1975

An evaluative study of Yellow Brick Road

Cherry Hartman
Portland State University

Nan Narboe
Portland State University

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

Part of the [Social Work Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Hartman, Cherry and Narboe, Nan, "An evaluative study of Yellow Brick Road" (1975). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 2158.

<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.2156>

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.

AN EVALUATIVE STUDY
OF YELLOW BRICK ROAD

by

CHERRY HARTMAN

NAN NARBOE

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

MASTERS OF SOCIAL WORK

Portland State University
1975

Approved by

A large black rectangular redaction box covers the signature area below the word "Approved".

FOREWORD

This study was completed as partial fulfillment of the requirement for the Masters of Social Work degree from the School of Social Work at Portland State University. The study was done by Nan Narboe and Cherry Hartman with much assistance from Nancy Koroloff, faculty advisor.

The study was originally conceived and initiated because of our own desire to evaluate a program which we had created, shaped and directed and because of our desire to "reward" program participants and supporters with feedback as to "how we're doing."

"In house" research may be seen as unusual or unorthodox. We felt there were many advantages to researching our own program, greatest of these was interest. As Project Director (Cherry Hartman) and Trainer (Nan Narboe) we had great investment in the program and in the research. Data collection and analysis was not viewed as a chore but rather as an exciting adventure which could have rich payoffs. Our familiarity with the program and its participants facilitated the study design and data collection. Of particular importance, was our position to actually utilize the data. We strongly believe that research has its greatest value in practical application. This study has had much influence upon the on-going development of Yellow Brick Road. Of

course, because it was our own program we were studying, it was of great value to have the outside perspective provided by Nancy Koroloff to avoid our blind spots and inside "jargon."

Both Nan and I are committed to the use of paraprofessionals in the area of counseling and we have experienced great satisfaction in completing a study which makes a positive statement about paraprofessionals as counselors.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
FOREWORD	11
INTRODUCTION	2
PROGRAM RATIONAL, HISTORY AND DESIGN	
RATIONAL	3
HISTORY	4
DESIGN	6
METHODOLOGY	10
RESULTS	17
INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS	
INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS	23
CONCLUSIONS	30
UTILIZATION	31
EPILOGUE	34
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A - GUIDE SELECTION	42
APPENDIX B - PROGRAM PARTICIPANT CHARACTER- ISTICS	45
APPENDIX C - QUESTIONNAIRE	54

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I	Data Retrieval 1973.	13
II	Data Retrieval 1974.	14
III	Block-by-Block Comparison, 1973.	19
IV	Block-by-Block Comparison, 1974.	20
V	Intra-Block Consistency.	58

INTRODUCTION

This is a study of Yellow Brick Road* a paraprofessional volunteer training and group counseling program. The study was designed to help determine whether or not the program was meeting its own goals which are stated as: 1) to offer clients an experience which not only helps them to effect changes in their lives, but to maintain those changes through healthy time-restructuring** within a supportive environment; 2) to demonstrate that volunteers who are undergoing intensive training can provide quality counseling and other services; 3) to create a community environment supportive of healthy change.

Toward evaluating these broadly stated goals, this study will specifically look at these factors: 1) client satisfaction, 2) internal program consistency, 3) activity group validity, that is, whether or not activity groups contribute to the change process.

Yellow Brick Road is a unique program which is designed to use volunteer paraprofessionals in highly sophisticated leadership roles facilitating change and growth of program

*The program was named from the Wizard of Oz and relates to self-discovery.

**The concept of time-restructuring is from Eric Berne the creator of Transactional Analysis. It is recognized by Transactional Analysis therapists as part of the change process.

clients. To measure acceptance of these volunteer as group leaders by paying clients by looking at the factors mentioned above was an important goal of the study.

Since volunteers at different stages of training and experience were leading groups, internal program consistency was of interest. Were all volunteer group leaders viewed by their clients equally or were some seen more favorably than others? If group leaders were viewed less favorably did their clients still feel they had had a valuable growth experience in Yellow Brick Road?

Another aspect of the Yellow Brick Road design which is unique is that it combines time-restructuring activity groups with counseling groups. A client is simultaneously involved in both groups, one following the other, on the same night. It was hypothesized that these activity groups would be an important adjunct to a client's counseling experience. Did clients think so?

PROGRAM RATIONAL, HISTORY AND DESIGN

Rational

Yellow Brick Road was designed, initiated and sponsored by Lutheran Family Service of Oregon, a small, private social service agency based in Portland, Oregon. Its funding and support base is from the Lutheran Church, the United Way and client fees. The agency functions with three primary sections: 1) Crisis section, which offers a variety of counseling and training programs, 2) Growth section, which is devoted to strengthening family life and developing community resources which are family oriented, 3) Structural Change section, which is searching for ways to deal with human problems within public systems. A spin-off agency located in Portland's poverty area (Albina Family and Community Services) is the most visible result of this section.

Yellow Brick Road is one program of Lutheran Family Service's Crisis section. Yellow Brick Road was created out of a belief that helping people to give up destructive behavior patterns is not enough. It is also necessary and desirable to assist people in developing new, positive life styles. Lutheran Family Service had viewed itself as successful in meeting the needs of clients in crises situation; family problems, potential suicides, marital conflicts, etc.,

however, many clients were expressing the need for something more--a direction in which to move after resolving the initial problem.

Also, many clients expressed interest in helping others. Traditionally, agencies such as Lutheran Family Service have made little use of paraprofessional volunteers. At the same time, agency expansion and growth had been limited by the relatively small number of trained professionals on staff. Adding professional staff seemed a short term solution, as an additional staff person was available, client intake increased and soon the demand for services was again greater than staff could meet. Therefore, it seemed crucial to recognize this growing resource of potential volunteers, respond to it and develop it.

History

In the fall of 1972, interviews for potential volunteers were begun. Twenty were to be selected and over one hundred were interviewed. The great response was explained by the fact that volunteers were, in exchange for their time, energy, and commitment, to be given training in Transactional Analysis and Gestalt Therapy (treatment methods employed by Lutheran Family Service counseling staff).

The response allowed for selectivity in choosing the

volunteers. The selections were made by the following criteria: 1) familiarity with Transactional Analysis, 2) awareness, 3) completed successful therapy or equivalent, 4) trainability, 5) special skills. (See Appendix A, Criteria for Trainees and Original Guide Selection.)

After the program was initiated, new volunteers were accepted intermittently. The criteria was changed to add the stipulation that a potential volunteer must first go through the program as a client and be evaluated by those volunteers who had worked with or observed him/her. (See Appendix A, Guide Applicant's Evaluation.)

The original twenty volunteers came from widely varying backgrounds. Occupations represented were English professor, program director, housewife, nurse, social work student, secretary, speech therapist, child specialist, high school teacher, yoga instructor, artist. Several were unemployed. Educational degrees were not included in selection criteria, thus educational backgrounds ranged from not having completed high school to the doctorate level. Economic levels were diverse. Annual incomes ranged from \$2500 to \$20,000. Eleven of the volunteers were women, nine were men. Age range was from 23 to 55 years. (See Appendix B, Program Participant Characteristics.)

Because the use of volunteers and paraprofessionals

as counselors was still experimental, it was decided to avoid the use of either term and refer to the persons as Guides. Later, advanced Guides were used to train others and they became known as Pilots.

The Guides were given some initial training experiences and then began working with twenty program clients, called Travelers, in January, 1973.

Travelers were referred to the program by Lutheran Family Service staff (many had previously been agency clients) and by PACT (Portland Action Committees Together) which serves a low-income area in Southeast Portland. Travelers paid \$28 for 28 program hours. The relatively low fee was meant to allow persons who are normally prohibited by the high cost of therapy to participate in a growth program. Some Travelers were given scholarships by Portland Action Committees Together. (See Appendix B, Program Participant Characteristics for description of Travelers in the first three sessions of Yellow Brick Road, 1973.)

Design

The program operated on Sunday nights from 6:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. (This was determined to be the time slot most readily available to the most people and it allowed for participation by people who are regularly employed.) The four

hours was divided into two, one and three quarter hour sessions with a half hour break between the two.

Each client was involved in a basic counseling group called Change group, either first or second session. The alternate time period was spent in a time-restructuring activity group.* A Change group and an activity group together made up a Route. For example, a client in Route 1 would be in a Change group followed by a Yoga activity group. A client in Route 2 would be in a community action activity group followed by a Change group.

FIGURE 1: SAMPLE PROGRAM SCHEDULE

	Route 1	Route 2
6pm		
	CHANGE	COMMUNITY ACTION
7:45		
	BREAK	
8:15		
	YOGA	CHANGE
10pm		

The activity groups were designed to help Travelers

*Activity groups offered throughout 1973 and 1974 were Art, Community Action, Psychodrama, Dance, Body Awareness, Yoga, Transactional Analysis for Fun, Relaxation and Sense Awareness.

increase awareness of themselves and how they interact with other people, to provide a safe, structured setting to experiment with new behavior, and to help Travelers look at how they structure time and increase awareness of options for time structuring.

Each group was co-led by two Guides. A Guide led only one group and was in a training group during the alternate time period. Training focused on Transactional Analysis and Gestalt Therapy theory and methodology, with emphasis on debriefing tapes of the client groups. Additional, optional training experiences were offered twice a month. These were sessions where Guides could have personal counseling experiences, as personal growth was seen as a major component of the training program.

New Guides were given an intensive, six week training program and then became observers in client groups. They gave feedback to Guide group leaders and learned by watching. Guides did not begin to lead client groups until they felt ready and then they were paired with more experienced leaders.

Paid staff of the Yellow Brick Road program consisted of a Program Director who put in 15 to 20 hours per week in the program and a Trainer who put in 10 to 15 hours per week. Both persons were counselors at Lutheran Family Service.

The program was divided into six-week segments. The segments were called Blocks. There were five Blocks within each program year.

METHODOLOGY

Before the first group of Yellow Brick Road clients had completed the program, a questionnaire was designed (See Appendix C.) which was to be administered to clients at the end of the final session. The questionnaire was designed to:

A. Relate to the specific factors of:

1. Client satisfaction
2. Internal program consistency
3. Activity group validity

B. Relate to a similar questionnaire which has been used with Lutheran Family Service counseling groups so that it would be possible to do a comparison study. (This has not been completed.)

Since the questionnaires were administered on the last night of each Block, it was felt that the "high spirits" of the Guides and Travelers may have affected the responses, therefore, a follow-up questionnaire (identical to the Original) was administered to a 50 percent random sample of the population of Block 4, 1974, three months later.

The following questions were designed to give information about client satisfaction:

Question 1. My expectations of Yellow Brick Road were met: (favorably, unfavorably).

Question 2. What I expected and did not get was:

_____*

- Question 3. (Answer this if you have had a previous group or individual counseling experience at Lutheran Family Service.) I found my Yellow Brick Road experience to be: (more helpful, same, less helpful).
- Question 4. (Answer this if you have had a previous group or individual counseling experience elsewhere.) I found my Yellow Brick Road experience to be: (more helpful, same, less helpful.)
- Question 7. The counseling methods used (Transactional Analysis and Gestalt Therapy) were: (very helpful, somewhat helpful, not helpful).
- Question 8. My level of trust and confidence in my group leaders was: (high, average, low).*
- Question 9. The usefulness and/or application of my Yellow Brick Road experience to any "real life situations" at home and work are: (very useful, somewhat useful, not useful).**

*Question 8 was changed on the questionnaires used in the second year (1974) of data collection to have two parts: 8a. My level of trust and confidence in my Change group leaders was: 8b. My level of trust and confidence in my activity group leaders was:.

**Questions 9 and 10 relate only tangentially to client satisfaction but were included as an attempt to measure change and "carry-over" of change outside of Yellow Brick Road.

Question 10. Changes in me have been mentioned by
others: (often, sometimes, not at all).**

Activity group validity was addressed by:

Question 5. Being involved in a time re-structuring
activity was: (helpful, no effect, harm-
ful).

Question 6. The effect my activity group had on what
I accomplished in change group was:
(great effect, some effect, no effect).

Internal program consistency was to be measured by
comparing responses within Routes, between Routes within
Blocks, and between Blocks.

The reader will note that there are eight questions
relating to client satisfaction and only two relating to
activity group validity. This is because client satisfaction
was viewed as a very broad area having many different aspects
which required examination. Whereas, activity group validity
was seen as a much more focused area.

The process of data retrieval was begun by stratify-
ing the client's questionnaires first by blocks, and secondly
by routes within blocks. There were five Blocks in the first
program year. Blocks 1 and 2 had two routes each, Block 3
had three routes, and Blocks 4 and 5 had four routes. Within
this process it was discovered that there was no data on the

29 clients who were in Block 3. (The questionnaires had inadvertently not been administered that block.) So, in fact, we had the following responses:

TABLE 1
DATA RETRIEVAL 1973

BLOCK & ROUTE NUMBER	NO. OF QUESTIONNAIRES RECEIVED	NO. OF CLIENTS
Block 1, Route 1	4 questionnaires	) total
Block 1, Route 2	<u>2</u> "	) clients - 18
	6	
Block 2, Route 1	4 "	) total
Block 2, Route 2	<u>3</u> "	) clients - 17
	7	
Block 3	No Data	) total
		) clients - 29
Block 4, Route 1	6 questionnaires	)
Block 4, Route 2	9 "	) total
Block 4, Route 3	4 "	) clients - 38
Block 4, Route 4	<u>8</u> "	)
	27	
Block 5, Route 1	8 "	)
Block 5, Route 2	9 "	) total
Block 5, Route 3	4 "	) clients - 38
Block 5, Route 4	<u>6</u> "	)
	27	
TOTAL:	67	TOTAL: 140

The second program year, 1974, also had 5 Blocks. Each Block had 4 routes. The following data was collected:

TABLE II
DATA RETRIEVAL 1974

BLOCK & ROUTE NUMBER	NO. OF QUESTIONNAIRES RECEIVED	NO. OF CLIENTS
Block 1, Route 1	8 questionnaires	)
Block 1, Route 2	7 "	) total
Block 1, Route 3	0 (not administered)	) clients - 38
Block 1, Route 4	5 questionnaires	)
	<u>20</u>	
Block 2, Route 1	6 "	)
Block 2, Route 2	8 "	) total
Block 2, Route 3	6 "	) clients - 39
Block 2, Route 4	11 "	)
	<u>31</u>	
Block 3, Route 1	4 "	)
Block 3, Route 2	7 "	) total
Block 3, Route 3	5 "	) clients - 40
Block 3, Route 4	8 "	)
	<u>24</u>	
Block 4, Route 1	8 "	)
Block 4, Route 2	0 (not administered)	) total
Block 4, Route 3	6 questionnaires	) clients - 40
Block 4, Route 4	10 "	)
	<u>24</u>	
TOTAL:	99	TOTAL: 157

(Block 5 data was collected later and is not included in this study. The results did not vary from the other Blocks.)

The discrepancy between total clients and completed questionnaires is explained by a high drop-out rate Block 1, absenteeism from the last session when questionnaires are administered, and failure on the part of the group leaders whose responsibility it was to administer questionnaires. Follow-up with clients who dropped out indicated that the reason for this was two-fold: 1) clients having differing expectations of the program (mostly that it would be "all fun") than what we were in fact offering; and 2) our inability to offer expected child care services in the first two blocks.

After dividing the data by blocks and routes, we computed the statistical data, mean, range and standard deviation (See Appendix B.) for each of the ten numerical items on the questionnaires within each route. The data was then arranged on a table which allowed us to look at the progression of responses from Block 1 through Block 5 of 1973, and Block 1 through Block 5 of 1974, comparing means and standard deviations. A further step was to compile a second table of data from the routes of Block 5 of 1973, comparing means and the standard deviation between the routes which allowed a look at the internal consistency of responses within a program Block. We further looked at the relationship between questions. For example, question 1, "My expectations

of Yellow Brick Road were met." and question 13, "I would summarize my Yellow Brick Road experience as."

Finally, Regression Analysis was used to determine whether or not there was a statistically significant difference among blocks in the responses to the questions. All ten questions were used to predict the block. Theoretically, if persons in any one block were responding in a different manner from the other blocks, this difference could be identified.

RESULTS

The results are presented on Tables 3 and 4. The Tables are set up by question (horizontally) and by program Block (vertically). The Tables present a Block-by-Block comparison of each question by mean. They show an overall progression in responses from Block 1, 1973, to Block 1, 1974. The means generally become higher showing a more favorable response to the program.

Block 2, 1974, means are overall lower than those of the preceding Block 1, 1974. There is, again, an overall progression in means from Block 2, 1974, to Block 4, 1974, with the means generally becoming higher. This suggests an increased favorable response to the program, although the high means of Block 1, 1974, are not again reached. Block 5, 1974, means are generally lower than those for any other Block of that year.

A probable explanation for the drop in means of Block 2, 1974, is that at the end of Block 1, 1974, (the Block with the highest means) five of the most skilled and experienced group leaders were made Pilots (trainers) leaving Guides with less experience and skill to lead the groups.

During Block 5, 1974, (the last Block of the year) Guides were generally "burned out" and program morale was low, probably accounting for the low means of that Block.

Regardless of the drops in means in Block 2 and Block 5, 1974, total means* for 1974, are overall higher than total means for 1973, again showing a favorable progression.

Total two year means are relatively high, ranging from 6.10 on question 10 to 8.50 on question 7, generally demonstrating that clients felt favorable toward their Yellow Brick Road experience.

Also presented on Table 4 is the follow-up data of a 50 percent random sample of the population of Block 4, 1974. Although the means of the follow-up data are not statistically significantly different from the other mean scores, they are generally lower. This suggests that the data may be influenced by the "high spirits" of the Travelers on the last night of the program when the questionnaires are administered.

*Standard deviations were also computed on this data but are not presented. Generally the standard deviations become progressively lower throughout the two program years demonstrating greater consistency in responses.

TABLE 3

BLOCK-BY-BLOCK COMPARISON, 1973

	Question Numbers												
	1	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	13			
BLOCK 1	6.625	5.83	8.00	6.625	4.75	6.625	6.00	6.75	5.75	7.00			
BLOCK 2	8.58	6.5	7.75	8.00	6.75	7.625	7.375	9.00	7.125	8.205			
BLOCK 4	8.01625	6.09375	7.025	7.43	6.362	8.19	8.546	8.525	5.875	8.5312			
BLOCK 5	8.458	6.9	8.04	7.345	8.1675	9.0475	8.8125	8.765	5.5075	8.825			
Total Mean 1973	7.9198	6.3309	7.79375	7.350	6.5073	7.8718	7.68337	8.26	6.06437	8.1523			

TABLE 4

BLOCK-BY-BLOCK COMPARISON, 1974

	Question Numbers												
	1	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	13			
BLOCK 1	9.0262	7.3333	8.8214	8.4047	6.8297	9.2380	9.923595	8.8392	6.2559	9.0214			
BLOCK 2	8.026	6.29	8.245	8.330	6.999	8.462	a)8.932 b)7.956	8.111	6.724	8.442			
BLOCK 3	8.035	5.7559	7.159	7.793	6.2312	7.809	a)7.879 b)8.073	7.504	5.706	7.833			
BLOCK 4	8.475	6.722	8.156	7.992	7.269	8.752	a)9.956 b)9.392	8.875	6.194	8.650			
BLOCK 4 FOLLOW-UP	7.538	5.571	6.285	6.900	5.583	8.500	a)7.231 b)7.462	7.666	5.667	7.115			

TABLE 4 (Con't)
BLOCK-BY-BLOCK COMPARISON, 1974

Question Numbers											
	1	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	13	
BLOCK 5*	7.094	5.222	7.400	7.719	6.215	8.263	a)8.354 b)8.856	8.356	5.831	8.208	
Total											
Mean	8.1312	6.2646	7.9562	8.0477	6.7087	8.5048	a)8.7161 b)8.7273	8.3332	6.1421	8.4308	
1974											
Two											
Year	8.0372	6.2941	7.7329	7.7376	6.6201	8.2235	a)8.2571 b)8.2633	8.3028	6.1076	8.3017	
Mean											

*A regression analysis was not run on this data. Because Block 5 means are so similar to others, we believe its inclusion would not have changed the outcome.

An additional measure of internal program consistency is shown in Table 5. Data collected about Block 5, 1973, contains a Route-to-Route comparison within that Block, finding no significant statistical inter-Route correlation or difference. (See Appendix D, Intra-Block Consistency.)

When a regression analysis was run on this data, it established that:

1. There are no significant differences inter-Block; ratings given Yellow Brick Road for one Block of its functioning are generally similar to ratings for any other Block. This holds true for the follow-up questionnaire administered four months later to Travelers from Block 4, 1974.
2. There are no significant relationships between answers for any of the eleven or twelve questions on the evaluation (question 8 was expanded to 8a and 8b).

These findings make a strong statement about Yellow Brick Road's consistency, while minimizing the significance of variations that surfaced while simply comparing one mean to another. Overall consistency and subtle differences in the responses to each question will be discussed below, with interpretations offered for both.

INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS

Interpretation of Results

The interpretation of results will be presented by question. (See Questionnaire, Appendix C.) Following each question the extremes of responses are given in parentheses; e.g., (favorably to unfavorably). These responses relate to the numerical scale of 10 through 0 (10 being favorable and 0 being unfavorable) used for rating each question. The two year mean as found on Table 4 (See Results Section) is also presented. For example, Question 1. "My expectations of Yellow Brick Road were met," (favorably to unfavorably). Two year mean, 8.04. Thus, 8.04 is the overall response on a 10 to 0 scale for that question. The response can be seen as favorable rather than unfavorable.

1. My expectations of Yellow Brick Road were met:
(favorably to unfavorably). Two year mean: 8.04

Although expectations were met more favorably as Yellow Brick Road developed, the increase is not statistically significant. This may be due to the individuality of client expectations; i.e., if a Block 1 Traveler expected the excitement and disorder of a new venture, the Traveler's expectations were likely to be met.

The question does not ask about quality but only whether

or not results parallel expectations. It was hypothesized that responses to Question 1 might correlate with those to Question 13, "I would summarize my Yellow Brick Road experience as: (very helpful, somewhat helpful, no help)," allowing the interpretation that clients measure Yellow Brick Road's value by how closely it meets their expectations. There is no significant relationship; in fact, mean responses to Question 1 are generally lower than to Question 13.

3. (Answer this question if you have had a previous group or individual counseling experience at Lutheran Family Service.) I found my Yellow Brick Road experience to be: (more helpful to less helpful). Two year mean: 6.29

Yellow Brick Road differs from Lutheran Family Service counseling experiences in two major ways: 1) the four-hour format including the time-restructuring activity group is unique to Yellow Brick Road, 2) Yellow Brick Road groups are led by paraprofessional volunteers; Lutheran Family Service counseling groups are led by professional social workers. It is difficult to know whether Travelers' favorable response was to the different format or to the paraprofessional group leaders or both or just a "vote of confidence" for Yellow Brick Road. Another variable which may have influenced response to this question is that some Travelers experienced individual, one-to-one, counseling at Lutheran Family Service

and group Counseling in Yellow Brick Road. So their response may be comparing individual to group treatment modalities.

4. (Answer this question if you have had a previous group or individual counseling experience elsewhere.) I found my Yellow Brick Road experience to be: (more helpful to less helpful). Two year mean: 7.73

It was expected that response to this question comparing Yellow Brick Road with all other counseling experiences would be higher than response to the previous question which compared Yellow Brick Road to Lutheran Family Service. The favorable response may in part be a response to the group counseling style which employs Transactional Analysis and Gestalt Therapy techniques, the combination of which is not generally used in this geographic area outside of Lutheran Family Service.

5. Being involved in a time-restructuring activity was: (helpful to harmful). Two year mean: 7.74

6. The effect my activity group had on what I accomplished in change group was: (great effect to no effect). Two year mean: 6.62

One of the goals of Yellow Brick Road and this research is testing the concept that time-restructuring activities support therapy and help maintain its benefits. The program's sophistication in dealing with time-restructuring activities

has increased with clearer understanding of activity theory, greater emphasis in training, increased design and leadership skills, heightened in-program status. Yet, the ratings from one Block to the next show no significant increase. There are two possible explanations. Although overall program expertise increased, Guides often use activity groups for their initial experience in leading, a place to "try their wings." Thus, skill gains are balanced by newcomers' gau-cheries, and the end product remains constant. Because of its novelty, Travelers may not realize what an activity group's impact has been; i.e., not recognized that anxiety experienced during a given exercise in activity group led into work during change group.

7. The counseling methods used (Transactional Analysis and Gestalt Therapy) were: (very helpful to not helpful).

Two year mean: 8.22

Responses to this question may indicate that Travelers felt good about the counseling methods used, however, this may also reflect group leaders' skill level. As shown on Tables 3 and 4, there is a marked rise in means from Block 1, 1973, 6.62 to Block 1, 1974, 9.23. This may be a direct result of the training that the original Guides received. Responses from Block 2, 1974, through Block 5, 1974, remain high but show no progression. By this point in the program,

Guides at widely varying skill levels were leading groups.

8. a. My level of trust and confidence in my activity group leaders was: (high to low). Two year mean: 8.35

b. My level of trust and confidence in my change group leaders was: (high to low). Two year mean: 8.86

Until Block 2, 1974, Travelers' reactions to their leaders were combined in Question 8. Since then, the question has been divided. This allows for more differentiation, although averaging still occurs: reactions to eight activity leaders (two for each of 4 Routes within a Block) are included in the Block mean for 8a. This process supplies data about Travelers' feelings for all the leaders within their Block (usually ten Travelers with two activity group leaders and two Change group leaders, multiplied by four Routes per Block). It blurs, however, reactions of these ten people to their specific leaders. These scores range from 10. (Block 4, 1974, Route 3) to 6.94 (Block 3, 1974, Route 4),* yet show no significant differences inter-block. Overall, there is consistency in Travelers' levels of trust and confidence. There are also variations worth noting and these have been used for Guide feedback.

Question 9. The usefulness and/or application of my Yellow Brick Road experience to any "real life situations"

*Individual Route means are not shown on Tables 3 and 4.

at home and work are: (very useful to not useful). Two year mean: 8.30

Perhaps more than any other single question, the high response to this question demonstrates the success of the Yellow Brick Road program. As discussed in the program rationale section, Yellow Brick Road was created to assist people in developing new, positive life styles. In other words, to promote some "carry-over" of therapy experiences to "real life situations." Response to this question indicates that Travelers were successful in attaining that carry-over. It was hypothesized that there would be a significant relationship between response to this question and Question 13, "I would summarize my Yellow Brick Road experience as: (very helpful, somewhat helpful, no help). Although statistically there is no significant relationship, a look at individual Block responses seem to indicate that a relationship may exist but is not statistically measurable. For example:

	Question 9	Question 13
Block 4, 1974	8.875	8.650
Block 5, 1974	8.356	8.208

10. Changes in me have been mentioned by others: (often to not at all). Two year mean: 6.11

This is the lowest two year mean and is consistently

the lowest mean of all the questions. This was the one question which attempted to get at some objective measure of change. Probably the question does not succeed in doing that.

13. I would summarize my Yellow Brick Road experience as: (very helpful to no help). Two year mean: 8.30

This was an important question in two regards. Information sought was: 1) Generally, how was Yellow Brick Road accepted by those it served? 2) What aspects of Yellow Brick Road led Travelers to evaluate it as they did? (It was thought that this data would show relationships between the means of this question and various other questions. There were no significant relationships.). Response to Question 13 has been increasingly positive, ranging from Block 1, 1973, mean of 7. to the "high point" response of 9.021 a year later, Block 1, 1974. Reasons for the response--which variables matter most--are not much clearer now than they were before collecting and processing two years of data, since no statistically significant relationships or differences were uncovered. This may be a comment on the level of significance used, .05, rather than on this research or on the answerability of the question. Although no answer provides information and consistency is certainly a valuable finding, the possibility of developing research tools to deal more exactly with questions and hypotheses raised here

seems worthwhile.

The lower mean scores of the follow-up data also suggests that the timing, as to when the questionnaires are administered, is important. And, that continued follow-up studies may give important information as to the personal value of his/her Yellow Brick Road experience as viewed in retrospect by a Traveler.

Conclusions

Overall, the information gained from the questionnaires is that:

1. Client satisfaction is high, a two year mean of 8.30 (as shown on Table 4 as a response to Question 13) on a scale of 0 to 10.
2. Internal program consistency exists: there is no statistically significant difference for any of the variables measured, either inter-Block or (in the sample checked) intra-Block.
3. Activity group validity remains an unknown, since no significant relationship can be shown between responses to activity groups and other responses. The trend, however, is favorable; activity groups were generally seen as helpful.

UTILIZATION

Because the researchers are Yellow Brick Road's Director and Trainer, opportunities to use the data have been rich. The data has been utilized in three ways:

1. For decision-making within the program.
2. For feedback to Guides.
3. For informing our sponsor, Lutheran Family Service, of participants' reactions to the program.

At the beginning, the Director and Trainer read each set of responses eagerly, hoping the scores would be high, enjoying the written comments. (A favorite was, "I wanted to work on not putting things off--but I decided to work on that later.")

Reading was for reassurance, as well as for information, with the assumption that high ratings implied satisfied Travelers--which in turn reflected on the quality of the program. This concept altered, however, because ratings were generally consistent, while subjectively some Blocks seemed to go well, others comparatively badly.

This variance, which outside researchers might have missed, has influenced its leaders thinking about Yellow Brick Road and affected its functioning. Since Travelers rate similarly the "good" Blocks and the "bad" ones, perhaps they are reacting to more variables than our questionnaire

measured. Enthusiasm of volunteers involved in their own growth sometimes seems contagious, and that spirit--more than skills--may influence Travelers. If this is so, then what standards should be used to decide who is ready to lead groups? Or do these results merely demonstrate again the difficulty of measuring how clients judge counseling? Such questions have broadened the concept of what Yellow Brick Road is and does and have provided distance helpful in dealing with program issues other than evaluation.

Feedback to Guides has occurred at periodic meetings. Overall data and tentative interpretations have been presented, with Guides showing interest not only in the data, but also in sharing their own hypotheses. Charts have been posted showing group leaders how their Change or Activity groups were rated. Guides could read not only the ratings given his/her group, but other groups offered during the same Block.

Differences that "average out" when questionnaires from eight groups are combined (Block mean), can be seen clearly on such a chart. (Block 3, 1974.) In two areas the charts seemed more effective than previous verbal statements had been:

Some Guides, who apparently thought positive comments from Pilots were support rather than evaluation, became more

confident after seeing statistics which confirmed that they had been well received by their clients.

The concept that activity group content should coordinate with change group functioning moved from being an opinion to a generally accepted "verity," as Guides looked at responses to Question 6. (The effect my activity group had on what I accomplished in change group was:)

Benefits from this use of data probably would have been greater if a presentation and chart had been offered at the end of each six-week Block.

Sharing of this data with Lutheran Family Service staff has been both formal and informal. Agency interest in volunteers, activity groups and like experiences, is high so special attention was paid to findings in these areas. Charted data (Tables 1 and part of 2) was presented in an all-staff meeting following Block 3, 1974, and active brainstorming about the meaning of the findings followed.

One of the possible future uses of this material is to report our findings in one of the professional journals. Although Transactional Analysis theory states that time-restructuring is an important aspect of therapy, few uses of that concept have been reported and, to our knowledge, there are no research findings.

EPILOGUE

One of the ongoing values of this research has been in focusing attention on program issues that might have been overlooked in the busyness of Yellow Brick Road's day-to-day functioning. The research supports belief in client satisfaction and internal program consistency. The third major question--the validity of activity groups and whether they contribute to change--remains unanswered: there is too little correlation to say it does, and too much subjective data to say it doesn't.

The questionnaire, designed at the beginning of Yellow Brick Road, reflects the Director's and Trainer's commitment to activity groups: two questions out of thirteen. At the beginning, activity group leaders were offered less training than change group leaders. Now 50 percent of Yellow Brick Road Sunday night training focuses on activity group leaders. Activity training lags behind change group training in other areas (minithons, marathons); it's still climbing up from its initial second billing.

The belief that activity groups are valuable persists, along with the realization that this hypothesis hasn't been proven here.

Additional impressions, not measured by the questionnaire but significant to seeing Yellow Brick Road whole, are

as follows:

Participation in Yellow Brick Road seemed to enhance career development of Guides and Pilots. A number of people were offered jobs on the basis of skills learned at Yellow Brick Road. In fact, the "community" aspects of Yellow Brick Road served as a network for finding jobs, apartments, babysitters, etc., thus generally contributing to the quality of participants' lives. This supportive quality also may have proved important to members of the Yellow Brick Road community leaving spouses, as about one-fourth did. One explanation for this is that by offering a supportive community, Yellow Brick Road attracted people whose needs were not being met in their home situation. Yellow Brick Road then became a catalyst for their dissatisfaction by offering what Guides often reported experiencing as more attention and affection than they were accustomed to, leading to decisions to divorce.

Yellow Brick Road seems to have offered incentive and support for life changes regarding education. Almost a third of the Guides and Pilots have entered graduate programs during the two years of Yellow Brick Road's existence. Again, it can be assumed that the program attracts people looking for self- and skill-improvement. Even so, the supportiveness of the Yellow Brick Road community and the successes gained in working with Travelers seems to play a part in

people defining themselves as potential master's degree holders in social work, education and counseling.

Yellow Brick Road was designed to meet clients' needs, but it soon became apparent that it met Guides' needs even more potently. Of the initial twenty Guides who had made a one-year commitment to the program, seventeen stayed for the second year. This has been a mixed blessing. On the one hand, it could be seen as a clear statement of satisfaction, that what Yellow Brick Road offered, Guides wanted. On the other hand, it created problems, particularly because the original design hadn't considered this possibility.

Sometimes it seems that allegiance to Yellow Brick Road has been at the expense of other activities. In the criteria used for selecting Guides (Appendix A.), bonus points were awarded for "potential impact in present employment setting." While some have used experiences from Yellow Brick Road to enhance their work life and there is community pride about this, others withdrew from settings where they might have made a difference since their Yellow Brick Road-influenced standards for openness, attention and impactfulness were not being met. This idealization of Yellow Brick Road and their desire for it to meet more and more of their needs then led to demands that their social interests and political aspirations be met through Yellow Brick Road.

Original emphasis on training sometimes lost its centrality. Whether good or bad in themselves, the impact of such demands has put extra stress on a design which didn't anticipate them. In general it can be said that Yellow Brick Road's popularity has created unexpected problems, and program revisions are being considered to deal with them.

One such problem is the growing body of people with counseling skills but no certification. Proposed solutions vary from using Lutheran Family Service as an umbrella under which they can work as paid counselors to limiting the time--and hence the training--a Guide may have in Yellow Brick Road. With the current mix of newcomers and Guides with several years' experience, training has become increasingly difficult. The time-limited proposal suggests viewing the desire to remain in Yellow Brick Road past a given time--one year or eighteen months--as a problem, not a success: that Yellow Brick Road has become a surrogate for other life experiences rather than an enhancement of them.

One solution to this dilemma might be to provide less specialized skill training to avoid trainees needing Yellow Brick Road as a setting to use their skills, since they can't be used in the general community without further accreditation. If the training were more general, with greater emphasis on communication and group process, it might be more

generally transferable to present work settings and thus weaken Guides' dependency on Yellow Brick Road providing a client population with which to work.

Another issue raised by Guides' desire to remain in Yellow Brick Road concerns their own growth, whether the Yellow Brick Road community inadvertently supports self-involvement, intellectualization and therapy as a life style. Because social interaction is based on the Guides' interest in his/her own therapy and in working with clients, conversations often seem stuck on the reporting of self-experience level. This is a stage clients in therapy generally go through, but it seems that involvement in Yellow Brick Road prolongs the stage, with consequences as yet unknown.

These social transactions may have an even more detrimental effect, when Guides become so focused on providing support and counseling for one another that appropriate professional help isn't sought. Yellow Brick Road Guides sometimes hesitate to get outside help, based on fantasies that 1) because they lead groups they shouldn't need counseling themselves and 2) what other trainees provide is sufficient. Paradoxically, the warmth that is usually considered a genuine asset of Yellow Brick Road can be used to avoid the realization that an individual needs help beyond Yellow Brick Road's resources. Although the Director,

Trainer and most of the Pilots make statements to the contrary, such beliefs seem to persist.

There is an "ingrown" quality to Yellow Brick Road, and such beliefs exemplify it. Perspective and consultation that might have helped avoid such consequences was not provided, with the Chairman of Lutheran Family Service making only two on-sight visits to the program.

While this communicated trust and confidence, it offered no check against the Director's and Trainer's enthusiasm and nearsightedness. It seems fair to conclude that Yellow Brick Road's commitment to serving Travelers was met without such back-up, but that Guide-related problems could have been eased with more outside observation and guidance.

Ironically, the popularity of Yellow Brick Road has created unforeseen difficulties; how these new challenges are met will determine Yellow Brick Road's ultimate success.

APPENDIX A

GUIDE SELECTION

Criteria for Trainees

Trainees are selected on the basis of the following criteria:

1. Familiarity with Transactional Analysis

Applicants are rated on a 0 to 10 scale based on their familiarity of concepts and terminology and their ability to apply both.

2. Awareness

Applicants are rated on a 0 to 10 scale based upon their awareness of self and others. This pertains to little professor (intuition) awareness as well as Adult.

3. Completed successful therapy or equivalent

Applicants are rated on a 0 to 10 scale based on their personal emotional health and their familiarity with therapy techniques. This also implies the absence of a "don't change" injunction or having successfully worked it through.

4. Trainability

Applicants are rated in five sub-categories, with each worth a possible two points.

a) will listen and learn

b) liked by trainer and director

- c) like trainer and director
- d) commitment and motivation
- e) cooperation (will attend regularly and are not opposed to the focus of the program and the religious position of the agency)

5. Special Skills

Applicants may receive up to ten points based upon special skills they possess and experiences they have had which will benefit the program and give them a head start toward being activity or change guides (yoga, art, therapy, etc.)

Bonus points are awarded (two each) to applicants on the following criteria:

- a) reside in Southeast Portland
- b) male
- c) are employed by Portland Action Committees Together
- d) have potential impact in present employment setting
- e) are over 40

APPENDIX A

Original Guide Selection

1. Familiarity with Transactional Analysis

0 _____ 10

2. Awareness

0 _____ 10

3. Completed successful therapy or equivalent

0 _____ 10

4. Trainability

0 _____ 10

5. Special Skills

0 _____ 10

NOTES:

Total points _____

APPENDIX A

Guide Applicant's Evaluation

TOURIST APPLYING TO BECOME GUIDE _____

Date _____ Block _____

Activity Group Leader _____ (Circle own name please)

Activity Group Observer _____

Change Group Leader _____

Change Group Observer _____

I see this person becoming a Guide at this time

yes _____ no _____

List three characteristics of this tourist:

What is your overall "hit" about this person becoming a guide:

1 2 3 4 5
No way Fully confident

Degree to which you personally like the person:

1 2 3 4 5
Not at all Very much

To what degree would her/his script interfere with "hearing"
and experiencing Yellow Brick Road?

1 2 3 4 5
Seldom Continuously

As a guide, her/his major strength(s) would be:

As a guide, her/his major conflict(s) and/or blind spot(s)
would be:

"And another thing I want to say is . . ."

APPENDIX B
PROGRAM PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS

Yellow Brick Road Guides

No.	Sex	Ed.	Age	Income	Occupation	Religion	Married	Agency Client
1	F	BS+	33	19,000	housewife	Unitarian	Yes	No
2	F	BA+	37	20,000	housewife	Jewish	Yes	Yes
3	M	HS	33	15,000	insurance agent	Presbyter.	Yes	Yes
4	F	HS	30	---	housewife	Presbyter.	Yes	Yes
5	M	BA	30	11,000	services coord.	---	Yes	No
6	M	BA	32	9,000	child care wrk.	Lutheran	Yes	Yes
7	F	2 yrs Col. BA	26	6,000	staff assist.	Episcopal	Yes	No
8	M	BA	35	11,000	community wrkr	Catholic	Yes	No
9	F	BA	37	9,000	teacher	---	No	No
10	M	MA	30	5,000	consultant	---	No	No
11	F	BA+	31	7,000	project dir.	---	No	No
12	F	MSW	39	12,600	housewife	Episcopal	Yes	Yes

APPENDIX B (Con't)

PROGRAM PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS

Yellow Brick Road Guides

No.	Sex	Ed.	Age	Income	Occupation	Religion	Married	Agency Client
13	F	BS	25	6,000	community wrtr	Catholic	No	No
14	F	HS	26	7,000	housewife	--	Yes	No
15	F	HS	43	9,000	secretary	Unitarian	No	No
16	M	BA+	29	13,000	mental health specialist	Quaker	Yes	Yes
17	F	HS+	28	--	housewife & teacher	Quaker	Yes	Yes
18	M	Bd+	48	15,000	community dev.	Presbyter.	Yes	Yes
19	F	MA	35	--	unemployed	--	No	No
20	F	HS	39	11,000	project dir.	Catholic	Yes	Yes
21	M	BS	25	12,000	CPA	--	Yes	Yes
22	F	BA	36	11,000	college instr.	Jewish	Yes	Yes
23	F	HS	25	6,500	community wrtr	--	No	Yes

APPENDIX B

Yellow Brick Road ClientsBlock I

No.	Sex	Ed.	Age	Income	Occupation	Religion	Married	Agency Client
1	F							Yes
2	F	1 yr. Col.	39	6,000	bank teller	Methodist	No	No
3	F	HS	32	6,000	housewife	--	Yes	Yes
4	F	BA	23	unempl.	Reg. Nurse	--	No	Yes
5	F	HS	35	--	--	--	Yes	Yes
6	M	HS	35	--	--	--	Yes	Yes
7	M	BA	28	7,500	Smoking Couns	--	No	Yes
8	M	BA	49	4,200	Laundry Mgr.	Unitarian	No	Yes
9	F	HS	30	7,500	Adm. Asst.	Lutheran	Yes	Yes
10	M	1 yr Col.	25	6,000	Diamond Lab Mgr.	--	Yes	Yes
11	M	2 yrs Col.	26	7,000	Radio Mgr.	--	No	Yes
12	F	HS	47	10,000	Secretary	--	Yes	No

APPENDIX B (Con't)

Yellow Brick Road ClientsBlock I

No.	Sex	Ed.	Age	Income	Occupation	Religion	Married	Agency Client
13	F	BA	43	5,500	Outreach Wrkr	--	No	No
14	F	HS	26	Welfare	unemployed	--	Yes	No
15	F	HS	25	Welfare	unemployed	--	No	No
16	F	3 yrs Col.	29	10,000	student	--	Yes	No
17	F	HS	33	5,000	secretary	--	No	No
18	F	HS	22	3,500	nurse's aide	Buddhist	No	Yes

APPENDIX B

Yellow Brick Road ClientsBlock II

No.	Sex	Ed.	Age	Income	Occupation	Religion	Married	Agency Client
19	M	BA+	28	9,000	Staff Dev. Trainer	--	No	No
20	M	3 yrs Col.	20	1,200	student	--	No	Yes
21	M	BS	32	7,500	Prog. Dir.	Malcomist	No	Yes
22	F	BA	29	8,100	teacher	--	No	Yes
23	M	BA	25	7,000	Outreach Wrk	--	No	No
24	F	BA+	31	--	grad student	Methodist	Yes	Yes
25	M	DDS	37	30,000	dentist	Episcopal	Yes	Yes
26	M	MA	38	2,800	unemployed	Unitarian	No	No
27	F	BA+	27	8,950	teacher	--	No	No
28	M	2 yrs Col.	25	7,500	clerk	--	No	No
29	M	BA	30	10,000	Social Wrkr	Episcopal	No	Yes
30	F	3 yrs Col.	26	--	unemployed	--	No	No

APPENDIX B (Con't)

Yellow Brick Road ClientsBlock II

No.	Sex	Ed.	Age	Income	Occupation	Religion	Married	Agency Client
31	F	HS	31	6,000	secretary	--	No	Yes
32	F	MA	29	1,500	free lance writer	--	Yes	No
33	M	2 yrs Col.	20	--	student	Lutheran	No	No
34	F	HS	30	7,500	Admin. Asst.	Lutheran	Yes	Yes
35	M	HS	25	6,000	mechanic	--	No	Yes

APPENDIX B

Yellow Brick Road ClientsBlock III

No.	Sex	Ed.	Age	Income	Occupation	Religion	Married	Agency Client
36	M	BA	29	9,000	Caseworker	Methodist	Yes	Yes
37	M	2 yrs Col.	37	7,000	Lab Tech.	Unitarian	Yes	No
38	F	1 yr. Col.	38	3,000	secretary	--	Yes	Yes
39	M	1 yr. Col.	41	9,000	const. worker	--	Yes	Yes
40	F	1 yr. Col.	31	5,000	payroll clerk	--	No	Yes
41	M	HS	33	13,000	salesman	Catholic	Yes	Yes
42	F	HS	22	4,000	clerk	--	Yes	No
43	F	HS	24	6,500	outreach wrkr	--	No	Yes
44	F	3 yrs Col.	34	8,500	psych. aide	Episcopal	No	No
45	F	BA	25	7,500	Admin. Assist.	--		No
46	F	MA	33	--	unemployed	--	No	No
47	F	HS	32	7,000	secretary	--		

APPENDIX B (Con't)

Yellow Brick Road ClientsBlock III

No.	Sex	Ed.	Age	Income	Occupation	Religion	Married	Agency Client
48	M	BA	29	11,000	bank mgr.	Lutheran	Yes	Yes
49	F	HS	26	6,000	secretary	Evangelist	No	Yes
50	F	HS	38	6,000	unemployed	--	No	Yes
51	M	HS	37	11,000	sales rep.	Lutheran	Yes	Yes
52	F	HS	33	--	housewife	Lutheran	Yes	Yes
53	M	BA	35	18,000	own business	--	Yes	Yes
54	F	2 yrs Col.	32	--	housewife	--	Yes	Yes
55	F	BA+	24	--	student	--	No	No
56	M	BA	27	11,000	treatment coord.	--	Yes	No
57	F	BA+	29	3,500	dressmaker	Quaker	Yes	Yes
58	F	MA	37	6,000	teacher	--	No	No
59	M	--	35	welfare	unemployed	--	No	Yes

APPENDIX B (Con't)

Yellow Brick Road ClientsBlock III

No.	Sex	Ed.	Age	Income	Occupation	Religion	Married	Agency Client
60	F	HS	33	--	unemployed	--	No	Yes
61	F	BA	36	6,000	secretary	--	No	Yes
62	M	BS	42	18,000	US Forest Serv.	Presbyt.	Yes	No
63	F	BA	22	5,000	clerk	--	No	Yes
64	F	BA	50	2,300	comm. worker	--	--	No

APPENDIX C
QUESTIONNAIRE

Yellow Brick Road Evaluation

SEX: F_____ M_____

How many previous blocks of Yellow Brick Road have you
attended? _____

Group leaders: _____

Change: _____

Activity: _____

1. My expectations of Yellow Brick Road were met (circle
one:

favorably									unfavorably
10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

2. What I expected and did not get was: _____

3. (Answer this question if you have had a previous group
or individual counseling experience at Lutheran Family Ser-
vice.) I found my Yellow Brick Road experience to be:

more helpful					same				less helpful	
10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0

4. (Answer this question if you have had a previous group
or individual counseling experience elsewhere.) I found my
Yellow Brick Road experience to be:

more helpful					same				less helpful	
10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0

5. Being involved in a time-restructuring activity was:

helpful					no effect				harmful
10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1 0

6. The effect my activity group had on what I accomplished in change group was:

great effect					some effect			no effect
10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2 1 0

7. The counseling methods used (Transactional Analysis and Gestalt Therapy) were:

very helpful				somehow helpful			not helpful
10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3 2 1 0

8a. My level of trust and confidence in my Activity Group leaders was:

high					average			low
10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3 2 1 0	

8b. My level of trust and confidence in my Change Group leaders was:

high					average			low
10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3 2 1 0	

9. The usefulness and/or application of my Yellow Brick Road experience to any "real life situations" at home and work are:

very useful					somewhat			not useful
10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3 2 1 0	

10. Changes in me have been mentioned by others:

often					sometimes			not at all
10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3 2 1 0	

11. Most change has taken place (circle one):

1. In the way I feel about myself
2. In relating to family
 - a. mate b. children c. brother or sister
 - d. parents
3. In relating to others outside family
4. In relating to situations (such as job)

12. My fee was (circle one):

1. About right
2. Higher than I expected
3. Lower than I expected

13. I would summarize my Yellow Brick Road experience as:

very helpful				somewhat helpful				no help
10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2
								1
								0

COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS: _____

APPENDIX D (Con't)

TABLE 5

INTRA-BLOCK CONSISTENCY

Block 5, 1973

Routes	Question Numbers												
	1	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	13			
5:4 mean	9	7.5	9	6.66	8.33	9.1	9.5	9	6.1	9.1			
TOTAL MEANS:	8.4575	6.9	8.04	7.345	8.1175	9.0475	8.8125	8.7225	5.5075	8.825			