1973

Selected attitudes and perceptions of adolescents at the Hood River, Oregon, attention home

Marilyn Czerwinski
Portland State University

Linda Olson
Portland State University

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

Part of the [Juvenile Law Commons](#), and the [Social Work Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Czerwinski, Marilyn and Olson, Linda, "Selected attitudes and perceptions of adolescents at the Hood River, Oregon, attention home" (1973). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 2877.
<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.2868>

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.

SELECTED ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS OF ADOLESCENTS
AT THE HOOD RIVER, OREGON
ATTENTION HOME

by
MARILYN CZERWINSKI
LINDA OLSON

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

MASTER OF
SOCIAL WORK

Portland State University
1973

FOREWORD

The basis of this study was a contract between Martha N. Ozawa, Ph.D. and James E. Klahre, Chairman of the Board of Next Door, Inc., for a team of graduate students to "use various measuring devices to evaluate changes of perception and attitudes of the juveniles in residence."

Details of the study were worked out with Dr. Clinton Goff of the Salem Law Enforcement Council, reviewed by the Board of Directors of the Next Door, Inc., and the work commenced in April of 1972. In August, Dr. Ozawa left the project, and Dr. Frank F. Miles became the director.

The basic hypothesis of this study was that "juveniles who had been in the Next Door, Inc. would show a positive change in their perceptions and attitudes towards themselves and their community after a stay of two months." However, it was recognized that two months might be too brief a time span to reveal significant changes in the juveniles' attitudes and perceptions.

The main variables chosen for this study were the youths' responses towards authority, community, peer

relationships, self-concept and the program of the Next Door, Inc. Data was collected on these variables by means of four separate but related measures: the Jesness Inventory, an Attitude Questionnaire, Semantic Differential Scales and interviews held with the juveniles by the researchers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
FOREWARD	11
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Development of Focus	1
Development of the Next Door, Inc.	6
Purpose of Study	11
Value of Research	12
Overview of Chapters	13
Footnotes	15
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	16
Adolescence	16
Authority	21
Peers and Self-Concept	23
The Treatment Home	26
Footnotes	32
III. METHODOLOGY	35
Hypotheses	35

CHAPTER	PAGE
Population Studied	35
Instruments of Data Collection	37
Jesness Inventory	37
Attitude Questionnaire	40
Interview	42
Collection of Data	43
Analysis of Data	44
Base Data	44
Jesness Inventory	45
Attitude Questionnaire	48
Semantic Differential Scale	48
IV. FINDINGS	50
Base Data	50
Jesness Inventory	60
Analysis of Individual Cases	68
Seven Male Entrance Scores	72
Attitude Questionnaire	76
The Semantic Differential	84
Subjective Interview Responses	89
V. SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS	95
BIBLIOGRAPHY	103
APPENDIX A	
ADMISSION CRITERIA FOR YOUTH HOMES	
IN HOOD RIVER	107

PAGE

CONTRACT FOR NEXT DOOR, INC. 109

PROGRESS REPORT FORMS 110

APPENDIX B

JESNESS INVENTORY 111

ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE 124

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALES 126

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. FLOW CHART OF JUVENILES IN THE NEXT DOOR, INC., FROM NOVEMBER 15, 1971 - DECEMBER 31, 1972	51
II. PLACEMENT UPON RELEASE FROM THE NEXT DOOR, INC.	55
III. REASONS FOR REFERRAL TO THE NEXT DOOR, INC.	56
IV. JUVENILES DETAINED OVERNIGHT OR LONGER IN THE HOOD RIVER COUNTY JAIL - NOVEMBER 15, 1971 - DECEMBER 31, 1972	57
V. NUMBER OF DAYS IN THE NEXT DOOR, INC.	59
VI. TWO-TAILED TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR RELATED MEANS FOR JESNESS SCORES AT TIMES I AND II (N = 4)	61
VII. T SCORES FOR TIMES I AND II ON ALL SCALES FOR N = 4	69
VIII. COMPOSITE SCORES OF SEVEN MALES UPON ENTRANCE TO THE NEXT DOOR, INC.	73

TABLE	PAGE
IX. TWO-TAILED TEST OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE FOR JESNESS ENTRANCE SCORES FROM THE NEXT DOOR, INC., AND THE MIDVALLEY TREATMENT CENTER (N = 7)	74
X. TWO-TAILED TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR RELATED MEANS; COMPARING FIRST AND LAST SCORES (ASOCIAL INDEX)	76
XI. SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALE SCORES FOR THE NEXT DOOR, INC.	85
XII. SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALE SCORES FOR AUTHORITY	86
XIII. SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALE SCORES FOR SELF-CONCEPT	87
XIV. RAW SCORES CONVERTED INTO RANK SCORES ON SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALE	88

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	PAGE
1. FRIENDS	77
2. FAIRNESS	78
3. COMMUNITY/AUTHORITY	79
4. COMMUNITY CONCERN	80
5. LEARNING EXPERIENCE	81
6. SELF-CONCEPT	82
7. HOUSEPARENTS	83
8. PEER RELATIONSHIPS	84

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The aim of this study is to report selected perceptions and attitudes of adolescents placed in the "attention home" at Hood River, Oregon, as an early aid towards improved understanding and treatment, and program assessment.

Development of Focus

In the past quarter of a century, emphasis in the mental health and correctional fields has shifted from an increasingly impersonal and regimented philosophy to a more meaningful, individualized approach. This is especially apparent in the correctional field in which individualized treatment in smaller, community-based units, such as group homes and half-way houses which provide a family-like atmosphere, is seen as a desirable alternative to custodial care and punishment carried out in a large-scale institution. Until recently, little such individualization has been provided for in the United States: adults have been housed with juveniles; dependent and neglected children have been institutionalized along with adjudicated delinquents.

Many researchers have long turned their attention to the conditions, structure and objectives of our jails, and have found reason for much criticism.

The Federal Bureau of Prison ratings point out that almost no jails are rated excellent by their standards; about half are rated good, a third as fair, and six to seven per cent as poor.¹ These ratings are made in terms of suitability of jails for adults, not for children. Among the major problems surveyed are idleness, untrained personnel, and lack of provisions for education of youth, recreation and religion. Inadequate provision is made for separation of adult from juvenile offenders; often when there is separation, one or two juveniles are isolated completely.²

With the establishment of juvenile court laws in 1899, the juvenile code provided for detention of children separate from that of adult offenders. The court maintained that juvenile lawbreaking differed from that of adults in that it does not have the same implications of moral deviation or intentional disregard of the law. The court maintains that children under the jurisdiction of the Juvenile Court are in need of protective care and guardianship, and that this can best be carried out in facilities for detention and treat-

ment which are separate from criminal adult influence and stigma of crime.

The case for the development of such facilities designed to provide individualized treatment for the juvenile has gained strength as we learn more about the causes of anti-social and abnormal behaviour. Konopka stresses that treatment of the juvenile delinquent must be community centered because self-respect and dignity grow from human relationships, both with peers and accepting adults.³ Kvaraceus cautions us that the level of community understanding and acceptance correlates highly with the success of programs designed for delinquent youth. The larger part of the community must support the values and philosophy of the program rather than feel it is a soft-hearted or ineffective approach to delinquency. Failure to achieve this understanding on the community's part can result in failure of the program.⁴

An essential aspect of the effective detention facility is provision of an opportunity to observe the juvenile in a controlled environment in which there is love, understanding and security and in which his physical needs will be met. Hardman notes that since one of the basic components of delinquency is a history of negative experiences with authority figures, an of-

fender can make a true adjustment only through reconciliation with authority or through a new and constructive relationship with an authority figure.⁵ The personnel involved with the detained juvenile offender should represent authority as understanding, dignified and consistent to change the juvenile's view of authority as unpredictable, hostile and rejecting.

Jail detention seldom provides such positive experiences as described above and frequently has even more undesirable consequences. Many studies indicate that confinement of a juvenile in jail gives him a delinquent status among peers. Studt maintains that the traumatic experience of being housed with adult criminals often reinforces noninvolvement with the normal community and widens the juvenile's separation from normal group controls which the community provides.⁶ The adolescent, who still has his choice of several self-concepts, fluctuates between conformity and under-conformity.⁷ The child's self-concept grows out of his perception of what others think of him. By confining the child in jail with adult criminals, society implies that he, too, is "bad," thus lowering his self-concept and possibly precipitating further delinquency.

Furthermore, the jail experience, while preventing the repetition of a specific act, may instill in the youthful offender a cautiousness and wariness of community-sanctioned authority figures and agencies. The philosophy of imprisonment as punishment often inhibits constructive efforts toward conformity to society's norms. Kenney states that juveniles often need detention but reminds us that the detention experience should begin the treatment process rather than push the individual further from it.⁸ A punitive attitude based on the premises of retaliation and removal from the community encourages resentment and inhibits growth of motivation toward resocialization.⁹ The process of resocialization necessarily involves a desire to change as well as a gradual process of reorganizing behavior by means of practicing new attitudes, roles and behavior. It is our belief that resocialization is more effectively achieved in detention homes designed to provide exposure to positive, successful and desirable ways of behaving than it is achieved in the traditional jail setting. The workers and members of a detention home offer several methods of transmitting society's norms. Behavior can be influenced by approval or disapproval of the members of the home. The socialization process can also be effected in a deten-

tion environment created to perpetuate and reinforce acceptable norms. The norms are internalized into each member of the home as the individual becomes his own judge of his behavior.

Development of the Next Door, Inc.

The State of Oregon Corrections Division carried out a study of District 9, comprising Wasco, Sherman and Hood River counties, to provide direction for correctional change in that district. The Feasibility Study team held the opinion that treatment cannot be conducted within a jail setting and that it is most effective within the local community. In view of this, the study identified the critical problem in District 9 as the lack of a detention resource for children of juvenile court age.¹⁰ The Law Enforcement Council of Oregon, in a grant proposal for the creation of such a facility in District 9, listed specific problems caused by the lack of a temporary child care facility:

1. Children alleged to have committed acts of delinquency must either be detained in inadequate jail-like facilities or released to the custody of their parents. Often the home situation is harmful to the child and the release of the child to his parents only perpetuates and aggravates the child's problems.

2. Sometimes it is necessary to lodge dependent children in the Juvenile Quarters of the Hood River County Jail due to a lack of any other temporary housing for the child.
3. Evaluation of the child's needs by the Court is often hampered by the lack of temporary care facilities.
4. Children coming before the Court with problems in the area of ungovernable behavior or situations of family conflict cannot be helped effectively because temporary care in a neutral setting is not available.¹¹

Recognizing these needs, Hood River, Oregon has developed an "attention home" called the Next Door, Incorporated.

The Next Door, Inc.

The Next Door, Inc., a temporary child care facility located in the community of Hood River, has been funded by Federal, State, and Local sources under Part C, Title I, Public Law 90-351, (as amended by Public Law 91-644). The Next Door, Inc. serves Hood River, Wasco and Sherman counties and is certified by the Children's Services Division for a total of eight children of both sexes. The technical age for placement lies between ten and eighteen years of age, although the majority of juveniles placed in the home have been adolescents. Placement in the group home is for both long and short term clientele referred from

the juvenile courts, from Children's Services Division, or on a voluntary basis. Children admitted to the attention home must meet the admission criteria formulated by the Hood River and Wasco County Juvenile Departments. In addition each child must sign a contract stating clearly that he will cooperate with the program of the attention home (see Appendix A).

The physical facility is a large, older home in Hood River, Oregon which has been remodeled to accommodate both sexes. Its location provides proximity to local schools and other participating community agencies.

The Next Door, Inc. is administered by a Board of Directors consisting of fifteen community volunteers who assume the responsibility of managing and directing the operation of the group home. Houseparents are responsible for the actual care and supervision of the children in residence as well as for the planning and coordinating of the children's needs. Together these two teams work towards achieving the goals of the attention home. These goals have been formulated by the Board as follows:

1. Temporary Child Care: To provide temporary care for up to eight children of both sexes as an alternative to placement of the child in jail or return to an unfavorable home situation. The home

is to be operated principally for the children of Hood River County, but children from Wasco and Sherman counties will be admitted on a space available and cost of care basis.

2. Attention to the Child's Needs: To develop and provide various types of attention for the child not possible if the child were detained in jail or released to his parents or even placed in shelter homes. The houseparents, community volunteers, and professional counselling personnel will be involved in providing attention to the child's various needs and problems.
3. Neutral Place for the Child to Stay: To provide a neutral setting for the child to stay for counselling and assistance following periods of family conflict. It will provide a cooling off period for both the child and parents and on-going care for those children needing specific services not available within their own homes. Parents will be involved in the counselling and program planning whenever possible.
4. Place for Child to Stay Other Than Jail Pending Case Planning and/or Placement: To provide a place for the child pending case planning and/or continuing care when not appropriate to release the child to his parents or to continue the child in detention.
5. Assist the Court in Evaluating Child's Needs: To provide evaluation information to the Court prior to hearing and if continuing care is necessary, make available counselling to the child.
6. Minimize the Child's Adjustment Program: To provide care and service to the child and his family while disturbing his world as little as possible.

sible; that is, the child will be allowed to continue in school and be allowed to remain in contact with persons and things familiar to him.

7. Obtain Volunteer Services from the Community: To secure the volunteer participation of at least one hundred individuals and/or organizations in the community. The participation is expected in the form of volunteer services such as preparation and remodeling of the facility, upkeep of facility, obtaining supplies, big brother services, contributions of money, etc.¹²

Through interviews with the houseparents, the research learned that in addition to these basic goals the houseparents have objectives relating to daily living experiences. Some of the tasks include provision of structure and routine schedules for those children who have never had such discipline. The houseparents hope to help these children improve their relationships with adults and with their peers through role modeling as well as through individual counselling and group meetings. Problems of honesty, sharing and getting along with others are discussed among the houseparents and children to achieve this goal. The houseparents also try to provide a model of a healthy and stable marriage for the children, many of whom have never been exposed to this. The houseparents delegate household chores and involve the children in recreational and group activities in order to provide a more family-like

atmosphere. In carrying out their parental role the houseparents are expected to use firm and consistent discipline, hoping to instill a more positive view of authority in the children.

The houseparents enter weekly progress and behavioral reports into each child's file to help evaluate the child's needs and to plan for placement upon release (see Appendix A). The houseparents meet with a planning committee consisting of a Children's Services Division worker, juvenile court personnel, a clinical psychologist, a psychiatric social worker, and other community volunteers to discuss the child's adjustment and future alternatives such as foster care, return to natural parents, or institutionalization.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of our study is to explore the value of the Next Door, Inc. program in terms of its effect on the children's attitudes towards and perceptions of, various components considered important to the group home's program. These components include the group home itself, the child's view of authority figures, his self-concept, his peer relationships, and his perception of the community's concern for him.

This research attempts to measure attitude change in those children who have resided in the home for a period of at least two months. In addition, the design allows us to formulate a description of the population served by this facility. Subjective comments from the residents of the home are used, to provide a broader view of the juveniles' feelings and perceptions.

This should provide some measure of the impact of the attention home's program on relevant attitudes held by its clientele, as well as a clearer description of the clientele with whom the home is dealing. The research findings should provide a base for analysis and improvement or modification of program aspects. It is hoped that such clarification in terms of the population presently dealt with will give direction to determination of program objectives and simultaneously provide a base for further research in this home, if not other facilities.

Values of the Research

The value of attention homes such as the Next Door, Inc., recently put into practice in many communities, has been increasingly advocated as a viable alternative to traditional detention. The implications of a community based attention home are far reaching

in that the attention home represents a shift from reliance upon impersonal and highly centralized agencies which are said to have contributed to an unmotivated and uncommitted philosophy pervading many communities. Some social scientists believe that community participation and active involvement in the solution of social problems, as demanded by community based group homes, result in a more effective and humanized service.

The possible significance of community group homes to the growth and advancement of both the mental health and correctional fields requires further research in this area to provide direction for its most effective utilization, as well as to provide guidelines for program assessment, development and implementation. Thus, the present research on the Next Door, Inc. was conducted in order to provide some such measure of the group home's value and effectiveness as an innovative effort in the Oregon Correctional system.

Overview of Chapters

The remaining chapters of this book will be devoted to a review of the relevant literature and to the actual implementation and findings of this research. Chapter II is divided into two sections, the first of

which provides a broad overview of the adolescent personality with which the home deals. The second section presents the research findings concerning adolescent treatment facilities in order to determine what factors contribute to an effective group home. Chapter III describes the research design and methods of data analysis. Findings of the research are presented in Chapter IV. The final chapter summarizes conclusions of the study and suggests implications for the program of the Next Door, Inc.

FOOTNOTES - CHAPTER I

1. Ruth Cavan, Juvenile Delinquency, J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia, Pa., 1969, p. 391.
2. Ibid., p. 39.
3. Gisela Konopka, "Our Outcast Youth," Social Work, Vol. 15, No. 4 (Oct., 1970), p. 81.
4. William C. Kvaraceus, The Community and the Delinquent, World Book Co., New York, 1954, p. 161.
5. Dale G. Hardman, "The Constructive Use of Authority," Crime and Delinquency, Vol. VI, (July, 1960), p. 250.
6. Elliot Studt, "An Outline for Study of Social Authority Factors in Casework," Social Casework, Vol. 35, (June, 1954), p. 235.
7. Ruth Cavan, op. cit., p. 276.
8. John P. Kenney, Police Work with Juveniles, Charles C. Thomas, Springfield, Ill., 1954, p. 104.
9. Ibid., p. 20.
10. Don C. Gibbons and Duane C. Lemley, Correctional Feasibility Study, District 9, State of Oregon Corrections Division, Salem, Oregon, 1971, p. 20.
11. Application for Action Grant, State Law Enforcement Planning Agency, Project Title: The Next Door, Inc., p. 2, attachment 1.
12. Ibid., p. 2, attachment 1.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Adolescence is a period of transition from childhood to adulthood, during which the youth experiences crucial physiological and psychological changes. Besides coping with the bewildering onset of glandular and bodily changes, the adolescent youth must also contend with psychological changes, called "tasks" of adolescence. These "developmental tasks" are defined by Havighurst as:

. . . skills, knowledge, functions and attitudes which an individual has to acquire at a certain point in his life; they are acquired through physical maturation, social expectations, and personal efforts. Successful mastery of these tasks will result in adjustments and will prepare the individual for the harder tasks ahead.

A primary task of this age is achievement of adult status and independence. The reawakening of sexual interest characteristic of adolescence requires a second task, that the youth experiment with new relationships with both sexes, as well as accept his own sexual identity and its concurrent role. Other tasks include dealing with and accepting his new body image,

learning to integrate society's norms and mores as his own; and finally, establishing a sense of identity.

The establishment of identity, defined by Sorenson as "the creation of an inner sense of sameness and continuity, a unity of personality felt by the individual and recognized by others,"² is essential to the transition from adolescence to mature adulthood. Erickson reminds us of this difficult period, when the youth is concerned about who he is, who he wants to be, what others feel about him, how to master powerful new drives and how to cope with authority as well as new responsibilities. When a youth is not sure of how he sees himself or of how others see him, that is, when he is not sure of his identity, delinquent, neurotic, and even psychotic incidents may result.³ When such "identity diffusion" occurs, the youth runs away in some form--truanting, staying out all night, withdrawing from friends or family. Erickson emphasizes that delinquent behavior is only one manifestation of diffusion.⁴ He cautions us against using the label delinquent, warning us that the youth may perversely oblige authorities by becoming what he is labeled. Delinquency, according to Lippman, is an outlet for hostility resulting from past neglect, rejection, or deprivation of vitally needed gratifications.⁵ The

U.S. Children's Bureau publication, Institutions Serving Delinquent Children, throws further light on the dilemma of defining delinquency:

"Delinquency" is a legal term, a finding by a court, generally as a result of the child's violation of a law. The term is not diagnostic and is not sufficient to classify the child. Chance sometimes determines whether a child is labeled delinquent, dependent, or neglected. Sometimes another term might easily have been used and the child given a different legal-social status A child may become delinquent because his life lacks some of the elements necessary to healthy, normal growth When these basic needs are not met, a child may become delinquent and seek his satisfactions in socially unacceptable ways Whatever the causes of their misbehavior, delinquents are likely to be immature, hostile, insecure, or badly frightened boys and girls. Most delinquent children believe that the world is essentially hostile, since this is what their experience of rejection and deprivation has taught them.⁶

Keller and Oliver note that "sharp delineations between delinquent and dependent children are more easily made by law than in practice."⁷ They maintain that children in need of care, regardless of their label, are more similar than different. Many of these children share the same deprivations in spite of their varying labels. Dependent and neglected children, like many delinquent children, have been "abandoned, neglected, subjected to cruelty or depravity or not pro-

vided with the care, guidance, and protection necessary for his physical or emotional well-being, by his parents or those having his custody."⁸

A major factor from which many of these deprivations stem is the inadequate family. Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck found that the parent-child relationship in a family held more import in contributing to delinquency than the factors of slum life, conflict of cultures, and low IQ. The chances that a youth with an adequate family life would become delinquent were only three in one hundred, whereas a youth with an inadequate family life was given ninety-eight chances out of one hundred.⁹

The inadequate families studied by the Gluecks were found to be more mobile, crowded, and with a lower standard of living. The parents were often divorced, separated, unmarried, or separated due to death, and more often afflicted by emotional disturbance, alcoholism, criminal behavior, and physical or mental illness. Their mode of interaction was more often hostile or indifferent than in adequate families, and their discipline less consistent.

Reckless and Denitz, in their studies on differences between delinquents and nondelinquents, learned that the nondelinquent felt his parents were concerned

about him and that his family was as good as any other.¹⁰ The parents of these boys took an interest in their sons and were satisfied with the friends chosen by their sons. Nondelinquents were more likely to identify themselves with the community in a positive way, possibly due to the strong emotional bond between the child and his parents, the primary transmitters of social standards. Reckless and Denitz' findings indicate that the child has a desire to emulate his parents' behavior and standards, which he then internalizes. Delinquents, they found, do not have this attachment so do not have the same sense of responsibility to the community.

Kvaraceus has devoted much research in defining differences between delinquents and nondelinquents. In the area of family and home life, he learned that delinquents usually come from homes with standards that vary from those of general society.¹¹ The interpersonal relationships in the family

. . . are negative and result in emotional deprivation and damage, economic stress and insecurity. Discipline is overstrict, punitive, erratic or lax; family living lacks cohesiveness; affection of parents is indifferent, hostile, or rejecting; the mother's supervision is inadequate or unsuitable. Substandard conditions prevail; the neighborhood presents a climate of rulelessness and rootlessness.¹²

Kvaraceus found that the youth himself often exhibits such traits as ambivalence toward authority, high defiance, emotional fluctuation, high self-concern but low self-concept, and a low frustration tolerance.

In the following sections, the concepts of authority, peer relationships, and self-concept will be discussed in more detail in order to relate them to the treatment process for the juvenile.

Authority

A general definition of authority offered by Lasswell and Kaplan is "that use of power which has been legitimized in the institutional structure of society."¹³ The Gluecks have found that attitudes toward authority "concern basic ways in which the individual establishes his place, his security, and his share in society and in life."¹⁴ They emphasize the importance of attitudes towards authority, which most youth experience first through their parents, and later through society's agencies, such as church or school. A reconciliation with authority is crucial to the development of the adolescent who is simultaneously achieving independence. The youth whose contacts with authority have been negative or hostile needs contact with authority figures who are consistent and under-

standing in order to work out his conflicts. These conflicts center around the youth's need to be independent of parental dominancy, hence his increased rebelliousness and rejection of their values. At the same time, however, the youth is seeking his own set of values to further solidify his identity, and needs adults with sound values with which he can identify without feeling that he is sacrificing his independence. A constructive relationship with an authority figure allows a child to meet his dependency needs while developing his conscience, his own means of self-control. Self-control is developed when the child is still in a dependent relationship with the parental authority figure, who defines limits for the child and helps him with the control of his impulses. Falsberg suggests three ways in which the child develops self-control:

1. The giving up of infantile pleasures to gain love and security.
2. Conscious and unconscious identification with and imitation of parental figures.
3. Incorporation of parental and later community standards.¹⁵

This suggests that dependent, neglected, and delinquent children experience more conflict with authority and thus increased difficulty in developing self-control.

Falsberg attributes this increased conflict to factors such as the absence of one parent, the unsuitability of role models, the lack of emotional availability of the parents, and the conflicting standards of the child's family with those of the larger society.¹⁶ For these children, fair and consistent discipline and firm limits are essential, coupled with a nonpunitive authority figure to help the child handle his feelings toward authority and to find socially acceptable outlets for his impulses.

Peers and Self-Concept

As we have said earlier, adolescence is the stage in which the child develops physically, psychologically, and socially into an adult. As the adolescent begins the task of forming a meaningful identity the peer group becomes his major vehicle. By conforming with his peers he receives a sense of belonging and the support needed for change. The peer group helps guard against the dangers of self-diffusion by providing an opportunity for self-testing, ego growth, identity formation and self-esteem. Thus, the peer group becomes the adolescent's major reference group, that group from which he learns his standards, values and goals.

Barron sees the roles in the peer group as a "powerful determinant in the formation of the child's conception of himself."¹⁷ A role is defined as that behavior which an individual assumes according to the position he holds in a particular group.¹⁸ Cavan notes that self-concept develops from the adolescent's perception of what others, in particular his peer group, think of him.¹⁹ Thus one's self-concept can be positive or negative, dependent upon the esteem with which the child feels himself held in his peer group. These feelings of being valued or of being worthless are incorporated into the child's identity and are known as his self-esteem. Failure to develop a strong self-concept and positive sense of self-esteem can result in identity diffusion.

Reckless and Denitz, in their studies on the relationship of self-esteem to peer group, learned that non-delinquents belonged to reference groups that defined themselves as good, and that these boys were satisfied with their own self-image. This supports Sorenson's theory that alienation from society, through institutionalization or segregation of delinquents, merely compounds the youth's problems by limiting contacts with non-delinquent youths and adults, contacts which are essential to positive identity formation.²⁰

The adolescent brings to the peer group attitudes and behaviors which are then reinforced, modified or changed as the individual assimilates group practices and norms of his own. The adolescent's attitudes are thus a mixture from past experiences, norms of his peers and minor reference groups such as family, church, or school. In a treatment home then, the peer group can be a valuable tool for rehabilitation or it can be a hindrance, depending on the values of the group.

Konopka states that status among one's peer group means more to the adolescent than status among adults.²¹ In view of this, a treatment center must focus on the peer social structure in addition to individual casework. Polsky supports this finding in his research of Cottage Six: "The position and status of each boy within his living group proved more important than acceptance by professional staff."²² This research illustrates the theory of differential association, which holds that delinquents learn their standards and norms of behavior from association with each other or isolation from nondelinquent standards. In view of the importance of the peer group to the formation of the adolescent's values, Polsky stressed community based treatment in order to prevent segregation of delinquents from nondelinquents.

The Treatment Home

Although Keller and Alper maintain that placement in group homes is not exactly formal treatment, they agree that many children can make extensive social and emotional adjustments from living with accepting adults and with the support of peers.²³ The group home that does provide treatment must provide certain experiences and controls, which include:

1. A group living experience in a family-like atmosphere that also provides opportunity to develop peer relationships.
2. An opportunity for identification and warm relationships with adult authority figures.
3. A favorable climate in which physical and emotional needs are met and deviant behavior may be tolerated.
4. Ordered patterns of daily living experiences which provide routines and control.
5. An opportunity for counselling, or to have someone listen to the child's needs and fears.

The group home provides a setting in which everyday living experiences can be examined and modified through the support and feedback of peers and houseparents. The group provides an opportunity for trying out new roles, skills, and ideas, and for learning new ways of relating and expressing feelings. The group members

can also learn the way others see and respond to their behavior and thus the consequences of their behavior.²⁴ In addition the group home provides the children with a feeling of belonging to something. This is especially important during adolescence because one of the developmental tasks is to become independent of the family and establish ties with others outside the home. Peers can offer substitution for the loss of parental support while they also can offer a group identity to the adolescent whose individual identity is still developing. Living in a group situation which gives the adolescent support of peers has proven to be a less stressful situation than living in a foster home without benefit of peer support. Adolescents are frequently unable to tolerate close one-to-one relationships with adults, who symbolize authority and dependency to the struggling youth. Support from peers helps him accept adult control as well as change his antisocial and anti-authority attitudes through group process.²⁵ Furthermore, group pressures from peers can help prevent an adolescent from making extreme emotional demands on the adult.

Attitudes towards authority can be greatly altered through a satisfying relationship with adult parental substitutes. The houseparents must offer security and

guidance as well as affection. Feelings of being loved and accepted enable the adolescent to develop the trust necessary to identify with adult values and standards. Opportunity for identification with adults helps the child find stability in his own identity as he integrates certain values and norms into his own developing system. Furthermore, the provision of a model of married and family life still proves to be the best means of filling the normal developmental and socialization needs of the child while providing a stable model with which to identify.

Houseparents also need to provide a favorable atmosphere where the child feels secure in that his physical and emotional needs will be met. A favorable climate is one in which the child feels respected and understood as an individual, knowing that he has someone to help him work on present problems as well as future goals. It includes protection and guidance of the child in controlling impulsive behavior until he is able to control himself. A most important aspect of a favorable climate for the growth of children is reasonable tolerance of deviant behavior by adults, without a punitive or rejecting attitude. Repression of such behavior does not allow it to be dealt with and

may produce outer conformity rather than internalized change.²⁶

Adult attention and affection as well as the planning of recreational and leisure time activities should not be based on the child's behavior. These are rights rather than privileges in a therapeutic climate. Fritz Redl compares the withholding of these rights from the needy child to withholding medicine from a sick child.²⁷

The Child Welfare League of America stresses that routines and regulations are necessary in a group living situation to provide a sense of continuity, regularity, and stability, as well as to help simplify living for the child.²⁸ A routine schedule delays certain gratifications, thus teaching the child self-control. Ordered patterns of daily living experience help the child to become aware of what he can expect and on what he can depend, thus lowering his anxiety. Well defined limits, controls, and pre-determined consequences of their violation are necessary so that the child knows what is expected of him and can fulfill them. During adolescence the child must cope with new developmental tasks, unresolved maturational conflicts, and physiological changes. This is difficult without external and substitute controls such as rules, rou-

tines, and the presence of authority figures, since the ego is still integrating its coping skills and the conscience is still developing.²⁹

A final component in the effective treatment home is the availability of understanding adults who have the time to listen to the concerns of the children. Jarvis, in a study of delinquent boys, found that eighty-five per cent of the boys felt that the best therapy for them was having someone listen and talk to them.³⁰ Other choices were having money, having an adult engage in some activity with him, thinking things out for himself, and finding activities for himself. Houseparents can also provide on-the-spot counselling in a crisis situation which may ward off further problems by allowing the child to ventilate his feelings and helping him understand his emotions. An opportunity for group meetings in which bottled-up daily living pressures can be discussed openly also helps vent frustrations and hostile feelings that may have been expressed through antisocial acts.

From the review of the literature, we found that juveniles who are classified as delinquent tend to possess negative attitudes towards authority figures and the community represented by them, and that they frequently have poor self-concepts. We also learned

that peer relationships have a substantial influence on the juvenile's attitudes towards himself and others, even more influence than most adults. For example, a juvenile whose peer relationships are based in a delinquent subculture will tend to adopt delinquent attitudes.

Thus it seemed that in a treatment program that attempts to change attitudes in the direction of conformity to society's accepted norms, changes in attitudes towards the following variables would be necessary: authority figures, the juvenile's surrounding community, his self-concept, and relationship with his peers.

FOOTNOTES - CHAPTER II

1. R. J. Havighurst, "Developmental Tasks and Education" in Theories of Adolescence, Rolf E. Muuss, ed., Random House, New York, 1968, p. 109.
2. Roy Sorenson, "Youth's Need for Challenge and a Place in Society," Children, Vol. 9, No. 4, July-August, 1962, p. 27.
3. Erik H. Erickson, "Identity and the Life Cycle," in Psychological Issues, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1954, p. 91.
4. Bernice M. Moore, Juvenile Delinquency: Research Theory, and Comment, Washington, D.C., Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1958, p. 28.
5. Hyman S. Lippman, "Preventing Delinquency," Federal Probation, (March, 1953), from Gisela Konopka, Group Work in the Institution, Associated Press, New York, 1954, p. 192.
6. Institutions Serving Delinquent Children - Guides and Goals, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1957, pp. 3-5.
7. Oliver J. Keller and Benedict S. Alper, Halfway Houses, Heath and Lexington Books, Lexington, Mass., 1970, p. 107.
8. Oregon Juvenile Law Handbook, Oregon State Bar, Oregon, 1970, Chapter 9, section 3B.
9. Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency, Commonwealth Fund, New York, 1950, from Milton L. Barron, The Juvenile in Delinquent Society, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1955, p. 81.
10. Ruth Cavan, Juvenile Delinquency, J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia, Pa., 1969, p. 391.
11. William C. Kvaraceus, Juvenile Delinquency, National Education Association, Washington, D.C., 1958, p. 12.
12. Ibid., p. 12.

13. Harold Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Power and Society, Yale Universities Press, New Haven, Conn., 1950 from Elliot Studt, "An Outline for Study of Social Authority Factors in Casework," Social Casework, Vol. 35, No. 6, (June, 1954), p. 231.
14. Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, Family Environment and Delinquency, Houghton-Mifflin Co., Boston, Mass., 1962, p. 81.
15. Martin Falsberg, "Setting Limits With the Juvenile Delinquent," Social Casework, Vol. 38, No. 3, (March, 1957), p. 139.
16. Ibid., p. 139.
17. Milton L. Barron, The Juvenile in Delinquent Society, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1955, p. 154.
18. Bruce T. Biddle and Edwin J. Thomas, Role Theory: Concepts and Research, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1966, p. 135.
19. Ruth Cavan, op. cit., p. 276.
20. Roy Sorenson, op. cit., p. 27.
21. Gisela Konopka, op. cit., p. 195.
22. Howard W. Polsky, Cottage Six: The Social System of Delinquent Boys in Residential Treatment, Russell Sage Foundation, 1962, p. 167.
23. Oliver T. Keller and Benedict S. Alper, op. cit., p. 90.
24. Henry Maier, Group Work As a Part of Residential Treatment, National Association of Social Work, New York, 1965, p. 28.
25. Keller and Alper, op. cit., p. 81.
26. Child Welfare League of America Standards for Services of Child Welfare Institutions, Child Welfare League of America, New York, 1963, p. 5.
27. Fritz Redl and David Wineman, The Aggressive Child, Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., New York, 1957, pp. 35-36.

28. Child Welfare League Standards, op. cit., p. 5.
29. Fritz Redl, op. cit., p. 110.
30. Richard Jarvis, "Dynamic Treatment Methods," an address delivered at Juvenile Court Institute, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon, August, 1963, in Alan, et. al., Use of the Depth Interview in Examining Attitudes of Delinquent Boys: An Exploratory Study, unpublished thesis, School of Social Work, Portland State University, Portland, Oregon, 1964, p. 81.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This research attempted to test the guiding hypothesis that "Juveniles who had been in the attention home would show a positive change in their perceptions and attitudes towards themselves and their community after a stay of two months," and to study the inter-relations of attitudes and perceptions which might be useful in program development, treatment or understanding of change factors. The research hypotheses were:

1. There is no difference in scores on the Asocial Index between Time I and Time II (two months after entrance).
2. Time II scores are more favorable than Time I scores.

The main variables in this study were responses in the areas of authority, community, self-concept, peer relations and the program of the attention home, together with sectors measured by the Jesness Inventory, which includes a combined Asocial Index explained in more detail later in the chapter.

Population Studied

The population to be studied was originally to consist of all juveniles who entered the attention home

and remained at least two months, within the ten month period of data collection. Juveniles whose stay in the Home was limited to overnight or to only a few days were not included.

However, certain problems encountered during the study necessitated a change in sampling units. The Home has a capacity for no more than eight youths at a time, and several youths remained in the Home for periods of up to six months. Six youths had entered the Home before the onset of data collection, resulting in their exclusion from Times I and II comparisons. Due to the small number in the Home during the period of data collection, it was decided that all youth would be given the Jesness Inventory at entry and every two months following. This meant that some juveniles were excluded from the Times I and II samples, but were eligible for Times III, IV, and V; that is, after four, six, and eight months' stay respectively. The researchers hoped this would increase possibilities for wider comparison and analysis of data; however, little more data was collected in spite of this addition to our original design.

The population actually studied consisted of sixteen juveniles who had taken either the Jesness Inventory or the Attitude Questionnaire, or both. The following list presents the numbers available for anal-

ysis, by time and instruments. This total included all of those entering and staying more than two days in the study period.

Jesness Inventory:

Number of juveniles in Time I and II sample	4
Number of juveniles in Time I sample only	5
Total number of juveniles in Time I sample	9
Number of juveniles in Time II and III sample	1
Number of juveniles in Time IV and V sample	1

Attitude Questionnaire and Interview:

Number of juveniles who have taken the Attitude Question- naire at Time II	11
Number of juveniles who have been interviewed at Time II . . .	9

Instruments of Data Collection (see Appendix B)

Jesness Inventory. In choosing an instrument to measure attitude change, it was necessary to look for a test in which the reliability level insured that differences in results were not due to differences in responding to the test itself, and which had been standardized for adolescents. The Jesness Inventory, a structured questionnaire consisting of one hundred fifty-five True-False items, is designed to measure attitude change over time in children of both sexes between the ages of eight to eighteen years. The in-

ventory is multi-dimensional for use in classifying both delinquents and nondelinquents through inclusion of items investigating areas of attitude and sentiment about self and others. The items included provide a single index of asocial tendencies predictive of delinquency; thus it is an instrument which can be used to distinguish delinquents from nondelinquents. It is important to point out, however, that the Asocial Index intends to measure psychological disposition only, and does not include social-environmental dimensions of delinquency such as lack of opportunity, lack of environmental support, family conflict and stress, and peer pressures.

The Asocial Index, one of eleven scales which represent separate personality characteristics, may be defined as a generalized tendency to resolve problems in social and personal adjustment or to behave in ways which violate established social norms and customs. There are two components to this index, the first being a motivation towards the goal, measured in the Social Maladjustment Scale. The second, consisting of seven of the nine remaining scales, is an inhibitory tendency related to an awareness of consequence, conflicting motivation, a generalized tendency to inhibit need gratification or impulse expression or incompatible self

concept. The Asocial Index is Social Maladjustment minus the inhibitory tendencies measured by seven scales.

The remaining scales and their definitions are as follows:

Social Maladjustment. (63 items) A set of attitudes associated with unfulfilled needs, especially dependent needs, parental rejection, punitive or inconsistent modes or reinforcement. This set of attitudes is defined by the extent to which the individual shares the attitudes of persons who demonstrate inability to meet, in socially approved ways, the demands of their environment.

Value Orientation. (39 items) Refers to a tendency to hold values characteristic of persons in the lower social classes.

Immaturity. (45 items) The tendency to display attitudes and perceptions of self and others which are usual for persons of a younger age.

Autism. (28 items) A tendency in thinking and perceiving to distort reality according to one's personal desires or needs.

Alienation. (26 items) Refers to the presence of distrust and estrangement in a person's attitudes towards others, especially towards persons representing authority.

Manifest Aggression. (31 items) Refers to an awareness of unpleasant feelings, especially of anger and frustration, a tendency to react readily with emotion, and perceived discomfort concerning the presence and control of these feelings.

Withdrawal. (24 items) Involves a perceived lack of satisfaction with self and others and a tendency toward passive escape or isolation from others.

Social Anxiety. (24 items) The perceived emotional discomfort associated with interpersonal relationships.

Repression. (15 items) Refers to the exclusion from conscious awareness of feelings and emotions which the individual normally would be expected to experience, or his failure to label these emotions.

Denial. (20 items) Refers to the failure to acknowledge unpleasant events or aspects of reality normally encountered in daily living.

Attitude Questionnaire (see Appendix B). A second instrument was devised to measure the attitudes towards authority, community, self-concept, peers and the Next Door, Inc.'s program. This instrument is a questionnaire designed to reveal attitudes towards more specific, concrete areas whereas the Jesness provides data on general, underlying attitudes.

The Attitude Questionnaire consisted of two parts, the first of which were eight closed response questions concerning the major variables of this study. The questions in this section were concerned with learning what kinds of juveniles were actually in the Home,

and what feelings they had about themselves, their peers and the houseparents, as well as the community and authority figures.

The second section of the Attitude Questionnaire consisted of a series of three Semantic Differential Scales designed to obtain a rating of each juvenile's attitudes towards selected concepts. Responses toward the Next Door, Inc. as well as towards the selected concepts of authority and the juvenile's self-concept, were rated on this scale. Attitudes towards these concepts were rated on a scale which consisted of twelve words and their opposites. These words were selected for their evaluative, potency, or activity connotations. Each word and its opposite was placed on a continuum, with seven sections between the two words. For example, the first words of the scale were "helpful/unhelpful," and looked like this:

helpful unhelpful

The seven sections between the two words represented degrees of meaning, such as "very helpful," to "very unhelpful." The juvenile marked an "X" in a section of the continuum that best described his feeling towards the concept being rated with respect to the particular word.

Six words and their opposites were considered to be evaluative; these were helpful/unhelpful, valuable/worthless, nice/awful, clean/dirty, good/bad and hot/cold. Thus, a juvenile who rated the concept "authority" very highly on the evaluative words, that is, if he marked an "X" very near the left end of the continuum, would probably feel that authority and representatives of authority are generally helpful to him and worthwhile in his life. A low scoring subject would probably feel that authority figures are unhelpful, that is, more trouble than of help or use to him, something to be avoided.

Potency words, which were large/small, strong/weak, and deep/shallow, dealt with the powerfulness of the concept or its perceived ability to be effective and of influence in the juvenile's or others' lives.

Activity words, noisy/quiet, fast/slow, and active/passive, connote feelings of energy, industriousness and readiness to act. Thus a subject scoring high on activity words on the concept "self-concept" would perceive himself to be an active and energetic person rather than passive, lazy, and stagnating or idle.

Interview. Recognizing that the test data would possibly prove inadequate due to our small sample size,

an in-depth interview was also administered by the researchers to eleven of the juveniles in the sample. The purpose of this interview was to collect certain identifying information as well as the juveniles' perceptions and subjective opinions regarding such areas as his placement in the home and the effectiveness of the home. Areas investigated included the juvenile's perception of the reasons for his placement in the home, kinds of juveniles placed in the home, and of how others viewed the home. Quality of peer relationships and of relationship to the houseparents, with suggestions for improvements in these areas, were also elicited.

Collection of the Data

The Jesness was originally administered by the Coordinator of Volunteers for Hood River County to each juvenile upon entrance and at subsequent two month intervals. The researchers chose a volunteer with no direct involvement with the juveniles in the Next Door, Inc. to avoid contamination of test results. After several months it was necessary for the houseparents to take over the administration of the test due to the volunteer's difficulty in arranging her time. Most likely this did not bias the test since there was a

built-in fake ability scale which checked the veracity of the individual's responses. The houseparents told all juveniles that their tests would remain confidential and that only the researchers would see their responses. The test was given to the juveniles at the Next Door, Inc. to make it as convenient as possible for the juveniles.

After a juvenile had been in the Home for a period of approximately two months, the researchers went to Hood River to administer the Attitude Questionnaire and to conduct a personal interview with each juvenile. Eleven juveniles took the Attitude Questionnaire and nine of these eleven also were interviewed.

Analysis of Data

Base Data. Thirty-six juveniles were placed in the Home between the periods of November 15, 1971 (when the Home opened) to December 31, 1972 (when the study was concluded). Base data was collected on these youths in order to compile a flow chart. Data included the age and sex of each juvenile, reason for referral, number of days each juvenile spent in the Home, and placement upon release.

The above information was organized in Table I according to the order in which the juvenile came into

the Home. This organization enables the reader to identify changes in other variables, such as days in Home or placement upon release, and their relationship with the relative data of the Home's program.

The mean, average deviation and standard deviation of the number of days the juveniles spent in the Home was also computed, excluding the five juveniles who remained in the Home at the conclusion of this study.

Tables presenting the exact number of juveniles referred to the Home for specified reasons and the number of juveniles placed in their own home, or specified alternatives to their home, were also compiled.

It was determined that during this same time period of November 15, 1971 to December 31, 1972, forty-eight youths were detained in the Hood River County Jail overnight or longer. Reasons for each juvenile's detainment were identified and presented in Table IV for comparison with similar data on juveniles placed in the Home.

Jesness Inventory. The four sets of Jesness Inventory scores for Times I and II were evaluated on each of the eleven scales by the two-tailed test of

related means to determine whether changes in scores from Time I to Time II were significant at the .05 level, thus testing the null hypothesis. With the null hypothesis rejected, a one-tailed probability was applied to determine the significance of change with respect to the expected direction. The mean scores of the population and variation in scores were computed by finding the mean and standard deviations for the four pairs of scores on all eleven scales. Raw scores for the Jesness were weighted, tabulated and converted into standardized T scores with a midpoint of fifty and each standard deviation equalling ten points. The norm for the nondelinquents on whom this test was standardized is a T score of fifty, with a range from forty to sixty.

Individual scale changes for each juvenile were scrutinized to determine in what areas and in what direction the most changes occurred.

The mean values on all scales for the seven male entrance scores were computed and examined for population description. The two female entrance scores were omitted due to insufficient N and the lesser reliability of the Jesness scales with female pop-

ulations.¹ These seven scores were compared on each scale to seven random scores of adolescent males from a similar group home in a nearby county. This was done by computing the means and standard deviations on all scales for each population, and applying a two-tailed t-test to determine if differences in scores were significant.

The Asocial Index scores of the six pairs of juveniles who took the Jesness more than once were tested for significant difference by comparing first and last test scores for each youth regardless of the time span elapsed between the testing. Again the mean and standard deviations on each scale were computed for all subjects in group I (first-time scores) and all subjects in group II (last time scores). A two-tailed t-test was then applied to determine if differences in scores between group I and group II were significant.

¹There is slightly more difficulty in distinguishing female delinquents from nondelinquents as their different base rate in the general population presents a more difficult prediction problem. However, on most scales the distribution of scores for the two groups, male and female, do not differ despite the fact that the scales were developed from a male sample. A separate discriminate analysis was run for the female sample, producing a formula of differing weights for each scale and a smaller constant factor, which resulted in a prediction of about 85% accuracy. Carl F. Jesness, The Jesness Inventory, California Youth Authority, 1963, p. 21.

Attitude Questionnaire. Each of the eight questions of this questionnaire were analyzed separately to determine frequency in each response category and general direction of response of the total sample. Questions 1 through 3 have five response categories which were assigned numerical ratings from one to five, with five representing the most favorable or positive response. Questions 4 through 8 were rated on a seven point scale, with seven being the most positive response. Whenever applicable, selected scales of the Jesness were related to questions from the attitude questionnaire, although no attempt was made to show statistical correlations.

Semantic Differential Scale. The responses towards the selected concepts were rated on a seven point scale with respect to each word. Seven was the highest or most favorable response and one was the lowest, or least favorable response towards the concept being rated. Since there were six "evaluative" words, six times seven points, or forty-two was the highest score obtainable on this factor. An index was compiled for this factor by dividing the total points achieved by forty-two, the total points obtainable. As there were three words each on the activity and potency fac-

tors, the highest score was three times seven points, or twenty-one points. Thus, an index was computed by dividing the total number of points obtained by total number of points obtainable (twenty-one points). In this way, each index for each factor is equal to 1.00 when the highest score is obtained, allowing us to make comparisons between raw scores for each of the factors, evaluative, potency, and activity.

Raw scores for each factor were presented for each concept rated, ranked in order from highest to lowest so that the distributions of scores could be readily seen (see Tables XI-XIII). Scores for the evaluative and potency factors on "Authority" and the "Next Door, Inc." and "Self-concept" were numerically ranked so that comparisons could be made as to how each juvenile responded to these.

A rank correlation was run between those concepts considered most likely to have a significant correlation. These were "Authority" and the "Next Door, Inc." on the potency factor, and "Self-concept" and the "Next Door, Inc." on the potency factor.

A great amount of data were collected but not analyzed due to time limitations. Further analysis would be useful, particularly in connection with an ongoing research.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Four separate but related measures were used to measure attitude change in juveniles placed in the Home and to determine, indirectly, how well the Home's program was meeting its declared goals. These measures also aimed to discover possible factors in the relationships of the Home, youth and community.

The Jesness Inventory was the measure used as a standardized base of comparison. An Attitude Questionnaire of a structured, closed-response nature and a differential word response test, the Semantic Differential, were also administered. Finally, the juveniles were interviewed with a set of questions, constructed from literature indicating them to be of significance, with open-ended responses. The findings from these measures will be reported in that order, preceded by base data on the juveniles placed in the Home.

During the period of November 15, 1971 through December 31, 1972, thirty-six youths were placed in the Next Door, Inc. Of these juveniles, twenty-two were males and fourteen females, ranging from ten to seventeen years of age. The mean age was 15.2 years.

Table I presents an overall flow chart of all juveniles in the Home during this period, their ages and sex, reason for referral to the Home, placement upon release, and number of days each juvenile spent in the Home.

TABLE I

FLOW CHART OF JUVENILES IN THE NEXT DOOR, INC.,
FROM NOVEMBER 15, 1971 - DECEMBER 31, 1972

Juve- nile*	Age	Sex	Reason for referral	Placement upon release	Number of days in Home
1.	16	M	O	7	1
2.	13	F	B	4	55
3.	15	M	H	1	1
4.	15	F	B	8	Still in Home
5.	15	M	A	1	2
6.	16	M	E	1	176
7.	16	F	B	2	116
8.	14	F	B	2	116
9.	14	F	D	1	14
10.	15	M	D	8	Still in Home
11.	15	M	E	1	114
12.	17	M	B	5	10
13.	15	F	A	4	69
14.	15	F	E	3	1

TABLE I--Continued

Juve- nile*	Age	Sex	Reason for referral	Placement upon release	Number of days in Home
15.	13	F	F	3	1
16.	13	F	F	3	1
17.	15	M	A,D	2	76
18.	17	F	G	1	2
19.	16	F	E	5	176
20.	14	M	D	1	22
21.	14	M	D	8	Still in Home
22.	10	M	E	1	1
23.	17	M	B	2	26
24.	14	F	A	1	4
25.	16	M	D	1	1
26.	12	M	D	1	1
27.	17	M	O	2	1
28.	14	M	F	1	23
29.	16	M	C	1	1
30.	13	M	C	1	1
31.	14	M	D	8	Still in Home
32.	13	M	I	1	2
33.	15	F	A	8	1
34.	15	M	D	6	18

TABLE I--Continued

Juve- nile*	Age	Sex	Reason for referral	Placement upon release	Number of days in Home
35.	15	F	A	8	Still in Home
36.	13	M	A	2	5

*Juveniles are organized in order of admission.

CODE FOR REFERRAL:

- A Run away
- B Foster home failed
- C Vandalism
- D Beyond parental control
- E Family problems (inadequate care, marriage problems, illness)
- F Run away from an institution
- G Driving under the influence of alcohol
- H Theft
- I Driving without a license
- O Unknown

CODE FOR PLACEMENT:

- 1. Returned home
- 2. Foster home

3. Returned to Institution
4. Ran from Next Door, Inc.
5. Placed in a group home
6. Placed with relatives
7. Unknown
8. Now in the Home

Mean days in Home -- 38.48

Average deviation -- 39.60

Standard Deviation -- 51.76

Table II shows where each child was placed upon release from the Next Door, Inc. Almost half (sixteen) of the juveniles were returned home, one of the goals the Next Door, Inc. hoped to achieve. One purpose of the home was to provide a neutral place for the child until the situation within the home or between the child and the parents could be improved. Six juveniles were placed in foster care through the efforts of a volunteer foster home finding service in Hood River.

TABLE II
PLACEMENT UPON RELEASE FROM THE NEXT DOOR, INC.
(TOTAL POPULATION - 36)

*See code below	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Males	12	4	0	0	1	1	1	3	= 22
Females	4	2	3	2	0	0	0	3	= 14
Total both sexes	16	6	3	2	1	1	1	6	= 36

*Code Placements

1. Returned home
2. Foster care
3. Returned to institution
4. Ran from Next Door, Inc.
5. Placed in group home
6. Placed with relatives
7. Unknown (placement information not in
file or file not available at this
time)
8. Child not yet released

Table III shows the reasons the juveniles came into contact with the juvenile court. Seven youths were referred for running away from home, six due to

failure of the foster home in which they were living, and another seven were classified as "beyond parental control." The smallest number (only one referral each), came to the attention of the court for offenses such as driving under the influence of alcohol, driving with no license, and theft.

TABLE III
REASON FOR REFERRALS - NUMBER
CATEGORIZED BY SEX

*Same code as for Table I	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	O	
Males	3	2	2	6	3	1	0	1	1	3	
Females	4	4	0	1	1	3	1	0	0	0	
Total both sexes	7	6	2	7	4	4	1	1	1	3	= 36

During the period in which the Next Door, Inc. was opened, (mid-November, 1971) until this research was completed (December 31, 1972), forty-eight youths were detained in the Hood River County Jail overnight or longer. Eighteen of these juveniles were from counties other than Hood River. Although the exact number of days each juvenile was detained is not available, it has been determined through court personnel

that most stayed only a few hours or one day, until parents could be contacted or the Home notified of the child's coming. Except for runaways, the reasons for referral to the County Jail were generally more serious than reasons for referral to the attention home.

TABLE IV

JUVENILES DETAINED OVERNIGHT OR LONGER
IN HOOD RIVER COUNTY JAIL
November 15, 1971 - December 31, 1972

Reason for Referral	Number Referred
Runaway	14
Minor in possession	10
Auto theft	6
Violated drug laws	5
Larceny	4
Breaking and entering	3
Drunkenness	2
Protective custody	1
Vandalism	1
Curfew	1
Ungovernable	1
Total	48

Table V is a bar graph indicating the number of days the juveniles stayed in the home. As Table I showed, the mean number of days was 33.48, with a range from one to one hundred seventy-six days. The mean is rather large but this is accounted for by the eight juveniles staying in the Home from fifty-five days to one hundred seventy-six days. The average deviation is 39.6, which means that on the average, the individual scores deviated from the mean score of 33.48 by 39.6 days, indicating that the range for planning is quite wide. About one-third of the juveniles remained in the home only overnight, another third less than a month, and one-third from two months to six months. This shows the variety of needs the home is meeting in serving both long and short term juveniles, and limitations on treatment.

TABLE V
DAYS IN HOME*

*This does not include the five juveniles not yet released from the home when the study ended.

The researchers interviewed eleven juveniles for additional details that might be of interest. There were seven males and four females ranging from fourteen to seventeen years of age. Only one youth was not from a broken home: seven lived with their mother and stepfather; two with their mother; and one with their father and stepmother.

All but two had been in foster homes, three had been in one foster home, two juveniles in three different homes, one in four homes, and one had been in five homes. Of these eleven, only three were placed in another foster home, one went to a group home, three are still in the Home, and the remaining number (four) were sent to their own homes.

The majority of the parents of these eleven juveniles were blue collar workers, such as dam worker, lumber mill worker, painter, and mechanic. One mother supported her family by fruitpicking, whereas three others held service oriented jobs such as cashier and waitress.

Jesness Inventory

The main focus of this research was on the sample set of four juveniles who took the Jesness at Times I and II. An increase or decrease in the Asocial Index

at the .05 level of significance would be sufficient to reject the null hypothesis that there would be no change in attitudes of juveniles under the type of treatment provided by the Next Door, Inc.

TABLE VI

TWO-TAILED TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR RELATED MEANS
FOR JESNESS SCORES AT TIMES I AND II
(N = 4)

SCALE	$\bar{X}_1$	$\bar{X}_2$	t	p
Social Maladjustment	65.75	71.25	1.859	NS
Value Orientation	59.75	60.75	.387	NS
Immaturity	59.00	55.00	2.189	NS
Autism	63.00	65.00	.805	NS
Alienation	65.00	64.50	.397	NS
Manifest Aggression	53.75	55.50	.504	NS
Withdrawal	53.50	58.50	.851	NS
Social Anxiety	51.25	47.25	.876	NS
Repression	61.06	59.69	.041	NS
Denial	36.25	38.75	.829	NS
Asocial Index	61.00	71.00	3.189	.05*

*Significant at the .025 level of confidence for a one-tailed test.

Upon entrance these four juveniles had a mean T score of 61.00 which is one standard deviation above the normal population for which the norm is 50. Compared with the nondelinquent sample, these four are in the eighty-fifth percentile meaning eighty-five per cent of the nondelinquent population had scores of 61.00 or less. After two months these juveniles scored at 71.00, two standard deviations above the norm, and fell in the ninety-eighth percentile of the nondelinquent population. Table VI indicates that an increase in the Asocial Index from 61.00 at Time I to 71.00 at Time II was found to be significant at the .05 level. The probability is one in twenty that this increase would occur by chance. However, due to the very small sample size the score of only one juvenile, who represents twenty-five per cent of the sample, could skew the results. Thus, although the results are significant for these four juveniles, they are not yet generalizable to outside populations. A one-tailed t-test found this ten point increase to be significant, although borderline, thus rejecting the null hypothesis and indicating that in these four cases, juveniles tended to adopt more delinquent attitudes as measured by the Asocial Index.

However, the t-test takes into consideration the uncertainties of such a small number; the chances are better than ninety-seven out of a hundred that repeated sampling would produce similar results. A test reported later in this chapter corroborates a shift to more delinquent proneness, as do some studies elsewhere. Such a shift is of current concern to group homes in the State, and is only partially understood.

The Asocial Index was constructed by statistical analysis which examined each of the ten inventory scales and then combined them to predict delinquent behavior. Asocialization measures Social Maladjustment minus the tendencies toward inhibition of anti-social behavior, measured by the remaining scales. The Asocial Index is one of the most stable scores on the test and is the least susceptible to change. This leads the researchers to believe that in these four cases the findings of the research are accurate. It should be noted that similar increases in this index have also occurred in other group homes.

As shown in Table VI, no other scale scores showed a significant difference from Time I to Time II. However, it should be noted that the Social Maladjustment score increased six points, a factor which contributed highly to the increase in the Asocial Index

score since Social Maladjustment is double weighted in tabulation. In addition, all scales except two, Autism and Alienation, were from one to two standard deviations below the Social Maladjustment score of 71.25 at Time II. This is of importance because the Asocial Index is dependent upon the relative distance between Social Maladjustment scores and other scale scores. Thus, the lower the inhibitory scale scores in relation to the Social Maladjustment, the higher the Asocial Index. Since Social Maladjustment refers to the extent to which one "shares attitudes expressed by persons who show an inability to meet in socially approved ways, the demands of living," it is possible that youths in the Home may have adopted attitudes of a delinquent subculture during their stay.

Higher scores in Value Orientation are related to a tendency towards nonconforming, rule-violating behavior, lack of responsibility, and an alienated attitude towards adults. There was no significant change in the scores from Time I to Time II but the score was one standard deviation above the norm for the nondelinquent population, indicating that these juveniles hold values associated with the lower class culture.

The Autism scale score for both times was 1.5 standard deviations above the norm, indicating that these youths are more likely than the normal population to distort reality according to their personal desires and needs. Item content indicates that

the high scoring individual sees himself as self-sufficient, smart, good-looking, and tough, while at the same time he expresses concern about "hearing things," feels there is something wrong with his mind, likes to daydream, prefers to be alone, is fearful, and expresses many somatic complaints. The picture is of a most inappropriate façade of self-adequacy covering a very insecure person.

The Alienation scale, which measures hostility, showed similar results, with a T score of 65.00. Again this score is 1.5 standard deviations above the norm of fifty, indicating that there is an increase in the presence of "distrust and estrangement in relationships with others, especially with authority figures."

Scores on the Immaturity scale were 59.00 at Time I and 55.00 at Time II, probably a normal variation rather than a significant change. These scores indicate that these juveniles differ little from the normal population on this scale, which attempts to measure the extent to which the youth fails to display those

responses, attitudes, points of view and perceptions which are more common to a group younger than his own. Item content for this scale indicates that high scoring juveniles tend to repress problems and lack insight into their own and others' motivations, thus prove to be poor candidates for traditional psychotherapy.

Manifest Aggression, which measures aggression and anger, is highly scored when the individual is concerned about controlling his feelings and is frustrated in his efforts to understand and feel comfortable with himself. Jesness cautions that there is not necessarily a close relationship between a high score on this scale and angry temper outbursts or hostile/aggressive behavior, since the youth's concern over control of his feelings may lead to overcontrolled behavior. As a whole, the composite score of the four juveniles did not differ significantly from the nondelinquent sample on the Manifest Aggression scale.

The Social Anxiety score also showed little difference from the norm. Since high scorers tend to feel nervous tension and self-consciousness and to see themselves as sensitive to criticism, we can assume from the mean score of the juveniles sampled that they do not have these tendencies.

Withdrawal refers to

. . . a tendency to resolve a lack of satisfaction with self and others by passive escape or isolation from others. The individual who scores high perceives himself as depressed, dissatisfied with himself, sad, misunderstood, and although preferring to be alone, feels lonesome.

The Time II score of 58.50 shows that there is a small tendency for this group as a whole towards withdrawal, but this score is still within the norm range of forty through sixty.

The Repression scale also borders on the upper range of the norm, with scores of 61.06 and 59.69.

"The high-scoring subject does not admit to, or is not aware of feelings of anger, dislike, or rebellion, and is generally uncritical of himself and others."

Scores on Denial show a negative relationship with scores on most other scales. A high score indicates a tendency to

. . . suppress critical judgement and avoid unpleasant thoughts about interpersonal relationships or in some instances may be defensive about admitting difficulties to others A very low score suggests the presence of family conflict and a willingness to admit to these and other problems.

Thus a low score, such as 38.75 found at Time II, would tend to increase the Asocial Index due to the decreased inhibiting effect of a decrease in denial.

Analysis of Individual Cases. Increases and decreases in each scale were analyzed to determine whether there were consistent trends in scale changes. For example, the researchers wished to learn if any scales, such as Alienation, showed a consistent increase or decrease for all individuals. Such information would indicate that the change in score, indicating a related change in attitude, was attributable to the Home's program rather than to individual differences. Table VII provides Time I and Time II scores on the eleven Jesness scales for the sample of $N = 4$, two females and two males. Direction of change in scores of each scale is indicated by an "F" (favorable) or "U" (unfavorable) in a column to the right of each pair of scores. Six points was chosen as the cutting point for "considerable increase." Any score change less than six points was taken to be of negligible importance.

TABLE VII

T SCORES FROM TIME I TO TIME II ON ALL
JESNESS SCALES FOR N = 4

SCALES*	Female			Female			Male			Male		
	X ₁	X ₂	Direction**	X ₁	X ₂	Direction	X ₁	X ₂	Direction	X ₁	X ₂	Direction
SM	56	65	U	76	73	F	64	70	U	67	77	U
VO	59	58	F	61	56	F	56	63	U	63	66	U
IMM	82	74	F	48	46	F	56	50	F	50	50	N
AU	59	62	U	68	64	F	63	64	U	62	70	U
AL	63	63	N	66	62	F	66	66	N	65	67	U
MA	47	49	U	62	55	F	55	57	U	51	61	U
WD	61	79	U	67	76	U	47	50	U	39	29	F
SA	60	57	F	60	64	U	37	37	N	48	31	F
REP	77	74	F	43	38	F	38	44	U	50	44	F
DEN	35	32	U	38	40	F	32	32	N	40	51	F
AI	54	71	U	72	74	U	58	67	U	60	72	U

*Categories are explained in Table VIII

**F = Favorable

U = Unfavorable

N = No change

Case #1 (female)

This individual's scores increased considerably in the Social Maladjustment and Withdrawal Scales, while there was a considerable decrease in Immaturity. The remainder of the scales did not change a great deal. The Asocial Index increased seventeen points showing a rise from the sixty-sixth percentile to the ninety-eighth percentile of the nondelinquent sample. This means that at T_1 sixty-six per cent of the nondelinquent population had scores lower than this individual.

Case #2 (female)

In this case there was a considerable increase only in the Withdrawal score, and a considerable decrease in Manifest Aggression and Repression. There was no significant change in the Asocial Index probably due to the negligible change in Social Maladjustment. The Asocial Index falls in the ninety-ninth percentile of the delinquent population meaning that this girl is within the top one per cent of the delinquent population, highly delinquent in attitudes.

Case #3 (male)

This individual showed a considerable increase in Social Maladjustment, Value Orientation, and Repression. The only index in which there was a considerable decrease was found in the Immaturity Scale. As in Case #1, the Asocial Index increased, showing a nine point increase to almost two standard deviations above the norm. This is an increase from the eightieth percentile of the nondelinquent population to the ninety-eighth percentile.

Case #4 (male)

This case had the largest variance in both directions between scores. There were large increases in Social Maladjustment, Autism, Manifest Aggression, and Denial and large decreases in Withdrawal, Social Anxiety, and Repression. The Asocial Index increased considerably but no more than in Case #3. The percentile in this case changed from the eighty-fifth to the ninety-ninth percentile.

The only individual whose score did not increase on the Social Maladjustment Scale also did not increase on the Asocial Index. This is probably due to the fact that the Social Maladjustment scale is the most signif-

icant in changing the Asocial Index score. Since increases and decreases in the other scale scores were not consistent there seems to be no general trend in attitude change. This suggests that changes were due to individual differences in the juveniles rather than due to the effect of the group home program.

Seven Male Entrance Scores. Table VIII shows the composite profile of the seven males who took the Jesness upon entrance into the attention home. As shown by the profile all of the individual scales as well as the Asocial Index are within one standard deviation of the normal range. The Asocial Index falls at the eighty-fifth percentile of the nondelinquent population. There was no significant difference in the Asocial Index score of the population $N = 4$, for whom the score was sixty-one, and the mean entrance score for these seven males which was sixty.

TABLE VIII
COMPOSITE JESNESS SCORES OF SEVEN MALES
AT ENTRY TO NEXT DOOR, INC.

SM - Social Maladjustment
VO - Value Orientation
IMM - Immaturity
AU - Autism
AL - Alienation
MA - Manifest Aggression
WD - Withdrawal
SA - Social Anxiety
REP - Repression
DEN - Denial
AI - Asocial Index

A two-tailed test of significance was applied to the scores of the same seven males in Table VIII and to seven random males chosen from a similar group home located in Salem. Table IX presents the results.

TABLE IX
TWO-TAILED TEST OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE FOR
JESNESS ENTRANCE SCORES FROM THE
NEXT DOOR, INC., AND MIDVALLEY
ADOLESCENT TREATMENT CENTER
(N = 7)

SCALE	NEXT DOOR	MIDVALLEY	Signi- t flicance
Social Maladjustment	$\bar{X} = 59.57$ $S = 9.81$	$\bar{X} = 55.29$ $S = 12.12$	.727 NS
Value Orientation	$\bar{X} = 50.71$ $S = 9.87$	$\bar{X} = 48.86$ $S = 13.29$	.297 NS
Immaturity	$\bar{X} = 48.85$ $S = 11.13$	$\bar{X} = 46.29$ $S = 12.98$	.398 NS
Autism	$\bar{X} = 57.00$ $S = 10.50$	$\bar{X} = 50.00$ $S = 9.49$	1.21 NS
Alienation	$\bar{X} = 55.86$ $S = 12.73$	$\bar{X} = 51.86$ $S = 10.49$	.594 NS
Manifest Aggression	$\bar{X} = 47.29$ $S = 8.66$	$\bar{X} = 46.29$ $S = 7.74$	.211 NS
Withdrawal	$\bar{X} = 49.29$ $S = 8.86$	$\bar{X} = 48.00$ $S = 9.96$	.236 NS
Social Anxiety	$\bar{X} = 43.00$ $S = 8.37$	$\bar{X} = 43.71$ $S = 5.95$	.170 NS

TABLE IX--Continued

SCALE	NEXT DOOR	MIDVALLEY	t	Signi- ficance
Repression	$\bar{X} = 49.86$ $S = 11.12$	$\bar{X} = 46.86$ $S = 11.19$	.466	NS
Denial	$\bar{X} = 43.57$ $S = 11.89$	$\bar{X} = 46.86$ $S = 8.03$	.561	NS
Asocial Index	$\bar{X} = 60.00$ $S = 8.57$	$\bar{X} = 60.57$ $S = 10.53$	.103	NS

$\bar{X}$ = Mean.

S = Estimated standard deviation for the population.

None of the scores between the two groups differed significantly, thus showing that these juveniles in the Next Door, Inc. have attitudes that are similar to the Salem group. In both cases the Asocial Index centered around 60.00 and all the scores fell within one standard deviation of the mean.

Table X includes the first and last scores of the six juveniles taking the Jesness at least twice, regardless of the time span between testing. This provides a rough index, but the best available at this point, of changes taking place over different time periods. For one subject scores from Time II and Time III were used; for another, scores from Time I and Time III were used;

for a third, Times IV and V were used. For the remaining three juveniles Times I and II were used.

TABLE X
TWO-TAILED TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR RELATED MEANS
COMPARING FIRST AND LAST SCORES
(ASOCIAL INDEX)
N = 6

	$\bar{X}_1$	$\bar{X}_2$	t	p
Asocial Index	62.50	75.00	3.969	.02*

*Significant at the .01 level for a one-tailed test.

Here again the Asocialization score increased from 62.50 to 75.00 at the .02 significance level indicating an increase in delinquent attitudes. A score of 75.00 is in the ninety-ninth percentile of the nondelinquent population. The probability that other samples would show improvement in delinquency proneness is less than one chance in a hundred. It is probable that in ninety-eight out of a hundred samples deterioration would occur.

Attitude Questionnaire

1. Real friends are hard to find where I live.

This question aimed to find out if juveniles in the group home had difficulties in forming peer rela-

tionships, or at least perceived themselves as having trouble making friends they could trust. If this were the case, a group home shared by peers with similar problems in which opportunity and encouragement were provided for relationship building, should have a beneficial effect. The mode of responses was generally positive, with six answering Very untrue or Untrue. Four felt that this was true or very true, while one was undecided.

FIGURE 1

FRIENDS

2. Some people in my town "get by with murder" while others take the rap for doing any little thing wrong.

This question aimed at uncovering the youth's underlying attitude towards the fairness of the commun-

ity and of authority figures in general. A basically negative response such as Very true or True, may indicate that the youth's past associations with authority have led him to see it as unfair, domineering and not to be trusted.

The scores ranged from one to five, with the largest number of responses (five) undecided. Four juveniles felt this was basically true, and two felt that it was untrue.

FIGURE 2

FAIRNESS

3. People are not concerned about what kids do as long as they keep out of trouble.

The youth's self-concept (feelings of "nobody cares about me") and possible past negative community/

authority experiences were the focus of exploration here. Do these youths feel others are concerned about them?

The largest number (five) felt that people were concerned about them. Only one juvenile felt this statement was very true, and two that it was true. Three juveniles were undecided, and no one gave a Very untrue response.

FIGURE 3

COMMUNITY/AUTHORITY

Questions 4 through 8 were rated on a seven interval continuum with one (1) the lowest possible score and seven (7) the highest possible score.

4. How do you feel about the community's (schools, court, police, neighbors, etc.) concern and interest for you?

Responses were placed on a continuum on which "Very concerned" (7) was the most positive response and "Not concerned" (1) was the most negative response.

The responses ranged from one through seven. One youth felt the community was very concerned, whereas two felt it was not concerned. Responses 5 through 7 were taken as positive responses; four fell into this category. Three juveniles gave an uncommitted response and four felt the community was not concerned.

FIGURE 4

COMMUNITY CONCERN

5. Have you learned anything while being here (about yourself, others, etc.)?

FIGURE 5

LEARNING EXPERIENCE

*Two subjects did not respond to this question due to changes made in the questionnaire.

This question aimed to learn if the juveniles perceived their experience in the home as a learning or educational experience for them. Responses to this question were the most positive of any of the questions, with three answering in the #7 category, "A great deal." Six youths answered positively; only one youth felt indifferent and two youths answered in the most negative category, "Nothing."

6. Are you happy with the way you are as a person?

Response categories ranged on a continuum from Very happy (7) to Very unhappy (1). This question was a perception check on the youth's feelings about his self-concept or satisfaction with his self-image.

FIGURE 6
SELF-CONCEPT

No one answered in the negative category, whereas four youths were ambivalent in their response. Seven youths answered that they were happy or very happy with themselves. In comparing individual scores from question 6 to question 5, it was shown that those who said they had learned very much in the group home program also felt very happy about themselves. In most cases the scores matched evenly. In the two cases in which subjects reported they had learned "nothing" while at the Home, they rated their happiness about themselves as a person at 4, the middle category.

7. Are the houseparents reasonable in their expectations and rules for you?

FIGURE 7
HOUSEPARENTS

The responses were heavily skewed in a positive direction and no one was very dissatisfied with the houseparents' expectations and rules. All but three respondents answered favorable, with five indicating that rules and expectations were very reasonable. None thought these were very unreasonable (#1 or #2 response); only one youth felt they were somewhat unreasonable (#3 response).

8. How well do you feel you get along with most of the kids here?

Here again quality of peer relationships and the child's sense of belonging to the group was the focus of exploration.

FIGURE 8

PEER RELATIONSHIPS

Five youths felt that they got along well with their peers at the attention home, whereas one youth felt he did not. Five youths felt that they got along with their peers neither very well nor very badly.

These scores tended to be higher and in a more positive direction than the scores from question 1, indicating that the youths got along with their peers in the Home better than they did in the community. A case by case analysis of responses to the two questions supports this finding in all but two cases. The difference may reflect the influence of the attention home in providing a feeling of belonging to a group.

The Semantic Differential

This test is a means of objectifying the subjects' reactions to words as symbols of their relation-

ships to authority, to themselves and to their experience in the Home. Raw scores were converted to an index representing the proportion of maximum scores possible for an individual. The possible range is from .00 to 1.00, on various indices. The evaluative index refers to the subject's evaluation of his relationship: the potency index gets at the influence of a relationship on the subject. The activity index is a way of getting at the subject's modal behavior--whether typically passive or active, as this might influence the other indices.

Table XI shows the relationship of scores on the indices, ranked separately from highest to lowest.

TABLE XI
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALE SCORES
FOR THE NEXT DOOR, INC.

Evaluative	Potency	Activity
.857	1.000	.851
.821	.834	.761
.809	.809	.761
.785	.778	.761
.785	.761	.722
.785	.761	.714
.714	.667	.714
.524	.619	.667
.500	.619	.619
.476	.429	.571
.285	.429	.571
$\Sigma X = 7.343$ $\bar{X} = .668$	$\Sigma X = 7.705$ $\bar{X} = .700$	$\Sigma X = 7.712$ $\bar{X} = .701$

The range was from .285 to 1.00, with means centered around .70. Taking .50 as a middle score, only two of those taking the test evaluated the Home or reacted to authority below this standard. No one tended to be on the passive side of reactive behavior. Attitudes to the Home and to authority tended to be well on the positive side, but not "enthusiastic."

Table XII presents the scored ratings on the concept "Authority." Scores range from .285 to .928, with a mean centering about .60.

TABLE XII
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALE SCORES
FOR AUTHORITY

Evaluative	Potency	Activity
.928	.904	.809
.821	.761	.761
.786	.761	.761
.714	.722	.714
.690	.714	.666
.678	.667	.611
.607	.524	.524
.517	.517	.517
.500	.429	.500
.285	.429	.476
.285	.285	.285
$\Sigma X = 6.812$ $\bar{X} = .619$	$\Sigma X = 6.712$ $\bar{X} = .610$	$\Sigma X = 6.623$ $\bar{X} = .602$

The results of this test are in keeping with other material in these areas, and together possibly reflect that the adolescents react to their present situation in the Home more positively than one might expect from their underlying predispositions.

TABLE XIII
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALE SCORES
FOR SELF-CONCEPT

Evaluative	Potency	Activity
.821	.952	1.000
.786	.944	.889
.714	.714	.809
.678	.666	.714
.690	.619	.666
.666	.611	.666
.666	.571	.627
.643	.571	.571
.607	.571	.464
.595	.523	.428
.143	.428	.334
$\Sigma X = 7.010$ $\bar{X} = .637$	$\Sigma X = 7.176$ $\bar{X} = .652$	$\Sigma X = 7.168$ $\bar{X} = .651$

The range of scores for this scale was .143 to 1.00. The means centered around .65. Most subjects' evaluations of their self-concept were above the middle score of .50, indicating that they valued themselves more than felt they were somewhat useless or worthless. The majority also felt themselves to be

potent or influential, as well as generally active individuals. With a few exceptions, then, these juveniles appear to possess average and basically healthy self-concepts.

TABLE XIV
RAW SCORES CONVERTED INTO RANK SCORES
ON SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALE

JUVE- NILE	NEXT DOOR		AUTHORITY		SELF	
	Evalu- ative	Po- tency	Evalu- ative	Po- tency	Evalu- ative	Po- tency
A	10	11	11	11	10	11
B	3	5.5	1	5	4	10
C	7	8.5	8	7	7	6
D	1	1	6	1	1	1.5
E	9	8.5	2	10	9	4
F	2	5.5	7	2.5	5	1.5
G	5.5	3	4	2.5	3	5
H	5.5	2	3	4	2	3
I	4	4	5	6	6	7
J	11	10	10	9	11	8
K	8	7	8	8	9	9

The scores for each individual on the evaluative and potency factors on all three concepts were ranked in order to determine if there were any correlations between scores on any two concepts. The rank correlation between the Next Door, Inc. and Authority on the potency factor is .89, a significant and very high correlation. This indicates a high association between

the way the juveniles perceive the potency (influence and powerfulness) of the Next Door, Inc., and their underlying attitude towards authority. Thus we can assume that if a child enters the Home with a hostile attitude towards authority, this will affect his perception of the Home.

A rank correlation was also run between the Next Door, Inc. and Self-concept on the potency factor. A correlation of .64 was found, showing only a moderate relationship. Thus, the juvenile's perception of his own ability to be effective and influential with others has a significant but not very close relationship to his perception of the effectiveness and influence of the Next Door, Inc.

In comparing the potency factor scores of each individual to his scores on question 5, "Have you learned anything while being here?" it was found that those who felt the Home was very influential in their lives also felt they had learned a great deal, and vice versa.

Subjective Interview Responses

The researchers asked each juvenile interviewed why he believed he was placed in the Home and to explain what kind of kids the Next Door, Inc. was designed for. They were also asked how outsiders viewed the Next Door, Inc. With these questions the researchers hoped

to discover whether these juveniles and the surrounding community viewed them as delinquents and to see if they viewed placement in the Home as punishment or as a way to receive help.

All of the interviewees said the Home was designed for kids with family problems and none mentioned explicitly it was for delinquents. Two comments follow, one from a male and one from a female, which are representative of answers to the question concerning the types of kids placed in the Home.

It's more for kids with family problems rather than for delinquents.

Three are here because things are messed up at home. One has personal problems. One was booted out of every school and one is here for runaway. It's set up for people with personal problems but not enough to be in McClaren.

There were a variety of answers to the question of how others outside the Home see the Next Door, Inc.

Kids on the cuts see it as a temporary place to stay.

The neighborhood really doesn't know about the Home. I have friends around the town and they all think this is a really nice place.

The kids think it's a far out place, most parents like it too but one said it was a place for hoodlums and he wouldn't let his daughter go out with me.

Kids in the community wish they were here because we have more freedom. Some parents complain because they feel we have too much freedom.

Another series of questions were aimed at uncovering the juveniles' feelings about how they are treated at the Next Door, Inc. All feelings given were positive, except in one instance, and the word "fair" came up time and time again.

There is no basis to complain, everything is fair and everyone is treated the same.

Dick and Holly (houseparents) are more like parents than my real ones.

Dick is good at helping with personal problems, he gets at you in a round about way.

People here are nice to be with and they don't put you down.

One boy felt more negative than the others and he said, "the houseparents only talk to you when you're in trouble." It is of interest that his responses to the attitude questionnaire were also generally negative.

When asked what the juveniles would change if they were running the home, they had trouble thinking of a response. Most of them said they wouldn't change anything but when pressed, some added they might change some of the rules such as having to stay home three nights a week, having to eat meals every night during the week, and changing the curfew.

I wouldn't change anything. Dick and Holly make mistakes but they apologize afterwards. We can spend nights with friends, it's no different here really, all parents make you come in.

In another question the researchers asked what the juveniles had learned from being in the Home and if they would recommend the Next Door, Inc. to a friend if their friend needed help. The responses are so varied that each juvenile's answers are given below.

1. I'm getting what I want, there's a good school here so I'm satisfied.

It depends on the situation as to whether or not I'd send a friend. I would if they needed a school or are having home problems.

2. People are helpful, everyone tells each other problems and tries to help one another. I didn't have any problems so didn't need to be helped.

It teaches you how to get along with people different from you.

3. You learn to know people better here than you do in other places.

4. Kids get all the help they need. Some resent discipline but they need it.

I can work out problems alone but I have learned to handle responsibility better and to create in harmony with others. Before I would punch someone in the mouth rather than try to settle it by talking.

5. It helped with everything, my temper is better, I'm a better dresser now.

6. It's no help except I don't have to see my stepfather. I didn't learn anything.
7. I'm learning to work things out with others by talking.
8. I learned how I act and I act differently in Hood River. I've been taking less drugs because I don't get any kicks from them anymore.

There were no questions on the group meetings specifically although some of the juveniles commented on them:

Group meetings aren't so good because no one wants to open up. I don't like to talk about problems in group because all the kids aren't the type you'd discuss things with.

I don't feel they are so good because we're forced to go to them. The kids close up and get defensive. I took psychology in school so I'm used to things like this. The others aren't and they don't trust each other yet.

For those juveniles who had been in foster homes previous to going to the Next Door, Inc., the researchers asked which they liked the best and why. They all said they would rather be in the Next Door, Inc.

I left the foster home because I was always having to babysit. I want to live at home but mother has to settle down.

This is better than a foster home because foster parents are older and there is less contact.

You're a slave in a foster home.

This chapter presented the findings on the main variables of this study as measured by the four instruments of data collection. The next chapter presents suggested implications of this data and recommendations for the program of the Next Door, Inc.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

1. The findings of the Jesness Inventory indicate that seventy-three per cent of the juveniles who participated in the research received an Asocial Index score of 60.00 or higher, thus indicating that they possess attitudes somewhat more delinquent prone than the average nondelinquent juvenile. Although these juveniles are within the normal range for their age, they are more delinquent prone than reasons for their referral might suggest. They also have more serious social and psychological problems than appear on the surface.

However, their attitudes have not influenced their behavior to the extent that they have committed serious violations of the law, thus diversion from the judicial process and from confinement in a county jail seems an appropriate goal which the Home is a means of achieving. This approach avoids the negative effects of isolation from the community agencies. As an alternative to detention in the county jail, and as a neutral home for youth in times of family crises, the Home has potential as a valuable and viable resource for the community, and, our study shows, for the juvenile.

2. All juveniles in the Time I and II comparisons held significantly more delinquent attitudes after a stay in the Home of two months. Asocial Index scores at Time II averaged at 71.00, two standard deviations above the norm for the nondelinquent population. The research did not uncover the reasons for this. In view of the positive reactions to the Home, the factors probably do not lie with any part of the program or relationships, except insofar as effort to discover the reasons for this increase and to treat them have been missing. Further research is necessary to determine if this trend will continue. The research team recommends that the Jesness Inventory continue to be given to all youths at entry to the Home and again at some specified time period.

3. If the trend towards an increase in the Asocial Index is found to continue, this indicates that the juveniles' attitudes are changing towards those of a delinquent subculture. Although further research is needed to determine the factors contributing to the youths' regression with respect to delinquency proneness and social adjustment, the researchers found that in all cases in which the Asocial Index increased, the Social Maladjustment score also increased considerably. The Social Maladjustment score, which refers to

. . . a set of attitudes associated with unfulfilled needs, as defined by the extent to which an individual shares the attitudes of persons who demonstrate inability to meet, in socially approved ways, the demands of their environment. . . .

is double-weighted in tabulation and has a sizable influence on the direction of change in the Asocial Index score. An implication of this finding is that these juveniles need help in developing values among themselves that are nondelinquent. This can be done by means of a closer peer/staff relationship and by a therapeutic milieu in which positive, nondelinquent values and attitudes are highly respected and modeled. Another means to achieve this end is through group meetings and activities in which a "group conscience" is encouraged to develop.

4. While continuing study is indicated, the data we have is consistent, has known statistical significance and can be used as a firm but tentative basis of program development and individual treatment. Mean scores for each scale of the Jesness can form a basis for developing the direction of programs. Standard deviations indicate how much flexibility in a program is indicated. In most cases, the higher the standard deviation, the more individual differences should be

considered. Scale scores indicate how much attention or emphasis is warranted with respect to a given factor. High scores for all scales, except that of the scale Denial, indicate that special attention is needed in that area. The probabilities, the t ratios and the statistical significance at given levels indicate how closely two elements are related, and are tests of assumptions about the program.

5. The range of adjustments as shown by the standard deviations, on the Jesness scales, is so wide that the program must be pitched to individual needs as well as to the common level of the group, and subgroups.

6. To aid in the task of evaluation of the juvenile's needs, the researchers suggest that the Jesness Inventory be used for diagnostic and program purposes. The Jesness Inventory is a sound instrument for diagnosis and program control. It correlates well with the other instruments used, and has the added advantage of standardization and comparability with studies elsewhere. If not employed in this way its categories and those of the Attitude Questionnaire and the Semantic Differential would be helpful guides in interviewing. These can aid in identifying areas of conflict for the child, as well as his strong and weak points, which could

increase the houseparents' and court personnel's understanding of the child's difficulties and needs.

7. The findings of the Attitude Questionnaire suggest that the largest number of juveniles feel most positive about the Home itself and generally positive or in the middle range about their relationships with their peers and about themselves. This indicates that these juveniles generally have close peer relationships and are very likely to be influenced strongly by their peers in their attitudes and values. Attitudes toward community and authority were more negative than positive, suggesting that these youths' perceptions of authority figures may be influenced by past negative, hostile or unfair experiences, whether with parents or other authority figures. Scores on the Alienation Scale of the Jesness, 1.5 standard deviations above the norm mean on the average, confirm this finding. This does not tell us if the youth's perceptions of his experiences with authority are reality-based or due to a psychological predisposition within the individual. In either case, it may be a factor on which the treatment program could focus either through group discussions on feelings and attitudes toward authority, i.e., rules, police, parents; or in individual counselling sessions.

8. From interviews with the youth, the researchers learned that they see the Home as a good learning experience, fair, reasonable and caring. Relations with houseparents are good, satisfying, helpful, and real.

9. According to the youth, the Home is well accepted by their peers, but not well understood or known by the adult community.

10. Many youth expressed dissatisfaction with the group meetings. Group sessions calling upon them to reveal themselves or their problems should be used with care. Many are threatened by an in-depth treatment oriented group and care should be taken in selecting such a group and post-release consequences need to be considered. A group in which problems of everyday living are aired and discussed can be helpful to the youth and a useful tool in a residential setting.

11. In collecting background data on these youth, it became obvious that a great many came from homes in which adequate care was not available to the juveniles. Ten of the eleven juveniles interviewed came from broken homes and nine juveniles had been placed in a foster home. In such cases a stable family life experience

and provision of a healthy marriage model can prove to be the most effective correction for these deficiencies. The structure of the group home is such that these experiences are naturally provided.

12. The daily contact and shared experiences between youth and houseparents give the houseparents a more intimate knowledge and awareness of the child's needs. However, the potential seriousness and variety of problems of the juveniles warrant a well qualified staff and treatment, not just service orientation.

13. Since admissions seemed to be restricted by the capacity of the Home, expansion of the program might be considered. An additional program designed as an alternative to foster care might be used in selected circumstances, such as when a juvenile is not ready for placement with a foster family or when his family circumstances are such that it is best that he not return home. Such an alternative would be especially appropriate in view of the present lack of foster homes in Hood River.

14. Base line data indicates that two rather distinct functions of the Home should be recognized: overnight shelter, and residential shelter. It is not clear from the study what differentiations are indicated, or how

much one interferes with the other. The researchers feel that at this point it would only be speculation to enumerate possible factors.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alan, et. al., Use of the Depth Interview in Examining Attitudes of Delinquent Boys: An Exploratory Study, unpublished thesis, School of Social Work, Portland State University, Portland, Oregon 1964.
- Application for Action Grant, State Law Enforcement Planning Agency, Project Title: The Next Door, Inc.
- Barron, Milton L., The Juvenile in Delinquent Society, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1955.
- Carter, Robert M., "The 'Authority Problem' Revisited," Federal Probation, Vol. 25, (Dec., 1961), pp. 52-56.
- Cavan, Ruth, Juvenile Delinquency, J. B. Lippincott Co., New York, 1969.
- _____, Readings in Juvenile Delinquency, J. B. Lippincott Co., New York, 1964.
- Child Welfare League of America Standards for Services of Child Welfare Institutions, Child Welfare League of America, New York, 1963.
- Cohen, Albert and James Short, "Research in Delinquent Subculture," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 14, No. 3, 1958.
- "Community Based Correctional Programs," Crime and Delinquency Topic Series, National Institute of Mental Health, Maryland, 1971.
- "Diversion from the Criminal Justice System," Crime and Delinquency Topic Series, National Institute of Mental Health, Maryland, 1971.
- Erickson, Erik H., "Identity and the Life Cycle," Psychological Issues, Vol. 1, No. 1, International University Press, New York, 1959.

- Falsberg, Martin, "Setting Limits with the Juvenile Delinquent," Social Casework, Vol. 38, No. 3 (March, 1957), pp. 138-142.
- Fink, Arthur E., "Authority in the Correctional Process," Federal Probation, Vol. 25 (Sept., 1961), pp. 34-40.
- Glueck, Sheldon and Eleanor, Family Environment and Delinquency, Houghton-Mifflin Co., Boston, 1952.
- Gibbons, Don C., and Duane C. Lemley, Correctional Feasibility Study, District 9, State of Oregon Corrections Division, Salem, Oregon (June, 1971).
- Hardman, Dale G., "The Constructive Use of Authority," Crime and Delinquency, Vol. VI (July, 1960), pp. 245-254.
- Institutions Serving Delinquent Children: Guides and Goals, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.
- Jesness, Carl F., The Jesness Inventory, Research Report No. 35, California Youth Authority (Nov., 1963).
- Kahn, Alfred J., When Children Must be Committed: Proposals for Diversified Systems of Facilities, Citizens' Committee for Children of New York, Inc., New York (June, 1960).
- Keller, Oliver J. and Benedict S. Alper, Halfway Houses: Community-Centered Corrections and Treatment, Heath Lexington Books, Lexington, Mass., 1970.
- Kenney, John P., Police Work with Juveniles, Charles C. Thomas, Springfield, Ill., 1954.
- Konopka, Gisela, Group Work in the Institution, Associated Press, New York, 1954.
- , "Our Outcast Youth," Social Work, Vol. 15, No. 4, (Oct., 1970), pp. 76-86.

- Kvaraceus, William C., Juvenile Delinquency, National Education Association, Washington, D.C., 1958.
- Maier, Henry, Group Work as a Part of Residential Treatment, National Association of Social Work, New York, 1965.
- Moore, Bernice M., Juvenile Delinquency: Research, Theory and Comment, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Washington, D.C., 1958.
- Muus, Rolf E., Theories of Adolescence, Random House, New York, 1968.
- Polsky, Howard W., Cottage Six: The Social System of Delinquent Boys in Residential Treatment, Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1962.
- Reckless, Walter, et.al., "Study of Self-Concept as an Insulator Against Delinquency," American Sociological Review, Vol. 21, No. 6 (Dec., 1956), pp. 744-746.
- Redl, Fritz, and David Wineman, The Aggressive Child, The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., New York, 1957.
- Sherif, Muzafer and Carolyn W., Reference Groups; Exploration into Conformity and Deviation of Adolescents, Harper and Row, New York, 1964.
- Sheridan, William, "Juveniles Who Commit Noncriminal Acts: Why Treat in a Correctional System?" Federal Probation, Vol. 31, No. 1 (March, 1967), pp. 26-30.
- Sorenson, Roy, "Youth's Need for Challenge and a Place in Society," Children, Vol. 9, No. 4 (July-August, 1962), pp. 131-138.
- Standards for Child-Caring Institutions in Oregon, State Public Welfare Commission, Salem, Oregon, 1963.
- Studt, Elliot, "An Outline for Study of Social Authority Factors in Casework," Social Casework, Vol. 35 (June, 1954), pp. 231-238.

Selected Empirical Bibliography

- Chandler, Charles and Albert J. Shafter, "A Critique of the Group Placement Concept," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, Vol. 59 (January, 1955).
- Empey, LaMar T. and Jerome Labow, "The Provo Experiment in Delinquency Rehabilitation," American Sociological Review, Vol. 26 (October, 1961).
- _____, and Steven G. Lubeck, The Silverlake Experiment: Delinquency Theory and Community Intervention, Aldine Publishing Co., Chicago, Ill., 1971.
- Flackett, John and Gail Flackett, "Criswell House: An Alternative to Institutional Commitment for the Juvenile Offender," Federal Probation, Vol. 34, No. 4 (December, 1970).
- Gula, Martin, "Group Homes: New and Differentiated Tools in Child Welfare, Delinquency and Mental Health," Group Homes in Perspective, Child Welfare League of America, New York, 1967.
- Haire, Sharlene and Ted Palmer, An Overview of Issues Central to the Use of Group Homes for Youthful Offenders, State of California Human Relations Agency, Dept. of the Youth Authority (November, 1969).
- McNeil, Frances, "A Halfway House Program for Delinquency," Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 13, No. 4 (October, 1967).
- Miller, Lovick C., "Southfield--Evaluation of a Short Term Inpatient Treatment Center for Delinquents," Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 16, No. 3 (July, 1970).
- Post, G. C., R. A. Hicks and M. F. Monfort, "Day Care Programs for Delinquents: A New Treatment Approach," Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 14, No. 4
- Sarcka, Anne, "Halfway Houses," Encyclopedia of Social Work, Vol. 1, National Association of Social Work, New York, 1971.

APPENDIX A

ADMISSION CRITERIA FOR YOUTH HOMES IN HOOD RIVER AND WASCO COUNTIES

I. Circumstances in which a youth will be considered for placement,

A. Youth's General Situation

1. Youth is neglected or abused.
2. Youth's parents are absent or ill.
3. Youth and parents or foster parents are in conflict.
4. Youth is awaiting placement by the Court or Children's Services Division.
- (The Dalles) 5. Youth has committed a delinquent act and is also found to have an important problem as listed in Nos. 1, 2 and 3 above.
- (Hood River) 5. Youth has committed a delinquent act but is not felt to be dangerous to himself or the community.

B. Youth's Attitude

1. Youth amenable to receiving help.
2. Youth willing to accept placement in the home as an alternative.
3. Youth willing not to run away and keep the house rules.
4. Youth agrees to attend school or maintain employment.

II. Circumstances in which a youth will not be considered for placement.

A. Youth's General Situation

1. Youth who seeks some advantage over his parents and by so doing would make improper use of the home.
2. A parent who seeks to use the home as a punishment or threat for the youth.
- (The Dalles) 3. Youth who has committed some offense but is not experiencing marked conflict or crisis in the home.
4. Youth is psychotic or is a pyromaniac or sexually deviant.

B. Youth's Attitude

1. Youth does not want help.
2. Youth is not willing to voluntarily accept the home as a planning alternative.
3. Youth will make no commitment not to run away or keep the house rules.
4. Youth refuses to attend school or maintain employment.
5. Youth who will make no effort to improve his behavior.
6. Youth who acts out violently.

Note:

1. The Dalles accepts youths of both sexes 12 through 17 years of age for a period not generally to exceed 30 days.
2. Hood River accepts youths of both sexes 10 through 18 years of age for a period which may exceed 30 days and become long term care.

The Next Door, Inc.
1029 May Street
Hood River, Oregon

Dear Sir:

I would like to request that you accept me for placement in The Next Door instead of being detained in some other place.

If you accept me in the home, I agree not to run away, and I also agree to obey all the rules of The Next Door as set forth on the attached sheet as well as the requests and orders of the people operating the home.

Very truly yours,

Date _____

STAFFING SHEET

NAME _____ DATE _____

Houseparent Check List
(circle one)

	Poor			Excellent	
House behavior	1	2	3	4	5
School behavior	1	2	3	4	5
Community behavior	1	2	3	4	5
Handles privileges	1	2	3	4	5
Relates to houseparents	1	2	3	4	5
Relates to peers	1	2	3	4	5
Organizes self	1	2	3	4	5
Follows through	1	2	3	4	5
General attitude	1	2	3	4	5
Self concept	1	2	3	4	5
Emotional stability	1	2	3	4	5

Privilege status:

Notes and Comments:

Staffing plan:

APPENDIX B

THE JESNESS INVENTORY

ITEMS COMPOSING SCALE 1 - SOCIAL MALADJUSTMENT

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Scored Direction</u>	
1.	T	When you're in trouble, it's best to keep quiet about it.
3.	T	I get into a lot of fights.
4.	T	I worry too much about doing the right things.
5.	F	I always like to hang around with the same bunch of friends.
6.	T	I am smarter than most boys I know.
7.	F	It makes me mad that some crooks get off free.
9.	F	Most police will try to help you.
13.	F	A person never knows when he will get mad, or have trouble.
14.	T	If the police don't like you, they will try to get you for anything.
18.	F	People always seem to favor a certain boy or girl ahead of the others.
22.	T	A person like me fights first and asks questions later.
26.	T	If I could, I'd just as soon quit school right now.
27.	T	Sometimes it's fun to steal something.
30.	T	Women seem more friendly and happy than men.
32.	T	Police stick their noses into a lot of things that are none of their business.
35.	T	I hardly ever get a fair break.
41.	T	A lot of strange things happen to me.
45.	F	It would be fun to work in a carnival or playland.
48.	F	Sometimes people treat grown boys and girls like they were babies.
51.	T	If someone in your family gets into trouble it's better for you to stick together than to tell the police.
53.	T	It always seems like something bad happens when I try to be good.
54.	T	Most men are bossy and mean.

SOCIAL MALADJUSTMENT (Cont'd)

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Score</u> <u>Direction</u>	
56.	T	It seems like wherever I am I'd rather be somewhere else.
58.	T	I think that someone who is fourteen years old is old enough to smoke.
64.	T	Police usually treat you dirty.
67.	T	I often feel lonesome and sad.
70.	T	A lot of times I do things that my folks tell me I shouldn't do.
71.	T	It's fun to get the police to chase you.
72.	T	A lot of people say bad things about me behind my back.
74.	T	It seems like people keep expecting me to get into some kind of trouble.
76.	T	Other people are happier than I am.
78.	F	I really don't have very many problems to worry about.
79.	F	Being called a sissy is about the worst thing I know.
81.	T	If a bunch of you are in trouble, you should stick together on a story.
82.	T	I have a lot of headaches.
85.	T	I would rather be alone than with others.
90.	T	Policemen and judges will tell you one thing and do another.
103.	F	Parents are always nagging and picking on young people.
108.	T	My life at home is always happy.
110.	F	A lot of women seem bossy and mean.
111.	T	Nobody seems to understand me or how I feel.
113.	T	I am always kind.
118.	T	I don't mind lying if I'm in trouble.
121.	T	I worry most of the time.
122.	T	If you're not in with the gang, you may be in for some real trouble.
124.	T	My mind is full of bad thoughts.
126.	T	Sometimes when my folks tell me not to do something, I go ahead and do it anyway.
128.	T	I hardly ever feel excited or thrilled.
129.	T	When something bad happens, I almost always blame myself instead of the other person.

SOCIAL MALADJUSTMENT (Cont'd)

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Scored Direction</u>	
130.	T	The people who run things are usually against me.
132.	F	Most people who act so perfect are just putting on a big front.
135.	T	I think my mother should be stricter than she is about a lot of things.
136.	T	I like to read and study.
137.	T	I feel alone even when there are other people around me.
140.	T	I often have trouble getting my breath.
141.	F	I worry about how well I'm doing in school.
146.	T	I am nervous.
147.	T	Stealing isn't so bad if it's from a rich person.
149.	T	Things don't seem real to me.
150.	T	I am afraid of the dark.
151.	F	Families argue too much.
153.	T	I think there is something wrong with my mind.
155.	T	When I get into trouble, it's usually my own fault.

ITEMS COMPOSING SCALE 2 - VALUE ORIENTATION

5.	T	I always like to hang around with the same bunch of friends.
9.	F	Most police will try to help you.
12.	T	Most people will cheat a little in order to make some money.
20.	T	Most police are pretty dumb.
23.	T	I have very strange and funny thoughts in my mind.
24.	T	It's hard to have fun unless you're with your buddies.
28.	T	I notice my heart beats very fast when people keep asking me questions.
29.	T	When I get really mad, I'll do just about anything.
30.	T	Women seem more friendly and happy than men.
32.	T	Police stick their noses into a lot of things that are none of their business.

VALUE ORIENTATION (Cont'd)

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Scored Direction</u>	
40.	T	Winning a fight is about the best fun there is.
47.	T	Sometimes I feel dizzy for no reason.
51.	T	If someone in your family gets into trouble, it's better for you to stick together than to tell the police.
53.	T	It always seems like something bad happens when I try to be good.
54.	T	Most men are bossy and mean.
56.	T	It seems like wherever I am I'd rather be somewhere else.
65.	T	Most of the time I can't seem to find anything to do.
69.	T	Nothing much ever happens.
70.	T	A lot of times I do things that my folks tell me I shouldn't do.
74.	T	It seems like people keep expecting me to get into some kind of trouble.
77.	T	If I could only have a car at home, things would be all right.
81.	T	If a bunch of you are in trouble, you should stick together on a story.
82.	T	I have a lot of headaches.
90.	T	Policemen and judges will tell you one thing and do another.
91.	T	It is hard for me to talk to my parents about my troubles.
98.	T	It doesn't seem wrong to steal from crooked store owners.
99.	T	I would never back down from a fight.
103.	T	Parents are always nagging and picking on young people.
107.	T	At home I am punished too much for things I don't do.
111.	T	Nobody seems to understand me or how I feel.
118.	T	I don't mind lying if I'm in trouble.
119.	T	A boy who won't fight is just no good.
121.	T	I worry most of the time.
133.	T	When luck is against you, there isn't much you can do about it.
143.	T	People hardly ever give me a fair chance.
144.	T	I like to daydream more than anything else.

VALUE ORIENTATION (Cont'd)

Item No.	Score Direction	
147.	T	Stealing isn't so bad if it's from a rich person.
152.	T	Sometimes it seems like I'd rather get into trouble, instead of trying to stay away from it.
155.	F	When I get into trouble, it's usually my own fault.

ITEMS COMPOSING SCALE 3 - IMMATURITY

8.	T	My feelings get hurt easily when I am scolded or criticized.
11.	F	When somebody orders me to do something I usually feel like doing just the opposite.
12.	F	Most people will cheat a little in order to make some money.
13.	F	A person never knows when he will get mad, or have trouble.
18.	F	People always seem to favor a certain boy or girl ahead of the others.
19.	T	I never lie.
31.	F	It is easy for me to talk to strangers.
33.	F	A lot of fathers don't seem to care if they hurt your feelings.
38.	T	Only a baby cries when he is hurt.
39.	F	Most adults are really very nice.
42.	T	I have all the friends I need.
44.	F	Nowadays they make it a big crime to get into a little mischief.
48.	F	Sometimes people treat grown boys and girls like they were babies.
50.	T	When things go wrong, there isn't much you can do about it.
57.	F	Once in a while I get angry.
62.	T	I have a real mean streak in me.
70.	F	A lot of times I do things that my folks tell me I shouldn't do.
75.	T	I like everyone I know.
76.	T	Other people are happier than I am.
79.	T	Being called a sissy is about the worst thing I know.
81.	F	If a bunch of you are in trouble, you should stick together on a story.

IMMATURITY (Cont'd)

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Score</u> <u>Direction</u>	
83.	F	Teachers always have favorites who can get away with anything.
84.	T	Every day is full of things that keep me interested.
86.	T	I can't seem to take much kidding or teasing.
88.	T	I never get mad at anybody.
92.	T	I am liked by everybody who knows me.
95.	T	I am always nice to everyone.
96.	T	It takes someone pretty smart to get ahead of me.
101.	T	I will do a lot of crazy things if somebody dares me.
104.	T	Some day I would like to drive a race car.
108.	T	My life at home is always happy.
112.	T	Most people get into trouble because of bad luck.
115.	F	Sometimes I don't like school.
120.	T	To get along all right nowadays, a person has to be pretty tough.
125.	T	When you're in trouble, nobody much cares to help you.
126.	F	Sometimes when my folks tell me not to do something, I go ahead and do it anyway.
127.	T	It's best not to think about your problems.
131.	T	I have too much trouble making up my mind.
132.	F	Most people who act so perfect are just putting on a big front.
134.	T	I get tired easily.
139.	F	I always hate it when I have to ask someone for a favor.
140.	T	I often have trouble getting my breath.
145.	T	The only way to really settle anything is to fight it out.
150.	T	I am afraid of the dark.
151.	F	Families argue too much.

ITEMS COMPOSING SCALE 4 - AUTISM

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Scored Direction</u>	
17.	T	Sometimes I feel like I don't really have a home.
18.	F	People always seem to favor a certain boy or girl ahead of the others.
24.	F	It's hard to have fun unless you're with your buddies.
47.	T	Sometimes I feel dizzy for no reason.
49.	F	It makes me feel bad to be bawled out or criticized.
60.	T	If somebody does something mean to me, I try to get back at them.
71.	T	It's fun to get the police to chase you.
72.	T	A lot of people say bad things about me behind my back.
80.	T	When I'm alone I hear strange things.
82.	T	I have a lot of headaches.
94.	F	Too many people like to act big and tough.
96.	T	It takes someone pretty smart to get ahead of me.
97.	T	Talking over your troubles with an older person seems like "kid stuff."
104.	T	Some day I would like to drive a race car.
106.	T	I feel sick to my stomach every once in a while.
123.	T	I really think I'm better looking than most others my age.
134.	T	I get tired easily.
137.	T	I feel alone even when there are other people around me.
138.	T	I'm good at out-smarting others.
140.	T	I often have trouble getting my breath.
142.	T	For my size, I'm really pretty tough.
144.	T	I like to daydream more than anything else.
145.	T	The only way to really settle anything is to fight it out.
147.	T	Stealing isn't so bad if it's from a rich person.
148.	T	My parents seem to think I might end up being a bum.

AUTISM (Cont'd)

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Scored Direction</u>	
149.	T	Things don't seem real to me.
150.	T	I am afraid of the dark.
153.	T	I think there is something wrong with my mind.

ITEMS COMPOSING SCALE 5 - ALIENATION

1.	T	When you're in trouble, it's best to keep quiet about it.
2.	F	It makes me nervous to sit still very long.
9.	F	Most police will try to help you.
14.	T	If the police don't like you, they will try to get you for anything.
15.	T	A person is better off if he doesn't trust people.
32.	T	Police stick their noses into a lot of things that are none of their business.
35.	T	I hardly ever get a fair break.
39.	F	Most adults are really very nice.
42.	T	I have all the friends I need.
50.	T	When things go wrong, there isn't much you can do about it.
54.	T	Most men are bossy and mean.
55.	T	I don't care if people like me or not.
61.	T	You can hardly ever believe what parents tell you.
64.	T	Police usually treat you dirty.
81.	T	If a bunch of you are in trouble, you should stick together on a story.
90.	T	Policemen and judges will tell you one thing and do another.
103.	T	Parents are always nagging and picking on young people.
107.	T	At home I am punished too much for things I don't do.
110.	T	A lot of women seem bossy and mean.
125.	T	When you're in trouble, nobody much cares to help you.
127.	T	It's best not to think about your problems.
128.	T	I hardly ever feel excited or thrilled.
130.	T	The people who run things are usually against me.

ALIENATION (Cont'd)

<u>Item</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Scored</u> <u>Direction</u>	
143.	T	People hardly ever give me a fair chance.
146.	F	I am nervous.
155.	F	When I get into trouble, it's usually my own fault.

ITEMS COMPOSING SCALE 6 - MANIFEST AGGRESSION

3.	T	I get into a lot of fights.
5.	T	I always like to hang around with the same bunch of friends.
10.	T	Sometimes I feel like I want to beat up on somebody.
11.	T	When somebody orders me to do something I usually feel like doing just the opposite.
12.	T	Most people will cheat a little in order to make some money.
13.	T	A person never knows when he will get mad, or have trouble.
18.	T	People always seem to favor a certain boy or girl ahead of the others.
22.	T	A person like me fights first and asks questions later.
23.	T	I have very strange and funny thoughts in my mind.
24.	T	It's hard to have fun unless you're with your buddies.
27.	T	Sometimes it's fun to steal something.
29.	T	When I get really mad, I'll do just about anything.
30.	T	Women seem more friendly and happy than men.
33.	T	A lot of fathers don't seem to care if they hurt your feelings.
37.	T	I seem to "blow up" a lot over little things that really don't matter very much.
38.	F	Only a baby cries when he is hurt.
41.	T	A lot of strange things happen to me.
53.	T	It always seems like something bad happens when I try to be good.
55.	T	It seems like wherever I am I'd rather be somewhere else.

MANIFEST AGGRESSION (Cont'd)

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Scored Direction</u>	
62.	T	I have a real mean streak in me.
65.	T	Most of the time I can't seem to find anything to do.
83.	T	Teachers always have favorites who can get away with anything.
86.	T	I can't seem to take much kidding or teasing.
89.	T	I keep wishing something exciting would happen.
93.	T	It seems easier for me to act bad than to show my good feelings.
100.	T	I have a lot of bad things on my mind that people don't know about.
117.	T	At times I feel like blowing up over little things.
124.	T	My mind is full of bad thoughts.
151.	T	Families argue too much.
152.	T	Sometimes it seems like I'd rather get into trouble, instead of trying to stay away from it.
154.	T	I get angry very quickly.

ITEMS COMPOSING SCALE 7 - WITHDRAWAL

5.	F	I always like to hang around with the same bunch of friends.
7.	T	It makes me mad that some crooks get off free.
11.	F	When somebody orders me to do something I usually feel like doing just the opposite.
43.	F	I get a kick out of getting some people angry and all shook up.
45.	T	It would be fun to work in a carnival or playland.
46.	T	My father is too busy to worry much about me, or spend much time with me.
49.	T	It makes me feel bad to be bawled out or criticized.
52.	T	I can't seem to keep my mind on anything.
63.	T	I don't think I will ever be a success or amount to much.

WITHDRAWAL (Cont'd)

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Scored Direction</u>	
67.	T	I often feel lonesome and sad.
69.	T	Nothing much ever happens.
70.	T	A lot of times I do things that my folks tell me I shouldn't do.
76.	T	Other people are happier than I am.
77.	T	If I could only have a car at home, things would be all right.
85.	T	I would rather be alone than with others.
91.	T	It is hard for me to talk to my parents about my troubles.
94.	T	Too many people like to act big and tough.
99.	F	I would never back down from a fight.
105.	T	I sit and daydream more than I should.
111.	T	Nobody seems to understand me or how I feel.
118.	F	I don't mind lying if I'm in trouble.
119.	F	A boy who won't fight is just no good.
121.	T	I worry most of the time.
131.	T	I have too much trouble making up my mind.

ITEMS COMPOSING SCALE 8 - SOCIAL ANXIETY

1.	F	When you're in trouble, it's best to keep quiet about it.
2.	T	It makes me nervous to sit still very long.
4.	T	I worry too much about doing the right things.
8.	T	My feelings get hurt easily when I am scolded or criticized.
15.	F	A person is better off if he doesn't trust people.
21.	T	I worry about what other people think of me.
25.	T	I get nervous when I ask someone to do me a favor.
28.	T	I notice my heart beats very fast when people keep asking me questions.
31.	F	It is easy for me to talk to strangers.
34.	T	I am secretly afraid of a lot of things.

SOCIAL ANXIETY (Cont'd)

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Scored Direction</u>	
35.	F	I hardly ever get a fair break.
36.	T	Others seem to do things easier than I can.
45.	F	It would be fun to work in a carnival or playland.
48.	T	Sometimes people treat grown boys and girls like they were babies.
66.	T	It's hard for me to show people how I feel about them.
68.	F	I don't mind it when I'm teased and made fun of.
73.	T	I wish I wasn't so shy and bashful.
78.	F	I really don't have very many problems to worry about.
102.	T	Having to talk in front of the class makes me afraid.
139.	T	I always hate it when I have to ask someone for a favor.
141.	T	I worry about how well I'm doing in school.
142.	F	For my size, I'm really pretty tough.
146.	T	I am nervous.
155.	T	When I get into trouble it's usually my own fault.

ITEMS COMPOSING SCALE 9 - REPRESSION

19.	T	I never lie.
48.	F	Sometimes people treat grown boys and girls like they were babies.
57.	F	Once in a while I get angry.
68.	T	I don't mind it when I'm teased and made fun of.
75.	T	I like everyone I know.
78.	T	I really don't have very many problems to worry about.
88.	T	I never get mad at anybody.
92.	T	I am liked by everybody who knows me.
95.	T	I am always nice to everyone.
108.	T	My life at home is always happy.
113.	T	I am always kind.
115.	F	Sometimes I don't like school.
126.	F	Sometimes when my folks tell me not to do something, I go ahead and do it anyway.

REPRESSION (Cont'd)

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Scored Direction</u>	
129.	T	When something bad happens, I almost always blame myself instead of the other person.
136.	T	I like to read and study.

ITEMS COMPOSING SCALE 10 - DENIAL

8.	F	My feelings get hurt easily when I am scolded or criticized.
16.	F	Sometimes I wish I could quit school.
17.	F	Sometimes I feel like I don't really have a home.
33.	F	A lot of fathers don't seem to care if they hurt your feelings.
39.	T	Most adults are really very nice.
46.	F	My father is too busy to worry much about me, or spend much time with me.
53.	F	It always seems like something bad happens when I try to be good.
59.	F	Most parents seem to be too strict.
65.	F	Most of the time I can't seem to find anything to do.
66.	F	It's hard for me to show people how I feel about them.
67.	F	I often feel lonesome and sad.
69.	F	Nothing much ever happens.
84.	T	Every day is full of things that keep me interested.
87.	F	I don't seem to care enough about what happens to me.
91.	F	It is hard for me to talk to my parents about my troubles.
103.	F	Parents are always nagging and picking on young people.
107.	F	At home I am punished too much for things I don't do.
110.	F	A lot of women seem bossy and mean.
114.	T	Talking with my parents is just as easy as talking with others my own age.
135.	T	I think my mother should be stricter than she is about a lot of things.

ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE

Circle the answer that best fits how you feel.

1. Real friends are hard to find where I live.

Very true True Undecided Untrue Very untrue

2. Some people in my town "get by with murder" while others take the rap for doing any little thing wrong.

Very true True Undecided Untrue Very untrue

3. People are not concerned about what kids do as long as they keep out of trouble.

Very true True Undecided Untrue Very untrue

Mark an "X" on the section of the vertical line that best describes how you feel. Mark the "X" between the horizontal lines, not on them.

4. How do you feel about the community's (schools, court, police, neighbors, etc.) concern and interest for you?

5. Have you learned anything while being here (about yourself, others, etc.)?

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALE

Here is a list of twelve words and their opposites. The lines in between the words stand for the different degrees of difference between them. Rate the "Next Door, Inc." on all twelve scales by marking an "X" on the line between each set of words to show where you feel the Next Door would be. Mark whatever comes to your head first; do not spend much time thinking of your answer.

helpful	_ _ _ _ _ _ _	unhelpful
valuable	_ _ _ _ _ _ _	worthless
nice	_ _ _ _ _ _ _	awful
clean	_ _ _ _ _ _ _	dirty
noisy	_ _ _ _ _ _ _	quiet
good	_ _ _ _ _ _ _	bad
large	_ _ _ _ _ _ _	small
strong	_ _ _ _ _ _ _	weak
deep	_ _ _ _ _ _ _	shallow
fast	_ _ _ _ _ _ _	slow
active	_ _ _ _ _ _ _	passive
hot	_ _ _ _ _ _ _	cold

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALE (Cont'd)

Following the same instructions as for the last question, rate "Authority" on this same scale.

helpful		unhelpful
valuable		worthless
nice		awful
clean		dirty
noisy		quiet
good		bad
large		small
strong		weak
deep		shallow
fast		slow
active		passive
hot		cold

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALE (Cont'd)

Following the same instructions as for the last question, rate "Me" (yourself) on this same scale.

helpful		unhelpful
valuable		worthless
nice		awful
clean		dirty
noisy		quiet
good		bad
large		small
strong		weak
deep		shallow
fast		slow
active		passive
hot		cold