to treatment and ability to form close, meaningful relationships are also indicated by these statements.

Factor 2 was named Family Dissension, with the following variables being highly correlated:

<u>Statement</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
We had lots of fights at my house.	.536
My mother hit me a lot.	.898
I often wanted to run away.	.547

This factor relates to findings from other studies that family conflict, and particularly physical abuse, is higher among runaways. Running away can be an avoidance of an intolerable home situation. Shellow indicated that family conflict has a direct bearing on runaway behavior.

Factor 3 was named Family Feeling Dysfunction. The following variables were included:

<u>Statement</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
My father loved me.	-.753
I had fun with my brothers and sisters.	-.812
I like doing things on schedule.	-.654

This factor relates to Factor 2 and findings in the literature. Runaways come from homes with a high amount of conflict. Further, some researchers believe the nature of this conflict to be major conflict over minor issues. This permits the displacement of intense anger to areas where it may be handled with less risk of totally disrupting fragile family relationships (Blood and D'Angelo). Hence the factors relating to lack of parental love and lack of positive ex-

periences with siblings indicate serious dysfunction in the family and this may be handled by conflict.

Parental Acceptance was the name given Factor 4.

<u>Statement</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
I considered my parents strict.	-.720
My parents were very understanding of me.	.807
I often wanted to run away.	-.413

In this sample, subjects considered parental understanding as being nearly opposite to parental strictness. Subjects who describe their parents as understanding, do not consider them to be strict and did not often want to run away. This again relates to findings in the literature which indicate parental acceptance to be a major need of adolescents.

Factor 5 was named Parental Protection, and "There was usually someone there when I came home," was the only statement highly correlated for this factor with a value of .884.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Our goal was to obtain reliable data as to whether preplacement counseling and visitation made a significant difference in runaway behavior of youth in residential facilities. The results of the questions relating to the hypothesis showed no statistically significant difference between runners and nonrunners. Other questions were not directly related to the hypothesis, but had been suggested by various agencies as possibly differentiating a runner from a nonrunner. Of these, the only significant variable was place of residence. Subjects were more likely to run if their residence was outside the Portland metropolitan area.

A profile of the typical run was compiled from questions asked of the runner. This is not statistically significant data, but it does describe the most common events, feelings and behavior that were associated with running away.

A total of thirteen factors were obtained from two separate factor analyses. Runners and nonrunners were combined to form one sample. The following factors with their variables were obtained from the first factor analysis.

Factor 1. Conflictual Relationships with Staff

Staff not taking enough time with kids.
Staff not trusting kids.
Staff not being honest with kids.
Not getting help with problems.
Feeling depressed.

Factor 2. Impulse Control

When I am tempted to get loaded on drugs.
When I feel a need to have sex.
When I feel depressed.
When I think I'll get to go home.
When I have hassles with parents during home visits.

Factor 3. Environmental Stress

When I have an upsetting counseling session.
When the living group is uptight and not caring.
When I am tired of being told what to do.

Factor 4. "Good" Parent Role Model

When I don't have close relationships with staff members.
When the staff doesn't set limits for me.
When the staff is not honest with me.

Factor 5. Isolation

When I lose contact with the staff.
When I am uptight or scared.
When someone gets too close to my problems.

Factor 6. Disturbed Peer Relations

When I have hassles with other kids.
When I lose contact with friends.

Factor 7. Authority

When the staff looks for problems that
really don't exist.
When I am having problems at school.

Factor 8. Helplessness

When I am tired of being told what to do.
When I feel locked in.

The factors obtained from the second factor analysis
are as follows:

Factor 1. Support Group

I like getting to know the adults here.
It helps to talk about my feelings in
group.
The group outings we have are fun.
It's helpful to have someone around to
talk with.

Factor 2. Family Dissension

We had lots of fights at my house.
My mother hit me a lot.
I often wanted to run away.

Factor 3. Family Feeling Dysfunction

My father didn't love me.
I didn't have fun with my brothers and
sisters.
I don't like doing things on schedule.

Factor 4. Parental Acceptance

I didn't consider my parents strict.
My parents were very understanding of me.
I didn't often want to run away.

Factor 5. Parental Protection

There was usually someone there when I came home.

Subjects were questioned as to when youths are most likely to run and where they are most likely to run to. Runners and nonrunners had a high degree of agreement that youths are most likely to run during the summer and to run to the home of a friend. Both groups disagree that just before release is a likely time to run.

Summary of Methodology

The research design proved to be appropriate for the kind of data that we sought to collect and analyze. Both subjective and objective data were collected by using a two-part instrument. Part I was administered as an interview by the research team and Part II was answered directly by the subject.

The instruments were for the most part very adequate for eliciting open responses. However, in Part I the wording in several questions was not specific enough to get at the definitive information that we needed. Part II was most successful in delineating the needs and feelings of the respondents.

Of the subjects, the runner group was judged to be fairly representative. However, the matching group of

nonrunners was too similar in characteristics and experience to make the results significant. We believe that this was the case because of the fact that the nonrunner sample, though not running in October, 1974, had indeed had a history of running away.

Our procedures were satisfactory in accomplishing the tasks. The only difficulty encountered was that of scheduling interviews that were convenient for all persons involved. The interviewees were, with few exceptions, affable, interested and cooperative.

Implications and Recommendations

In the opinion of the authors, this research study might have proven more significant if the data had been collected from a selected control group that had been specifically involved in preplacement counseling, previsitation and participation in planning for their own treatment plan.

(Our question No. 28 did not clearly define whether the preplacement counseling was related to this present placement.) For future research we would suggest that a model program be implemented within one of these agencies. Within such a program we would recommend that the young person have some input into their own treatment plan, as well as counseling and visitation, well before placement.

Our results indicated that a majority of those questioned felt that they wanted to be involved in their own placement, by visiting and planning. This need not to feel helpless is substantiated throughout the literature. Evaluations of this plan could more accurately be made if such a group could be treated within an agency, while the control remained untreated in the same agency. This would take care of the variables between agencies.

Some differential factors that emerged suggest a need for more complete evaluation of individual agencies in view of their different programs and populations. For example, a variable which might be of interest for further research is that associated with the kind of schooling provided. Since school problems, failing and truancy, are thought to be factors preceding runs, these situations are minimized in facilities that have schools in residence. This factor could be separately associated (see Table 5, page 40, and Table 6, page 42).

Another factor found to be important by the youths questioned was the location of the placement as related to their homes. The need to maintain contact with friends was noted as being important. Youth who were placed some distance from their homes and friends ran more frequently.

It has been suggested to us by one of the participating agencies that our instruments would be very useful as

projective tools in interviewing their own residents. They felt that our questionnaire elicited valuable responses that they would otherwise not have gotten. Following this implication, it would seem fruitful to use such data in making individualized treatment plans for their residents, as well as being able to avoid if possible those anxiety producing stress situations that cause the young person to run.

FOOTNOTES

¹"Runaway Children--A Problem for More and More Cities," U.S. News & World Report, April 24, 1972, 38-42.

²Lawrence S. Bradshaw, et al., "Runaway Youth in Salt Lake County" (unpublished Master's thesis, University of Utah, 1969).

³James A. Hildebrand, "Why Runaways Leave Home," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, Vol. 54 (June, 1963), 211-216.

⁴Ivan Nye and James F. Short, Jr., "Scaling Delinquent Behavior," American Sociological Review, June, 1957, pp. 326-331.

⁵Robert Shellow, et al., "Suburban Runaways of the 1960's," Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, XXXII, No. 3, 1967, pp. 1-37.

⁶Ibid., p. 19.

⁷Ibid., pp. 36-37.

⁸Amos Robey, et al., "The Runaway Girl: A Reaction to Family Stress," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XXIV, No. 4, (July, 1964), pp. 762-767.

⁹Clyde B. Vedder, The Runaway Girl (Englewood, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1958), Chap. IV.

¹⁰Randall Foster, "Intrapsychic and Environmental Factors in Running Away From Home," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XXXIV (April 1, 1962), pp. 486-491.

¹¹Robey, et al., pp. 765.

¹²Fredrick Rosenheim, "Techniques of Therapy," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, X, (1940), pp. 651-665.

¹³Ibid., p. 657.

- ¹⁴ Robey, et al., p. 763.
- ¹⁵ Theodore Leventhal, "Inner Control Deficiencies in Runaway Children," Archives of General Psychiatry, I (August, 1964), pp. 170-176.
- ¹⁶ Ibid., p. 170.
- ¹⁷ Linda Blood and Rocco D'Angelo, "A Progress Research Report on Value Issues in Conflict Between Runaways and Their Parents," Journal of Marriage and the Family, Vol. 36, No. 3 (August, 1974), pp. 486-491.
- ¹⁸ Ibid., p. 487.
- ¹⁹ Ibid., p. 490.
- ²⁰ David Street, Robert D. Vinter and Charles Perrow, Organization For Treatment (New York: Free Press, 1966).
- ²¹ Ibid., p. 278.
- ²² Lloyd McCorkle, Albert Elias and F. Lovell Bixby, The Highfields Story (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1958).
- ²³ Gisela Konopka, The Adolescent Girl in Conflict (Englewood, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966).
- ²⁴ Institutional Rehabilitation of Delinquent Youth, National Conference of Superintendents of Training Schools (Albany, N.Y.: Delmar Publishers, 1962).
- ²⁵ Ibid., pp. 45-49.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF
PERTINENT LITERATURE

Books

- Aichorn, August. Wayward Youth. New York: The Viking Press, 1935.
- Ambrosino, Lillian. Runaways. Boston: Beacon Press, 1971.
- Armstrong, Clariette P. 660 Runaway Boys. Boston: Gorham Press, 1932.
- Bock, Richard and English, Abigail. Got Me on the Run. Boston: Beacon Press, 1973.
- Dornbusch, Sanford and Schmid, Calvin. A Primer of Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1955.
- Forcese, Dennis and Richer, Stephen. Social Research Methods. Englewood, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.
- McCorkle, Lloyd; Elias, Albert; and F. Lovell Bixby. The Highlands Story. New York: Henry Holt, 1958.
- Street, David; Vinter, Robert D.; and Perrow, Charles. Organization for Treatment. New York: The Free Press, 1966.
- Thom, D. A. Normal Youth and Its Everyday Problems. New York: Appleton, 1933.
- Vedder, Clyde B. The Runaway Girl. Englewood, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1958.
- National Conference of Superintendents of Training Schools and Reformatories. Institutional Rehabilitation of Delinquent Youth. Albany, N.Y.: Delmar Publishers, 1962.

Articles and Periodicals

- Balser, B.H. "A Behavior Problem--Runaways." Psychiatric Quarterly, XIII (1939), 539-557.
- Blood, Linda and D'Angelo, Rocco. "A Progress Research Report on Value Issues in Conflict Between Runaways and Their Parents." Journal of Marriage and the Family, Vol. 36, No. 3 (August, 1974), 486-491.
- Foster, Randall M. "Intrapyschic and Environmental Factors in Running Away from Home." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XXXIV (April, 1962, 486-491.
- Frank, Lawrence K. "Community Planning for Children and Youth." Social Forces, XXIV (May, 1946), 385-388.
- Hildebrand, James A. "Why Runaways Leave Home." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, LIV (June, 1963), 211-216.
- Holt, Norman. Escape from Custody, Research Report No. 52, Research Division, California Department of Corrections (May, 1974), 1-63.
- Leventhal, Theodore. "Control Problems in Runaway Children." Archives of General Psychiatry, IX (August, 1963), 122-126.
- Leventhal, Theodore. "Inner Control Deficiencies in Runaway Children." Archives of General Psychiatry, IX (August, 1964), 170-176.
- Lowrey, L. G. "Runaways and Nomads." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XI (October, 1941), 775-783.
- Nye, Ivan F., and Short, James F. "Scaling Delinquent Behavior." American Sociological Review, XXII (June, 1957), 326-331.
- Outland, G. E. "Determinants Involved in Boy Transiency." Journal of Educational Sociology, XI (February, 1938), 360-372.
- Outland, G. E. "The Home Situation as a Direct Cause of Boy Transiency." Journal of Juvenile Research, XXII (1938), 33-43.

- Peters, William. "Riddle of Teenage Runaways." Good Housekeeping, CLXVI (June, 1968), 88-89, ff.
- Rein, Martin. "The Social Service Crisis." Trans-Action, I (May, 1964), 3-6, ff.
- Robey, Amos, et al. "The Runaway Girl: A Reaction to Family Stress." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XXXIV (July, 1964), 762-767.
- Robins, Lee N. "Mental Illness and the Runaway: A 30 Year Follow-up Study." Human Organization, XVI (Winter, 1958), 11-15.
- Robins, Lee N., and O'Neal, Patricia. "The Adult Prognosis for Runaway Children." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XXIX (October, 1959), 752-761.
- "Runaway Children--A Problem for More and More Cities." U.S. News & World Report, (April 24, 1972), 38-42.
- "Runaway Kids." Life, LXIII (November 3, 1967), 18-29.
- "Runaways: Teenagers Who Run Away to the Hippies." Time, XC (September 15, 1967), 46, ff.
- Shellow, Robert, et al. "Suburban Runaways of the 1960's." Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, XXXII, No. 3 (1967), 1-37.
- Stark, Heman G. "Standards for Juvenile Halls." Federal Probation, XXIV (March, 1960), 35-41.
- Tunley, Roul. "If You're Thinking of Running Away." Seventeen (February, 1968), 138-139, ff.
- Whitbread, Jane. "Runaways: Greenwich Village Case Histories." Look, XXXI (July 25, 1967), 26-32.
- Wylie, Dorothy C., and Weinreb, J. "The Treatment of a Runaway Adolescent Girl Through the Treatment of the Mother." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XXVIII (January, 1958).

Unpublished Materials

Bradshaw, Lawrence Stuart, et al. "Runaway Youth in Salt Lake County: A Study of Their Use of Social Service Agencies and Community Planning Related to Their Problems." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Graduate School of Social Work, University of Utah (1969), 1-96.

Greer, Susan G.; Hertlein, Sarah J.; and Regner, Stephen C. "A Study of the Characteristics of Runaways and Their Families in Two Social Agencies." Unpublished Master's Practicum, Portland State University School of Social Work (1972), 1-40.

Study of Wandering Youth, Council of Planning Affiliates, Seattle, Washington, 1973.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

1

Pretest Interview Questionnaire

1. Age _____ 2. Sex _____ 3. Race _____
4. Height _____ 5. Weight _____ 6. Hometown _____
7. School Achievement V. good _____ Good _____
Average _____ Poor _____ V. poor _____
8. School Attendance Always _____ Almost
Skip Drop- always _____ Skip
freq. _____ out _____ Occas. _____
9. Marital status of parents Married _____ Separated* _____
Divorced* _____ Widowed* _____ Never married _____
Don't know _____
*Give number of years ago.
10. Were you adopted? _____
11. Number of siblings and order
12. Where were your previous placements? (May be more than
one) Own family _____ Group home _____ Fosterhome _____
JDH _____ Other _____
13. Length of time in each
14. What month did you come to this placement?
15. Who came with you when you were placed?
16. What is your family's attitude toward your being here?
V. good _____ Good _____ O.K. _____ Poor _____
V. poor _____
17. How do you feel about your placement here? V. good _____
Good _____ O.K. _____ Bad _____ V. bad _____

18. How much do you think that you were involved in choosing this placement? V. much ____ A lot ____ Some ____
V. little ____ Not at all ____
19. What had you heard about this placement and what did you expect it to be like?
20. Was it like you had expected?
21. Who did you first meet? Staff, kids, who?
22. Did they make you feel welcome?
23. Did you make a pre-placement visit?
24. How often has the caseworker visited you since your placement? V. often ____ Often ____ Sometimes ____
Rarely ____ Not at all ____
25. Had you received counseling before this placement?
Probes: Kind, how long, by whom?

For runners:

26. Did you ever run away from your own home?
27. What was the month, day and hour that you last ran?
28. Had anything special occurred to cause you to run at that time? Explain.
29. What were your feelings at that time?
Probes: Angry, sad, trapped, lonely, other?

30. Were there any consequences for prior runs? Describe.
31. Had you planned this run for some time?
32. Did you run without planning?
33. Did you run alone? If others, whom?
34. Where did you go?
Probes: Home, boyfriends, girlfriends, other?

APPENDIX B

PART I

1

Final Questionnaire for Runners And Nonrunners

Sponsoring Agency _____
Date _____
Interviewer _____

1. Age	2. Sex	1.	2.
3. Race	4. Height	3.	4.
5. Weight	6. Hometown	5.	6.

7. School achievement	7.	Very poor	Poor	Ave.	Good	Very good

Drop-out	Skip freq.	Skip occas.	Always

9. Marital status of parents	9.	Married	Separated*	Di- vorced*
		Widowed	Never Married	Don't know

*Number of years ago.

2

10. Were you adopted? 10.
Yes No

11. Number of siblings and order 11.

(circle interviewee)

12. Where were your previous placements and order? 12.
(May be more than one) Own Group Foster
family home

JDH Other

13. Length of time in each 13.
Own Group Foster
family home

JDH Other

14. What month did you come to this placement? 14.

15. Who came with you when you were placed? 15.

16. What is your family's attitude toward your being here? 16.
Very Poor O.K. Good Very
poor Good

3

17. How do you feel about your placement here?	17.	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>Very</td> <td>Bad</td> <td>O.K.</td> <td>Good</td> <td>Very</td> </tr> <tr> <td>bad</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Good</td> </tr> </table>	Very	Bad	O.K.	Good	Very	bad				Good
Very	Bad	O.K.	Good	Very								
bad				Good								
18. How much choice do you think you had in being placed here?	18.	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>None</td> <td>Very</td> <td>Some</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>little</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>
<table border="0"> <tr> <td>A lot</td> <td>Very</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>much</td> </tr> </table>	None	Very	Some		little		A lot	Very		much
None	Very	Some										
	little											
A lot	Very											
	much											
19. What had you heard about this placement?	19.											
20. What did you expect it to be like?	20.											
21. Was it like you had expected?	21.											
22. Who do you remember talking to first? Staff, kids, who?	22.											
23. How welcome did they make you feel?	23.	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>Not at</td> <td>Very</td> <td>Some</td> </tr> <tr> <td>all</td> <td>little</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>
<table border="0"> <tr> <td>A lot</td> <td>Very</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>much</td> </tr> </table>	Not at	Very	Some	all	little		A lot	Very		much
Not at	Very	Some										
all	little											
A lot	Very											
	much											
24. Is there a buddy system (big sister or brother) in this agency?	24.											

4

25. Did you make a pre-placement visit?
A. Do you think this would have helped?

25.

A.

26. How often has your caseworker visited you since your placement?

26.

Not at all	Rarely	Sometimes
------------	--------	-----------

Often	Very Often
-------	------------

27. How often would you have liked the caseworker to visit you?

27.

Not at all	Rarely	Sometimes
------------	--------	-----------

Often	Very Often
-------	------------

28. Had you received counseling before this placement?
Probes: kind, how long, by whom?

28.

29. Did you ever run away from your own home?
A. When did you first run?
B. What happened at that time?

29.

A.

B.

30. Have any members of your family run?

30.

Yes	No
-----	----

For runners:

31. What was the month, day,
and hour that you last
ran?
32. How did you leave? Probe:
33. Had anything special
occurred to cause you to
run at that time? Explain.
34. What were your feelings at
that time?
Probes: angry, sad,
trapped, lonely, etc.
35. Were there any consequences
for prior runs? Describe.
36. Had you planned this run?
37. Did you run alone? If
others, with whom?
38. Where did you go?
Probes: home, boyfriend,
girlfriend, other?

For runners:

31.

32.

33.

34.

35.

36.

37.

38.

PART II Page 1

For Runner:

In your opinion

How much importance does this
have in running away?

Not at
all

Very
little

Some

A lot

Very
much

When I have an upsetting counseling
session.

When I have hassles with parents dur-
ing home visits.

When I have hassles with other kids.

When the living group is uptight and
not caring.

When I lose contact with friends.

When I lose contact with staff.

When the staff looks for problems that
really don't exist

When I am having problems at school.

When I don't have close relationships
with staff members.

When the staff doesn't take enough
time with me.

When the staff doesn't trust me.

When the staff doesn't set limits for
me.

When the staff is not honest with me.

When I am uptight or scared.

When someone gets too close to my
problems.

Part II Page 2

For Runner (Continued):

In your opinion

How much importance does this
have in running away?

Not at
all

Very
little

Some

A lot

Very
much

When I am tempted to get loaded on
drugs.

When I feel a need to have sex.

When I feel depressed.

When I'm not getting help with
problems.

When I feel locked in.

When I am tired of being told what
to do.

When I think I'll get to go home.

PART II Page 3

For Nonrunner:

In your opinion

How much importance would this
have in running away?

Not at all	Very little	Some	A lot	Very much
---------------	----------------	------	-------	--------------

An upsetting counseling session.

Hassles with parents during home visits.

Hassles with other kids.

If the living group is uptight and not
caring.

Loss of contact with friends (outside).

Loss of contact with staff.

When the staff is looking for problems
that really don't exist.

Problems at school.

No close relationships with staff
members.

Staff not taking enough time with kids.

Staff not trusting kids.

Staff not setting limits for kids.

Staff not being honest with kids.

Feeling uptight or scared.

Others getting too close to the kids'
problems.

Being tempted to get loaded on drugs.

Feeling a need to have sex.

Feeling depressed.

Part II Page 4

For Nonrunner (Continued):

In your opinion

How much importance would this
have in running away?

Not at
all

Very
little

Some

A lot

Very
much

Not getting help with problems.

Feeling locked in.

Feeling tired of being told what to do.

Thinking they'll get to go home.

PART II Page 5

Kids are most likely to run during:	Disagree strongly	Disagree somewhat	Neither agree nor disagree	I agree somewhat	I agree very much
--	----------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------	-------------------------

Spring

Summer

Winter

Fall

Breaks	a.	morning
	b.	lunch
	c.	evening

Group outings

Home visits

During outside employment

Just before release time

At holiday time

PART II Page 6

Kids are most likely to run during: (Continued)	Disagree strongly	Disagree somewhat	Neither agree nor disagree	I agree somewhat	I agree very much
---	----------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------	-------------------------

Kids run to:

Home

Seattle

California

Parks

Communes

Friends

Other (describe)

PART II Page 7

I agree with this
statement:

Not at all Very little Some A lot Very Much

I considered my parents
strict.

My parents were very under-
standing of me.

My father loved me.

I had fun with my brothers
and/or sisters.

We had lots of fights at
my house.

There was usually someone
there when I came home.

My mother hit me a lot.

I often wanted to run away.

I like getting to know the
adults here.

It helps to talk about my
feelings in group.

PART II Page 8

I agree with this
statement:
(Continued)

Not at all Very little Some A lot Very much

I like doing things on
schedule.

The group outings we have
are fun.

It's helpful to have some-
one around to talk with.