



The Group Home Project

California -

A DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

**DIFFERENTIAL TREATMENT ENVIRONMENTS
FOR DELINQUENTS** - Progress Report, 2nd Year

Second Year Progress Report

By

JOHN W. PEARSON
SHARLENE E. HAIRE
THEODORE B. PALMER

Sponsors:

California Youth Authority
National Institute of Mental Health

18068

Research Report No. 2
AUGUST, 1968

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

RONALD REAGAN
Governor

SPENCER WILLIAMS
Administrator
Human Relations Agency

DEPARTMENT OF YOUTH AUTHORITY

ALLEN F. BREED
Director

GEORGE SALEEBEY
Deputy Director

HARRY R. WILSON
Chief, Division of Rehabilitation

THOMAS A. MCGEE
Deputy Chief
Division of Rehabilitation

KEITH S. GRIFFITHS, Ph. D.
Chief, Division of Research

GROUP HOME PROJECT
3526 Fifth Avenue
Sacramento, California 95817

Theodore B. Palmer, Ph. D.
Principal Investigator

Glenn W. Avery
Co-Investigator

John W. Pearson
Research Analyst

Sharlene E. Haire
Coordinator

Leilani J. Johnston
Stenographer

Margaret M. Smith
Stenographer
(to June, 1968)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION.....	1
OVERVIEW OF THE DTED PROGRAM.....	3
Background.....	3
Study Population.....	5
Management of the Project and the Homes.....	5
Selection of Group Home Parents.....	8
Research Activities.....	10
CHRONOLOGY OF MAJOR PROJECT DEVELOPMENTS 7/1/67 - 6/30/68.....	12
REVIEW OF DEVELOPMENTS WITHIN SPECIFIC GROUP HOMES.....	14
Type I Protective Home.....	14
Type II Containment Home.....	23
Type III Boarding Home.....	37
Type IV Temporary Care Home.....	48
Type V Temporary Restriction Home.....	54
Type VI Individualized Home.....	56
Type VII Girls' Home.....	59
DEVELOPMENT AND COORDINATION OF GROUP HOMES.....	60
Introduction.....	60
Recruitment of Group Home Parents.....	60
Training: General.....	64
Training: Events, Interactions, and Techniques Related to Group Home Development and Impact upon Wards within Specific Homes....	68
Type I Home.....	68
Type II Home.....	73
Type III Home.....	78
Type IV Home.....	80
Type VI Home.....	81
SUMMARY DISCUSSION OF RESEARCH GOALS AND EMERGING ISSUES.....	83
Feasibility.....	83
Taxonomy.....	101
Impact upon Wards.....	104
General Worth and Utility.....	105
Concluding Remarks.....	107
APPENDICES.....	108

APPENDICES

	Page
A Group Home Model Types.....	108
B Contracting.....	113
C Group Home Instruments and Forms.....	115
D Definitions and Explanatory Remarks Relative to Appendices E and K, Tables 2, 3, 4, and 5.....	119
E Group Homes/CTP: Population Data Summaries (Long-Term Placement Homes: Protective, Containment and Boarding).....	120
F Type I Protective Home: Placement Patterns.....	121
G Percentages of Wards by I-level Placed in the Type I, II, and III Homes.....	122
H Type I Protective Home: Home Rules.....	123
I Type II Containment Home: Placement Patterns.....	124
J Type III Boarding Home: Placement Patterns.....	125
K Type IV Temporary Care Home (Mr. and Mrs. N): Population Data.....	126
L Type IV Temporary Care Home: Placement Patterns.....	127
M Type IV Temporary Care Home: Home Rules.....	128
N Group Home Project Guidelines for Parole Agents and Group Home Managers.....	129
O CTP/DTED Paid Out-of-Home Placements.....	135

TABLES

	Page
1. DTED Group Home Parents: Population Data.....	9
2. Type I, Protective Home: Population Data.....	15
3. Type II, Containment Home: Population Data.....	24
4. Type III, Boarding Home: Population Data.....	38
5. Type IV, Temporary Care Home: Population Data.....	51
6. Selected Characteristics and Sources of Referral to Project by Type of Home.....	61
7. Screening Sequence and Marital Status of Referrals to Project by Home Type.....	70

INTRODUCTION

The First Year Progress Report of the Differential Treatment Environments for Delinquents Project (DTED)¹ submitted to NIMH in August, 1967, covered the period April 1, 1966 to July 1, 1967 and contained a historical perspective on the implementation of the proposal. This included: (a) the rationale of the study, (b) Program and Procedures, (c) the Development and Status of the Group Homes, (d) Issues Relating to Feasibility (e.g., contracting, communication) and, (e) Summary Impressions to Date. The appendices included various population descriptions, staffing guides and data collection instruments, descriptions of the alternative ways of contracting with group homes, and an outline of the specific contracts and budgets for each of the homes that had been developed.

The present report covers the period July 1, 1967, through June 30, 1968. It consists of an overview of the program and major project developments, a summary of the operation and development of the group homes, general discussion in regard to research goals, and a section by the Group Home Coordinator. Various descriptive tables appear in the text and appendices.

Data collection will continue through approximately June, 1969. The remaining four months will be spent in extensive, detailed evaluation and presentation of data for the Project's final report in September, 1969. Other separate reports may be published prior to September, 1969, dealing with specific aspects of the total project.

The last year has seen the Project become more "settled in", with three long-term homes in operation. The first DTED home to be established (Type II, Containment) was cancelled at the close of the reporting year, and efforts to establish the Type V (Temporary Restriction) home were terminated. However, an additional home (Type VI, Individualized) has been developed and research involvement with a non-DTED girls group home may begin before very long.

Many important issues relating to feasibility and other research goals have emerged during this year, generally with an increasing degree of complexity. We will attempt to convey the quality of these experiences often in the form of impressionistic reporting and discussion. Since the Project is, by design, of an exploratory rather than hypothesis-testing nature, succinct reporting is difficult - and, we feel, often inappropriate even though many readers may not have the time or the will-power to bear with us. However, by reporting in depth and in detail we hope that some aspect of our experiences may provide a clue, a suggestion, to someone involved in program planning or implementation. To report otherwise would be to lose the quality of our experiences and perhaps that clue or suggestion.

Future reports - such as the present one and the First Year Progress Report - will continue to be addressed to a broad range of readers; however,

¹DTED and Group Home Project will be used interchangeably to refer to the present project.

their main audience should be those in child care services who may wish to become vicariously involved in our program in depth and detail. An Interim Progress Report (July, 1968) and possibly a short "highlights" summary of results in September, 1969, will provide the casual reader with a succinct overview.

For the most part the reporting and impressions are those of the Research Analyst assigned to the Project.¹ Much of the supportive data has not been fully analyzed as yet. However, the reporting here comes as a result of first-hand, systematic involvement in all aspects of the project. Many issues and impressions which are presented represent a substantial amount of converging evidence and agreement, among a wide range of CTP and Group Home Staff.

This report has been reviewed prior to publication - both by Parole Operations and Research Staff. In general, it has been seen as an accurate synthesis of the past year's experience. There are, of course, some areas of disagreement and to the extent possible, the areas have been specified as such. Beyond this, however, some areas are quite complex and need more in-depth study than can be done at present. For example, in describing the Project's experience in attempting to operate on the basis of a team approach to the management of given homes, an attempt has been made in the present report to outline significant issues and dimensions. The in-depth evaluation of our experiences in this area will come in the coming year.

Background

The Group Home Project, though separately funded, is an integral part of the Community Treatment Project (CTP) in Sacramento and Stockton, California. CTP, a research-demonstration project, also jointly sponsored by NIMH and the California Youth Authority, has been operating since 1961. It compares an intensive treatment-control program in the community (average of twelve cases per Agent) with the traditional California Youth Authority program (typically institutionalization), for Juvenile Court committed wards from the Stockton and Sacramento areas.²

An experimental-control design carried out in CTP has permitted random assignments of wards to the community program and to the traditional program from a pool of eligible subjects. All CTP cases are classified according to the "Interpersonal Maturity Level Classification: Juvenile (I-level)."³

CTP's goals to date have been:

- (1) Comparison of the effectiveness of a period of treatment in the community with a period of incarceration;
- (2) the refinement of a classification scheme (the Interpersonal Maturity Level Classification: Juvenile);
- (3) the development of treatment models which describe specific treatment plans for defined types of delinquents in specified kinds of settings;

¹The First Year Progress Report (August, 1967) went into greater detail in this area. The overview section of the present report is only a summary of major points.

²In 1965, the Community Treatment Project was expanded to include an additional two units in San Francisco. One is a Differential Treatment Unit similar to the Stockton and Sacramento units. The program of the other unit is designed along lines of Empey's Guided Group Interaction approach.

³The code names and delinquent subtypes of the classification system are as follows:

<u>Code Names</u>	<u>Delinquent Subtypes</u>
I ₂ Aa	Asocial Aggressive
Ap	Asocial Passive
I ₃ Cfm	Immature Conformist
Cfc	Cultural Conformist
Mp	Manipulator
I ₄ Na	Neurotic Acting-Out
Nx	Neurotic Anxious
Se	Situational Emotional Reaction
Ci	Cultural Identifier

¹Except, of course, for the section written by the Coordinator.

- (4) detailed descriptions of CTP program elements, as a means of creating an empirical base for expansion of community treatment program;
- (5) comparison of CTP approaches with alternate community programs.

Thus far, the experimental community program has shown to be more effective than the traditional Youth Authority program for most types of delinquents as measured by lower recidivism rates and more positive pre-post test psychological score changes.¹

In developing and carrying out treatment-control plans for CTP wards during Phase I (1961-1964), Community Agents² experienced continued dissatisfaction with facilities used for temporary detention (usually a Youth Authority or County facility), and difficulty in locating and maintaining adequate foster homes. They were, at the same time, using out-of-home placements to a greater extent than were Agents in regular parole units (30% vs. 5%). This led to the development of the DTED proposal which suggested the development and study of a variety of "Professional" group homes, designed for (a) long-term placement of specific types of youngsters defined along the lines of particular treatment models, and (b) temporary holding homes for youngsters needing either control, or a protective setting where control was not the central consideration.

The research goals of the DTED Project are:

1. To determine the feasibility of establishing five different types of group homes - with the five varying in stance taken toward wards and in modes of handling interpersonal relationships - and with each type of home representing a type of environment specifically related to the growth and development needs of particular types of delinquent youths.
2. To develop a taxonomy of group home environments, describing in detail the important aspects of the five environments. This is an attempt to define environments differentially in treatment-relevant ways, rather than through a controlled experiment.
3. To evaluate the impact of the group home experience on the youngsters assigned to them.

Underlying these three goals is the additional research attempt to evaluate the relative worth and utility of each home as a placement alternative and treatment

¹ Previous CTP articles and publications describe in detail the classification system, the program, and results to date. For further information write the Community Treatment Project, 3610 Fifth Ave., Sacramento, California 95817.

² The title "Community Agent" (or Agent) is used to identify Youth Authority Parole Agents working in the Community Treatment Project. Their official job classification is "Parole Agent".

treatment resource within CTP, and to relate the use of group homes to settings other than CTP (e.g., regular parole operations, probation, welfare, etc.). In addition, the findings of this project may have several implications in exploring the differential use of other types of out-of-home placement (e.g., foster homes, receiving homes, part-way houses, etc.) in the matching of people, program and varying kinds of clients.

DTED staff has revised the Type II Containment Home model and has developed a model for a sixth type of home, primarily for those I₄ youngsters who do not fit the model design for the Type III Boarding Home. Also, there are plans to study a girls' group home in Stockton.¹ Descriptions of the original five types of group homes and the Type VI, Individualized Home model appear in Appendix A.

Study Population

The DTED study population includes those male wards in the experimental group of the Community Treatment Project who are placed in any one of the group homes. It also includes the homes themselves (their method of operation, management, etc.), the group home parents, all potential candidates, and CTP staff.

To date, none of the Project group homes have been available to female wards. This has been due, primarily, to the fact that none of the homes (except the Type III home) has had a physical facility that would permit both boys and girls to be placed within the same home at the same time. In addition, there has been no strong or continuing interest expressed by operations staff in having the homes co-educational, relative to this being seen either as a positive and/or necessary treatment condition. None of the homes were originally developed exclusively for girls, since female Agents in the Project (one Agent in each unit) are assigned a heterogeneous caseload in terms of I-level classification and it appeared improbable that the needs for out-of-home placement for girls would justify a separate group home that would be consistent with the DTED research design.

Management Of The Project And The Homes

The Group Home Project is an integral part of CTP, and as such, a given group home represents one of a number of out-of-home placement alternatives for CTP Agents. Wards placed into a group home are not at that point transferred to the Group Home Coordinator or to a different Agent who, so to speak, is to have responsibility for all youngsters residing within the given home. Transfer to another Agent simply because a youngster is placed in a group home would most likely interfere with or destroy the matching procedure that had already taken place in assigning a youngster to a particular Agent together with the treatment

¹ The girls' home will not be an "official" project home although most of the data that is being collected in project homes will be collected in the girls' home. More discussion on the girls' home appears later in this report.

relationship which had already been established (or was in the process of being established). It would also be generally antithetical to the research design of CTP.¹

Current treatment needs and Agent styles are considered in the original selection and ongoing training of group home parents, and also in the management and development of the homes. This allows the homes to be operated and evaluated according to current treatment thinking and needs. Thus, all operational procedures attempt to integrate or involve CTP staff. Problems arising from this type of arrangement are dealt with through what is essentially a team approach. In addition, the various types of meetings and discussions through which this approach is implemented serve a research function: They provide a source of information regarding (a) events occurring within the Project and within any given home, and (b) the dynamics of issues. They also provide a setting (and a mechanism) through which (a) and (b) may be evaluated and resolved.² The four basic types of staffings which have been developed to coordinate the DTED program were described and discussed in the First Year Progress Report.³

In addition to these formal aspects of the program, Group Home and CTP staff maintain routine, ongoing contact with the group homes. The Group Home Coordinator maintains contact both with the group home parents and Agents in regard to over-all procedures relative to running the homes, gaining first-hand information about the daily operation of the homes, and providing orientation, training, acceptance and support for the group home parents. The Coordinator's role thus involves a wide range of responsibilities.⁴ (Her role does not, however, involve any direct case work responsibilities for individual youngsters).

¹In addition, the DTED Project is not a controlled experiment in which youngsters are randomly assigned either to a group home or to some other type of placement. Requests for placement into a group home are handled in terms of a treatment decision by each given youngster's Agent in conjunction with the treatment supervisor.

²A basic goal of the present study relates to the empirical description of the operational aspects of the program. A great deal of interest has been expressed in this type of arrangement, particularly by some County Welfare and Probation Departments who have "specialists" who supervise youngsters in out-of-home placement, and who - when a placement is terminated - are charged with transferring the case. Later in this report, the operational aspects of the Project will be discussed and evaluated at greater length.

³These include Group Home Administrative Meetings; Management Staffings; Maintenance Staffings; Ward Intake Staffings.

⁴Beginning on page 60 is a section written by the Coordinator.

In the long-term placement homes, Community Agents have primary responsibility for the communication of individual and general ward needs to the group home parents, for interpreting individual youngsters' behaviors and background information, and for suggesting specific techniques for handling youngsters. The Coordinator handles treatment concepts and issues on a more general, abstract level. In addition, the Coordinator relieves Agents of some of the more routine elements involved in the operation of a home. Included here would be: providing general orientation regarding the Youth Authority and its procedures; interpreting living and dietary standards; budgetary matters; interpreting the contract and handling attendance reporting and payment problems with the Youth Authority Administration. This allows Agents to focus their efforts more directly or exclusively upon treatment and placement issues as they relate to given youngsters in given homes.

Community Agents also see youngsters placed in the group homes on an ongoing basis and in a number of contexts - as, e.g., individual treatment sessions, group meetings, recreational outings, away from a home or even within a group home either in connection with routine or crisis-related meetings (with or without the presence of the group home parents).¹

Research guidelines or requirements for admission to a home are spelled out in general, and are then interpreted on an individual case basis. Generally speaking, research guidelines for admission to a long-term placement home are:

- (1) the youngster being considered must be currently classified under an I-level subtype for which the home is designed;
- (2) at the time of placement, it should be the Agent's intent that the youngster be placed within the home on a permanent basis, or at least on an open-ended type of placement (i.e., not temporary or transient);
- (3) the Agent's projected use of the home should fit the model of that home; and,
- (4) the youngster's placement should not negatively affect the long-range developmental goals for that home.

In the Type IV Temporary Care home, all of the above except (2) apply. Youngsters are not allowed to remain in the Type IV Home on a permanent basis. Maximum placement time, while flexible, is limited to about three or four weeks - longer under unusual circumstances - but under no circumstances longer than two months. There is no minimum placement time and, on a temporary basis, a wide variety of uses may be made of this type of home.

¹The opportunity (or permission) to do so is always present. The nature and extent of these types of contact is left primarily to individual Agent preferences.

Selection of Group Home Parents

For the most part recruitment and development of the group homes has followed the pattern established in most agencies in connection with individual foster homes. Housing and equipment are not leased or bought by the Youth Authority, either in this Project or in the regular Youth Authority group home program. Thus, it falls upon the group home parents themselves to provide adequate housing.

The major focus in the selection of group home parents is on matching them with particular types of youngsters with a particular type of group home. Thus, once individuals appear to have a general capacity or potential for foster care, they are then further screened and evaluated with regard to their potential for effectively dealing with a particular type of youngster, as well as their potential for developing and operating a given type of group home. In addition, consideration is also given to the question of whether candidates meet licensing standards since, in California, a home must be licensed to accept youngsters under the age of 16.

To aid in the selection process, Group Home staff utilizes their previous experience in the Community Treatment Project, together with results of CTP Research findings relative to the question of which major characteristics and styles of interacting appear to be most and least appropriate with which types of youths.

Initial recruitment and screening is done by the Group Home Coordinator. Candidates are referred for further interviewing and testing, by the Research Analyst, if they appear to have a number of general and/or specific, desirable qualifications. Together with other evaluative measures, the information which is gathered by the Researcher is used to determine which particular types of youngsters the given candidates seem best matched with. Following this, the candidates are reviewed by the Group Home staff. If at this point they are felt to be appropriate for one or more of the group homes yet to be developed, the Coordinator and Researcher meet with the CTP unit in the city in which the home is to be located for the purpose of arriving at a final decision about the candidates. Thus, "hiring" (or not) at this point becomes a joint DTED-CTP decision.¹

A contract specifying the group home parents' obligations and the specific subsidy which the home will receive is then agreed upon and signed by the group home parents. (The specific subsidy that is offered to the group home parents is determined by DTED staff in assessing monetary needs and what appears to be a "reasonable" amount of payment, and one which stays within the limits of each home's budget).² The contract is then submitted to Youth Authority Administrative Services for processing. It has taken, on the average, two to three months for a contract then to become effective. Wards have been placed in homes in the interim by paying regular foster home payments (\$94.00 per ward per month), where the group home parents feel they can manage temporarily on this amount.

¹Table 1, page 3, summarizes some of the factual information about the candidates who have been selected thus far to operate a group home.

²See Appendix B for further discussion in regard to contracting.

TABLE 1

DTED Group Home Parents: Population Data

Name	Type Home	Age ¹	Race	Others In Home	Religion	Occupation and Income/Mo. ²	Education	Previous Foster Home Experience	Dates of Operation
Mr. D	II	58-8	Cauc.	daughter, 19 (part-time)	Morman	Janitor (\$350)	8th grade	None	11/1/66 - 7/1/67
Mrs. D	II	53-4	Cauc.		Morman	Housewife	8th grade		
Mr. N	I & IV	47-0	Mex/Am	2 sons, 13 & 17 daughter, 25 grandson, 2	Catholic	Tallyman (\$475)	11th grade	3 years: welfare (licensed), CYA (GTP Group Home 1966)	I: 1/1/67-3/17/67 IV: 3/17/67-7/1/67
Mrs. N	I & IV	40-6	Mex/Am		Catholic	Housewife	11th grade		
Mr. B.	III	40-3	Negro	3 daughters, 10, 17 & 18 Mrs. B's Brother	Baptist	Warehouseman & Janitor (\$510)	12th grade	1 year: CYA & Probation, boys girls; '57-'60: African Student	2/20/67-Present
Mrs. B	III	47-6	Negro		Baptist	Housewife	11th grade		
Mr. H	I	27-3	Cauc.	2 sons 3 & 5	Lutheran	Mechanic (\$550)	1 yr Jr. College	1 yr CYA Girls	5/1/67-Present
Mrs. H	I	24-8	Cauc.		Catholic	Housewife	12th grade		
Mr. F	IV	74-4	Cauc.	None	Prot.	Retired (\$325)	3 grade school	4 yr: Probation boys, licensed	4/1/68-Present
Mrs. F	IV	52-11	Cauc.		Prot.	Childcare to 6/68	grade school (Voc. Nurse)		
Mr. U	VI	25-7	Cauc.	son, 18 mo. daughter, 4	Baptist	Engineer (\$550)	3 yr College	2 mo: Probation boy	7/1/68-Present
Mrs. U	VI	26-4	Cauc.		Baptist	Housewife	1 yr College		

¹All references to ages are ages at time a home began.

²Income is net per month (Approximate).

³Includes retirement, and rental income.

Research Activities

Generally speaking, the research role is directed toward the goal of describing - globally and in detail - all significant aspects of the Group Home Project. This role is thus similar to that of an anthropologist (in observing the culture) and/or a historian. This is carried out by means of consistent and systematic involvement with every participant of the study population.

DTED research staff utilizes five major techniques for data collection: (a) interviews, (b) questionnaires, (c) research observation and participation, (d) staffings, and (3) rating of descriptive items.

Most of these instruments will be used for descriptive and evaluative purposes in terms of pre-post and/or specified time-interval test comparisons within homes, between homes, and with respect to differing subgroups within the total project population. A number of instruments can also be used for item analysis. In addition, data is being collected relative to a number of the routine program activities - e.g., meetings with Agents, group home parents, and the like.

As predicted in the First Progress Report, research activities and involvement have been broad and diversified. Aside from routine data collection, considerable time continues to be spent participating in the overall management of the Project relative to developing major policies, and in participating in the handling of day-to-day issues which have implications for the research design and for the collection of data. Research, for example, has been involved with DTED and CTP staff in evaluating and discussing means of handling major issues that have come up in each of the homes; in expanding the scope and detail of research by assisting in the development of the Type VI home and the development of additional instruments; in pursuing the possibility of researching a girls group home; in discussing with CYA Administration the various means of contracting with group homes to arrive at the present policy; involvement in the selection and termination of group home parents and admission of wards to homes; and in responding to requests for information about the project.

Appendix C contains a chart of all data collection instruments and forms, developed to date, together with their source or origin, and the timetable which guides their usage. Given this large number and wide range of research instruments plus the numerous other research commitments as well - it has been difficult to maintain the original, proposed schedule and method of application in the case of all instruments. Group home parents and Agents have been more than tolerant and patient with Research demands. Particularly with regard to Agents, these demands have been added on top of their already heavy research commitment in CTP.

In the Type I, II and III homes, DTED research has spent approximately sixty hours in two-hour blocks of time, jointly interviewing group home parents, using the Group Home Management Instrument. The scope and detail of this instrument is extensive, and there have been differences between homes with respect to the ease with which they are able to respond to it. In some instances the originally designed degree of detail was difficult to elicit, but in almost every instance the scope of the instrument was utilized. The recordings from these interviews are currently being rated and evaluated for presentation during the coming year. In addition, this instrument will be used again with the Type I and III homes to describe changes that have occurred. It will also be used with newly developed homes so that a complete set of inter-home comparisons can be made.

DTED research has developed a student intern position attached to the project. One senior Social Welfare student each semester (four thus far) from Sacramento State College has been interviewing and testing foster and group home parents from CTP (excluding those in the DTED study) and Sacramento County Welfare and Probation Departments.¹ The presence of this additional data will broaden our base of knowledge about individuals who are engaged in foster work. It may also provide a population against which to compare the relatively small DTED group home parent sample.

In addition to answering inquiries from the Youth Authority and other agencies (in and out of California), providing ongoing feedback to CTP staff, and reviewing some of the literature on out-of-home placement programs, DTED Research has, during the past year, published the following:²

Pearson, J. W. and Palmer, T. B.: Group Home Project Research Report No. 1: A Demonstration Project, Differential Treatment Environments For Delinquents, First Year Progress Report, August, 1967.

Pearson, J. W. and Palmer, T. B.: The Use of Group Homes For Delinquents in a Differential Treatment Setting. Group Home Project Interim Progress Report, July, 1968.

Pearson, J. W.: "A Demonstration Project: Group Homes For Delinquents: California Youth Authority Quarterly, Vol. 21, No. 1, Spring 1968".

¹The interview was adapted from the "Group Home Project Interview Guide For Prospective Group Home Parents". The tests are the same as those used by research in screening prospective group home parents-viz; the "Characteristics of Youngsters Questionnaire" and the "Foster Parent Preference Survey".

²The interest shown in the present project by the Youth Authority, and agencies across the United States (and by some foreign countries) suggests an increasing interest in the use of group homes.

CHRONOLOGY OF MAJOR PROJECT DEVELOPMENTS

July 1, 1967 Through June 30, 1968

July, 1967: The Type II Containment Home moved to a different location within the Sacramento area. The group home parents did not advise anyone of this ahead of time, thereby causing concern among CTP and DTED staff and negative reactions from the group home youngsters.

August, 1967: Intake criteria for the Type III Boarding Home were re-evaluated (relative to Research requirements for entrance) and made more flexible, thereby making the home potentially available to a greater number of CTP I₄ wards.

September, 1967: The Type I Protective Home was opened to compatible I₄ Nx's and Na's due to a rather severe reduction in newly committed I₂'s and Cfm's. The home, however, always reserves at least two beds for Cfm and/or I₂ youngsters.

January, 1968: Discussions with County Welfare in Stockton indicated serious problems from the point of view of gaining an increased degree of flexibility in regard to licensing of DTED homes. This discussion and previous experience indicated that the Welfare Department, apparently, does not feel they are in a position to approach the issue of licensing Youth Authority foster homes or group homes any differently than in terms of the approach that is used for the licensing of their own homes (even though the placement needs and problems of the CYA population are acute and, in many instances, unique when compared to the population serviced by the Welfare Department).

February, 1968: A review of increasing concerns with the Type II Home resulted in a two to three month intensive effort to "bring the home around" and to evaluate what set of circumstances or conditions we would have to "live with" if we were to continue to use the home.

April 1, 1968: A new (the Project's second) Type IV Temporary Care Home was established in Stockton for a maximum of five youngsters and was in use immediately.

May 29, 1968: A review of efforts in the Type II Home, together with an up to date assessment of current circumstances in the home, resulted in the decision to terminate that home from the Project and to attempt to locate more appropriate individuals to re-establish the Type II Home. Current treatment thinking in regard to Cfc's and Mp's also suggested that certain modifications, and points of clarification of the original model for this home were desirable and/or essential. The modified model for the Type II Home is shown on page 35.

May 31, 1968: Attempts to establish a Type V Temporary Restriction home were terminated, due to the fact that during the preceding twenty months no interested, qualified candidates had been located and not enough time would have remained to do the required quantity and quality of research, even in the somewhat unlikely event that home could have been established by September 1, 1968.

June 10, 1968: A model for a different type of home (Type VI) was finalized. This home would be primarily for those I₄ youngsters who did not meet the model

requirements of the boarding home. The home model attempts to meet a broad range of placement needs for I₄ youngsters. This model is part of Appendix A.

June 25, 1968: A couple was selected to operate the Type VI home in Modesto, California, 30 miles south of Stockton.¹ The contract for the Type VI home is due to become effective on August 1, 1968; and, we expect one youngster will be in placement prior to that time. The funds for contracting with this home are coming from a portion of the original Type V Home budget.

June 27, 1968: Began pursuing the issue of subsidizing and researching the girls' group home developed and used by the Stockton unit - by using some of the monies remaining in the Type V Home budget - in order to expand our base of information about group homes, and to compare differing methods of managing group home programs.

¹Modesto is currently the major source of new commitments which are coming into the Stockton CTP unit.

REVIEW OF DEVELOPMENTS WITHIN SPECIFIC GROUP HOMES¹

Type I Protective Home - (Mr. and Mrs. H)²

Mr. and Mrs. H began operation of this home in Stockton on May 1, 1967. It was the Project's second attempt to develop this type of home. Another couple had operated (quite unsuccessfully) a Type I home from January 1, 1967 to March 17, 1967. Mr. and Mrs. H are presently under contract for the fiscal year July 1, 1968 to June 30, 1969 and it appears that they will remain as a project home through the life of the Project.

The H's home had been operating only two months when the First Year Progress Report was written. The two boys in the home then had stabilized (for the first time in several months), and it appeared the home was off to a good start.

The population in the home has been relatively stable during the past year. A total of seven youngsters have lived in the home; three are there at the present time. One boy was removed because of incompatibility with the group home parents. Of the other three that were removed, one was nearing discharge as a result of age (21), and the Agent was attempting to emancipate him. Another was returned recently to live with his mother. This move had been guaranteed by the Agent at the time the boy was first paroled (November, 1967), provided that the boy's adjustment in the ensuing six to seven months was satisfactory. The third boy was placed by mistake prior to an intake staffing and was in the home less than two weeks before returning home. Of the three now in the home, one is nearing completion of a full year in placement. The other two have been in the home for six months. Of these three, only one has been removed by the Agent for placement in temporary custody.

Table 2, page 15, describes (relative to age, race and number of other variables) the youngsters who have been placed in the H's Protective Home during the first fourteen months of its operation (through June 30, 1968). Half of the six youngsters officially placed were paroled directly to the group home. Of the three wards removed from the home all had spent at least three months in placement - a feature unique among the three long-term care homes. Through June 30, 1968, the six youngsters placed had spent an average of about six months in placement (including temporary breaks in placements). Official breaks in

¹This section will contain descriptive and impressionistic summaries for each one of the group homes. Even though this discussion is based on only a little statistical information it is, nonetheless, a reflection of continuous, direct involvement with all aspects of the project and each home, and it derives from reliable, specific sources of information.

Background information in regard to characteristics of group home parents, physical lay-out of the homes, etc., which appeared in the First Year Progress Report in regard to specific homes, will not be repeated here. The section by the Coordinator (pp.60-82) contains further descriptive information about each home.

²For a maximum of four wards: Asocial, Passive - I₂Ap; and Conformist, Immature - I₃Cfm. As well be discussed, this home is now open to certain I₄ wards. See Appendix A for the original model for this type of home.

TABLE 2

TYPE I PROTECTIVE HOME: POPULATION DATA¹
Mr. and Mrs. H, 5/1/67 - 6/30/68

A		B		C Age				D Race			
Number of Wards Placed	Number of Placements	15-5 and under	15-6 to 17-5	17-6 and over	Average Age	Cauc	Mex/Am	Negro	Other		
6*	6*	-	4	2	17-3	3	2	1	-		
		-	67%	33%		50%	33%	17%	-		

*Does not include one Cfm placed by error.

E I-level									
	Aa	Ap	Cfm	Cfc	Mp	Na	Nx	Se	Ci
N	-	-	3	-	-	-	2	-	1*
%	-	-	50%	-	-	-	33%	-	17%

*Erroneously classified Cfm when placed

F
Months on Parole Prior to Placement

	0	1-6	7-12	13-18	19 & Over
N	3	-	1	1	1
%	50%	-	17%	17%	17%

G
No. of Breaks in Placements

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6 & Over
N	3	2	1	-	-	-	-
%	50%	33%	17%	-	-	-	-

H
Days in Placement

	0-30	31-60	61-90	91-120	121-150	151-180	181-210	211-240	241-270	271-300	301-330	331-360	361 & Over	Ave.
N	-	-	-	1	1	2	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	187
%	-	-	-	17%	17%	33%	17%	-	-	-	17%	-	-	

I
Wards in Home

on 6/30/67	on 6/30/68
2	3

J
Placements

through 6/30/67	7/1/67 - 6/30/68
2	4

¹See Appendix D for detailed explanations of these items. Appendix E summarizes the tables for the three long-term care homes (Protective, Containment and Boarding). Appendix F is a chart of the placement patterns for the Type I Protective Home.

placement have averaged only about one per youngster. Youngsters of all of the three major ethnic groups have been placed in the home and the average age of these boys is slightly higher than in the Containment and Boarding Homes (17 years - 2 months and 17 years - 0 months respectively).

In September, 1967, it was decided to accept "compatible" I₄ Nx's and Na's (no more than two in the home at any one time) into this home to increase the extent of usage of the home. This modification was necessary due to the very low number of newly committed I₂ and Cfm wards in Stockton. (There has been a severe drop off in these I-levels during the last few years in Stockton and Sacramento.) In addition, there were at the time no I₂ wards and only one or two Cfm wards already on parole who were seen as possibly (but unlikely) candidates for placement in the home.¹

I₄ wards referred for placement are carefully screened, and those approved for placement must - with regard to their relative maturity, placement needs, etc. - be seen as being appropriate for, and not interfering with, the existence and development of what is considered to be an appropriate environment for I₂ and Cfm youngsters.

The two Nx boys were placed during December, 1967, and January, 1968, and these boys are still in the home at the present time. This "non-homogeneous" arrangement has been working fairly well. It has provided Mr. and Mrs. H with additional challenges and learning experiences - helping them to better understand some of the issues involved in dealing with differing types of youngsters.

In July, 1967, Mr. and Mrs. H bought an older, two-story frame house which had six bedrooms and two baths. (Their original home was too small in terms of the project's needs.) The group home parents and their own two young boys (ages 5 and 3) occupy the two bedrooms downstairs. Three bedrooms are available upstairs for the group home boys. The remaining upstairs bedroom is used for recreation; it houses a pool table. The boys who entered the home in July were made a part of the move by helping to paint and prepare the house and by choosing their bedrooms as well as the decor. During the past year Mr. and Mrs. H have also bought a nine passenger "bus" for transportation. They continually look for ways of improving the home and its program.

Mr. and Mrs. H have taken quite seriously the responsibility of operating an "official group home". In addition, they see it from a different perspective than when they were "just foster parents". They now seem to feel more a part of a total project. In some respects they have developed an attitude of evaluating many issues within the context of the total home circumstances, and in terms of a pattern of operating the home which includes all the persons who reside within it as a total family unit. In this respect the home seems to fit the original model for the Type I home fairly well.

However, there are other circumstances that tend to fit less well with the model. For example, in most respects the group home parents (particularly Mrs. H) are not seen as parental figures, and are not seen as really offering an unusual

¹Of the total number of Cfm's in the Stockton unit (5), three (or 60%) have been placed in the Protective Home (see Appendix G).

degree of patience relative to the more immature youngsters who reside in the home. When the H's were screened and subsequently hired it was recognized that Mrs. H at times tended to react impulsively and immaturely, particularly when frustrated by other individuals, or when some of her own needs for acceptance and recognition were, from her own point of view, not being adequately met. Our early predictions of Mr. and Mrs. H's strengths and weaknesses have been verified this past year. Problems during the last year have occurred off and on - chiefly with respect to immature and/or inappropriate responses on the part of Mrs. H to issues of a typically minor nature.

At the same time, Mrs. H's strong motivation (not well understood by herself) to provide foster care, together with her willingness and openness to discuss her behavior and feelings - these have made it possible for the Coordinator and Agents to develop a fairly clear understanding of her. These same factors have helped to maintain open, direct discussions with her, in regard to her reactions and feelings. The Coordinator and Agents have worked together extensively to develop techniques of working together with Mrs. H. Their approach - together with the present Agent's ongoing involvement with his boys in the home and with Mr. and Mrs. H - has resulted in the establishment of a very good atmosphere within which to deal with emergent issues.

While still considerably less than totally satisfactory, the situation with regard to Mrs. H has shown improvement during the last year. Mrs. H is aware of this change; and, she states that she is more patient and understanding than used to be in the case. Her husband, and the parole staff as well, also see some growth and changes.

In regard to their not being seen as "parental figures" both by themselves and by the boys, the group home parents' ages (Mr.: 27, Mrs.: 24) - in conjunction with the ages of their own children - probably account in part for the fact that their role is perceived more in terms of an older brother or sister.

Early in the operation of the home, Agents were especially concerned with Mr. H relative to the role he would take with the group home boys. This was partly because of their wish to offset some of Mrs. H's inappropriateness and partly because the adult male-adolescent relationship was viewed as being quite important for Cfm youngsters. Mr. H, who is a calm, patient and non-threatening individual, was seen as more of a "natural" for weak, dependent youngsters. But since there had been no evidence of his ever having undertaken a direct, personally involved relationship with the foster girls who had previously been placed with the H's, it was uncertain how assertive and/or comfortable he would be with the role demands which might be placed upon him relative to boys. Staff initially tried to structure the H's to allow for Mr. H's being "in charge". This approach was not very successful. The real change in the desired direction came as a function of "time" and of the present Agent's involvement and compatibility with Mr. H. In addition, during discussion-activity meetings that were held over a period of several months during a time when two Agents were using the home, Mr. H's natural inclination to become involved with the group home boys emerged.¹

¹These meetings also included non-group home youngsters - mainly those who might at some time be in a position to use the home. Particularly with the Cfm youngsters this was viewed as a technique which might reduce fears and apprehension related to what would otherwise be total unfamiliarity with the home and with Mr. and Mrs. H. It was also thought that - with Mrs. H being included in the discussion meetings - these meetings would help the H's to become more familiar with and understanding of those types of boys whom Agents viewed as most likely to be placed in the home.

Mr. H and the boys (and, at times, the Agent) go fishing together, work together on projects, and play softball together on the part-staff, part-ward CTP softball team. Mr. H is now seen as a real source of strength in the overall operation of the home. He provides a "balance" in the home - often helping Mrs. H to view things more objectively. The boys seem to view him as a person whom they can identify with and enjoy relating to - one who is "firm but reasonable."

The general atmosphere of the H's home seems, in many respects, similar to many "normal" homes in which teenagers reside. There is a sense of "groupness", or family; and there is a basic underlying acceptance of each member of the home as an individual within the group. Through time, the H's have come to view each youngster's strengths and weaknesses. They have grown fairly perceptive in regard to differences between the boys, in picking up indirect cues, and also in terms of discovering the major techniques of dealing with each boy which seems most and least effective.

In general, each boy has specific responsibilities in maintaining the home. It is sometimes possible to tailor their responsibilities to fit the interests of individual boys (e.g., in terms of such chores as gardening vs. inside maintenance). However, in all cases the H's try to develop mutual responsibility in maintaining the home. In addition, each boy cares for his own room and clothes (except, in some cases, when it comes to washing clothes). "Unpleasant" chores (e.g., dishwashing) are usually rotated. Additional chores (i.e., those in addition to routine chores) are not used for punishment; nevertheless, routine chores must be completed before a boy is "free to go".

Mr. H leaves early for work; and since each boy may have a different time to leave the house (to get either to regular school, the CTP school, or work) breakfast is usually a matter of self-service. Lunch is provided for those who happen to be at home at noon-time. Supper is a family affair except in the case of given individuals who might be working late or who may be practicing sports at school. Evening usually finds everyone pursuing their own interests around the house - watching TV, reading, doing homework, playing cards, checkers or pool. Some evenings checker games between Mr. H and the boys have gone on into the early morning hours. There is no required time to go to bed; but, in most instances, nearly everyone turns in by 11:00 p.m. Curfew for the home is 9:00 p.m.; and all of the boys are expected to let Mr. and Mrs. H know where they are whenever they are away from the home.

Saturdays are usually a day for the boys to catch up on chores and for Mr. H to work around the house so they can all be free on Sunday. Although group home youngsters are not required to participate in weekend recreational activities, they are encouraged to do so. Occasionally, an individual youngster on restriction who refuses to go with the family has held everyone back. At times some of the boys visit with their own families on weekends;¹ sometimes they go on dates or to parties. Most of the time, however, the boys are around the house on weekends.

Although each boy knows that he is expected to cooperate with the general home program,² Mr. and Mrs. H do not anticipate that the "cooperation" which is given will always be consistent, or, for that matter, really voluntary. The

¹Parents have on occasion visited with their son in the group home itself.

²See Appendix H for the home rules that the H's developed which they have posted in the home.

mechanics of the home do not always run smoothly. Youngsters occasionally resist or refuse to cooperate with the arrangements and understandings mentioned above; but, generally speaking, the H's have been able to obtain a fairly consistent level of acceptance and cooperation by the youngsters of their responsibilities in the home. All of the boys placed in the home have, on occasion, "tested" the limits to explore the strength of a given limit, the manner in which the H's will handle their behavior, and the nature of their relationship with the H's.

Behavior problems are usually dealt with as soon as possible, and directly with the particular boy in question. The Agent is advised later of the circumstances and actions taken. However, unless the problem is considered severe the group parents prefer to handle things by themselves. In addition, Mr. and Mrs. H prefer to handle problems within the home setting itself in terms of penalties (usually restriction to the home), rather than in terms of having a boy placed in temporary custody. Thus, e.g., when one of the boys came home from a party quite drunk, Mr. and Mrs. H got up to ply him with coffee, gave him a cold shower, got him up at the usual time in the morning and sent him off to school in spite of his obvious hangover. In this case, they felt that temporary detention would have merely allowed the boy to get behind in school, to "sleep off" his problems and, most importantly from their point of view, to avoid having to deal with them in relation to his problems.

In September, 1967, an issue arose of the presence of guns in the home. Mr. H had at that time some three rifles and shotguns for hunting and a small caliber pistol. The guns were all kept unloaded and locked up in the house. Though the H's had asked about keeping the guns, and staff generally felt it was not advisable, the H's (prior to September, 1967) had not been asked to remove the weapons. Aside from the obvious risk involved, staff had not considered prior to September, the treatment implications involved - particularly with Cfm's (who tend to fantasize a good deal about fears of being harmed by others).

The incident in question involved the second boy who was placed in the home (5/67). He had become increasingly rebellious and one night angrily announced he was running away and stormed out of the house. Mr. H went after him to calm him down and bring him back and to disarm him of a set of brass knuckles he had. Shortly after Mr. H left, Mrs. H went after them in their car out of concern for her husband. (The boy was obviously very upset and was larger than Mr. H). The boy gave up the brass knuckles to Mr. H and returned to the home when Mr. H convinced him that if he (the boy) was going to run away Mr. H was going with him wherever the boy went. Later one of the other boys in the home claimed that Mrs. H had taken the pistol with her when she went after her husband and the other youngster. (In addition, the boy "believed" Mrs. H kept the pistol to protect herself against either himself or the other group home boys.) He had not seen the pistol when Mrs. H left the house, nor had he actually seen Mrs. H with the gun on other occasions, or been told that it was in the home to protect Mrs. H from the boys.

Mrs. H denied that she had the gun when she left the house. Mr. and Mrs. H had made no secret of the guns being in the house. They stated that they had been locked up except on a couple of occasions when Mr. H was checking them and the boys saw them. Even though this incident was not substantiated, the H's were asked to remove the guns, and they did immediately. They seemed understanding of the safety issue and, to some extent, of the fact that the presence of the guns coupled with the fantasies of some youngsters, could interfere with those youngsters comfortably relating to the H's.

The feasibility of maintaining the H's home has been largely a result of the attitude and persistence of the Stockton CTP Agents (and Treatment Supervisor), together with the compatible relationship which exists between Mrs. H and the Coordinator. While it is recognized that the home does not represent the ideal home of this type, staff have been able to objectively evaluate its relative merits and they have - particularly in regard to Mrs. H - been expending a good deal of time and effort in working with and helping the group home parents. The basic attitude seems to be that of recognizing and doing something about aspects of the home which are not satisfactory, while at all times trying to emphasize the positive elements and to make use of strengths which are present. Had the approach used with the H's been greatly different, they would probably have become increasingly frustrated, inappropriate, and cancellation of the home might well have resulted.

From more than one point of view, most of the boys placed within this home appear to have experienced some benefit which is probably related to the placement itself. The first two boys placed - both older, "difficult" Cfm's - stabilized in the home quite rapidly. One boy - an individual who had been a heavy glue-sniffer - stopped sniffing glue, began taking better care of himself, and with the help of Mr. and Mrs. H found a job which he then held for four of the five months he was in the home. Problems which this boy later encountered in the home seemed to arise as a consequence of a combination of factors: transfer to another Agent, increased demands - from his Agent, primarily - for independent functioning (he was nearing parole discharge, at age 21), and his apparent disturbance over the fact other boys were living in the home. The fact that this youngster, who was strongly attached to his mother, accepted the placement at all, much less for five months, was surprising.

The second Cfm boy - more sullen and seemingly more hostile than most Cfm's - had never been able to accept for any length of time placement away from his life-long, rejecting foster mother. It is possible that Mr. and Mrs. H might at the present time be able to deal with this type of boy. However, at the time of his arrival in the home they were unable to find a way to break the circular pattern of demands-rebellion-punishment that ultimately defeated the placement. Nevertheless, the boy remained in the home more than four months before being removed.

The other boys (one Cfm and two Nx's) placed in the home have been two to three years younger than the above two boys. They have been more conforming and less hostile. In addition, these boys have had more ego strengths than is usually found with Cfm's. This allowed for the occurrence of some positive

¹For example that the H's have a strong investment in the home, and a commitment to be of help to the group home youngsters. The youngsters seem aware of this and generally feel accepted by the H's "as they are" (i.e., not rejected for any particular trait or habit - even though the H's try to press the youngsters to alter negative traits or habits). In other words, the group home youngsters appear to feel they are "wanted"; and, none of the youngsters have expressed any concern in this area.

interactions and experiences between the boys and the H's - all of which appear to have helped the home become more stabilized and to give the H's a feeling of accomplishment.¹

The above Cfm youngster has been in the home eleven months. He had never been placed away from home before. He has shown a great deal of movement in the last year, much of which seems to be related directly to the group home placement. This placement has provided him with a form of acceptance and stability which was lacking in his own home. Together with the Agent, the H's have been able to help this youngster deal with his parents and with some of his feelings about them. He shows signs of moving toward the I₄ level of maturity.

The other two youngsters (both Nx's) differ from one another, in terms of the impact the home has had upon them. One boy - an individual who has adopted a "hippie" philosophy and manner of dress - has been stable in terms of his placement in the home. He tends to be more distant and more rejecting of close relationships; nonetheless, he appears to have a definite (non-destructive) position within the group home family environment. He seems to have accepted the placement as a reality that he has to "live with", in order that - from his point of view - he will one day be able to leave and then "go live my own life". He regards much of the home (its activities, etc.), and many of its demands, as being "stupid".² Nevertheless, this individual consciously cooperates with the program which exists within the home. In addition, he has remained in the home for the last six months.

The other Nx boy had lived in numerous foster homes while on probation. None of these placements had lasted for any length of time. He is a relatively dependent youngster, yet one who has become rather pessimistic about forming close relationships with adults. The H's have shown a good deal of perceptiveness in understanding and dealing with this boy, and with his "games". The H's approach appears to be responsible, at least in part, for this boy's six months of unbroken placement within the home.

Another youngster who was classified as Cfm when placed in the home was, after returning home, reclassified as an I₄ Ci.³ He was in the home for six months. He seemed to fit rather well into the home even though his conforming behavior now appears to have resulted from his conscious effort to eventually be placed with his mother by "proving himself". Little impact either positive or negative, was noticed in this boy's case. The H's nevertheless enjoyed him and did deal rather appropriately with him in regard to a particular drinking incident (alluded to earlier)

¹Examples of these types of experiences include being able to "reason with" these boys, and having a feeling that the boys understand - and respond favorably to - the H's position (rather than having to handle control issues primarily on an external - "do it or else" - basis). The presence of areas of mutual interest (e.g., checkers, sports, etc.) also contributes to the H's feelings of satisfaction.

²On one level this boy seems socially inept and dependent but he consciously rejects circumstances that, to him, require him to be somewhat dependent or involved - e.g., doing chores, telling the H's where he is going, etc. He seems unable to see the need for general standards. He does not feel very much need for him to be in the home.

³This change was the result of an error in the original diagnosis, and does not represent a change in the youth's maturity level as a result of CTP treatment.

In general, it appears that this home has provided fairly appropriate care for several CTP youngsters. While the development of this home has required a good deal of Agent involvement and time, the involvement and time that would have been invested in developing and maintaining individual foster homes for each of the boys placed would probably have been just as great - and quite possibly greater.

In the coming year, it is expected that the home will begin to enter into a new phase. Up to now it has demonstrated the capacity for providing initial stability for youngsters. In the next year at least two of the boys currently in the home will be entering a stage of development in which the potentials of the home as a long-term resource will be tested. In this regard, the major question relates to whether wards and/or staff can see the H's and the home as meaningful contributors to a long term growth process with specific types of youngsters. Much of this - together with the question as to what aspects of the home can come to be generalized as being appropriate for I₂ or Cfm youngsters (as well as the "types" of I₄'s placed in the home) - seems to be primarily a function of Mrs. H's ability to grow and change. Related to this will be an assessment of a recent shift in the Agent's role in the home - a shift which involves his having "turned over" a major portion of the responsibilities for working out problems to the group home parents themselves. Instead of being the "counselor" (or referee) who attempts to reconcile differences, he will now come in when either a particular ward or the group home parents "calls it quits".¹ In addition to the challenge of helping youngsters grow, there will be the issue of simultaneously - providing acceptance, support and stability for new youngsters who may enter the home.

¹The first month of this arrangement has been quite satisfactory to the H's, the wards, and the Agent. It is hoped that this arrangement (plus ongoing, weekly contact with the Coordinator) will begin to help Mrs. H to have to deal with her feelings and behavior and their consequences, rather than having the Agent "bail her out" of predicaments.

Type II Containment Home - (Mr. and Mrs. D)¹

This was the first DTED home to be established (November 1, 1966, in Sacramento). We began the reporting year on a positive note, having completed eight months of fairly adequate operation of the home. Seven boys (4 Mp's and 3 Cfc's) had been placed in the home during that time. Both the D's and their approach to managing the home appeared congruent with the Type II research model.

Table 3, page 24, describes (relative to Age, Race and a number of other variables) the youngsters who have been placed in the D's Containment Home during the twenty months of its operation (through June 30, 1968). Thirteen separate placements have been made in the home - representing a total of ten wards. Five of these ten wards were paroled directly to the group home. Almost half (6) of the thirteen placements have been for less than two months, with the average stay per placement being approximately five months. Official breaks in placements have occurred in more than half of the placements - with an average of 1.8 such breaks per placement (slightly higher than the Boarding Home; somewhat higher than the Protective Home). There have been almost equal numbers of Caucasian, Mexican-American and Negro youngsters placed in the home. The average age at time of placement was 17 years - 2 months - this being similar to that of the other long-term care homes.

From July 1, 1967 to June 30, 1968, a total of eight youngsters (4 Mp's, 4 Cfc's) have resided in the home. The population during most of the year was stable; the three new wards who were placed in the home during the past year were in the home an average of 9.7 months. The remaining youngsters in the home were much less stable. Two were removed when the home relocated in July, 1967. One was in the home from July 11, 1967 to November 13, 1967 (4 months) and again from March 17, 1968 to May 13, 1968. The two remaining youngsters - those who were placed back into the home during the last year - were in the home five months and three weeks respectively.

Beginning with the group home's change of location in July, 1967, numerous issues and problems developed, few of which were adequately resolved. On May 22, 1968, DTED and CTP staff decided to terminate the use of the D's home effective July 1, 1968.² Leads are being followed presently to establish another Type II home in Sacramento.

The home into which the D's moved in July, 1967, had been inspected by the Coordinator by request of the D's who said they were considering buying it. It was located closer to the CTP office, and was easily reached by freeways. The neighborhood was older and less racially integrated than their previous location, but it represented about the same economic level. The home had two stories - 4 bedrooms, 2 baths, family and living rooms, a screened-in porch and a large yard. The two upstairs bedrooms and bath were for the wards. It seemed to be much more comfortable, "livable" quarters for the home; and although staff was concerned somewhat about the lack of Negro and Mexican-American families in the area, the situation appeared quite acceptable.

¹For a maximum six wards: Conformist, Cultural - I₃Cfc; and Manipulator - I₃Mp. See Appendix A for the original model for the Containment Home. A revised model appears at the end of the discussion of the D's Containment Home.

²The group home contract requires a minimum of 30 days for notice of cancellation.

TABLE 3

TYPE II CONTAINMENT HOME: POPULATION DATA¹
Mr. and Mrs. D, 11/1/66 - 6/30/68

A		B		C Age				D Race			
Number of Wards Placed	Number of Placements	15-5 and under	15-6 to 17-5	17-6 and over	Average Age	Cauc	Mex/Am	Negro	Other		
10	13	-	9	4	17-2	3	4	3	-		
		-	69%	31%		30%	40%	30%	-		

E I-level								
Aa	Ap	Cfm	Cfc	Mp	Na	Nx	Se	Cl
-	-	-	5	4	1*	-	-	-
			50%	40%	10%			

* Official diagnosis: Cfc when placed
(Na diagnosis confirmed later)

F Months on Parole Prior to Placement					G No. of Breaks in Placements						
0	1-6	7-12	13-18	19 & over	0	1	2	3	4	5	6 & over
5	2	4	2	-	6	3	2	-	1	-	1
39%	15%	31%	15%	-	46%	23%	15%	-	8%	-	8%

H Days in Placement													
0-30	31-60	61-90	91-120	121-150	151-180	181-210	211-240	241-270	271-300	301-330	331-360	361 & over	Ave.
2	4	-	1	1	-	-	-	2	2	-	1	-	
15%	31%	-	8%	8%	-	-	-	15%	15%	-	8%	-	145

I Wards in Homes		J Placements	
on 6/30/67	on 6/30/68	through 6/30/67	7/1/67 - 6/30/68
3	3	7	6

The move to this - or any other - house did not appear imminent, simply because the D's were quite vague and noncommittal about their plans, other than to indicate that they eventually did intend to move. Because of apparently good relationships that had been developed with the D's, staff felt confident that they would make their plans known well ahead of time.¹ Except for "hints" to the group home boys - e.g., "one day we'll just up and leave here" - no notice was given to DTED or CTP staff until the day of the actual move (7/7/67).

On that day, the Agent was asked to keep the boys away from the house and not to tell them of the move until it was completed. The D's seemed to have felt no necessity, and/or no advantage to discussing this major event with the Coordinator. The way in which the D's handled this matter had serious consequences for at least one boy in the home,² and for staff's confidence in its previous assessments of the D's. Attitudes on the part of the D's which had not been seen before began to emerge at this point - when staff discussed with them their reasons for handling the move in the way they did.

The D's indicated that they had considered involving the group home youngsters in the move, although mainly to help out with the work. They seemed not to have considered other possible advantages to the boys - advantages associated with making them participants in the planning, decision-making, and the actual move itself. Nor did they appear to have considered the possible disadvantages to the boys of not involving them. Their decision to handle the move as they did appeared

¹Neither the Coordinator nor the Agent explicitly told the D's that they wanted to know well ahead of any actual move, what the specific plans were or what the particular advantages and disadvantages might be to various means of handling a move. They did feel that the D's would advise them and assumed that a move was not imminent, judging from the lack of definitive plans expressed by the D's when they were asked how things were developing in regard to the purchase of a home. The D's had asked the Coordinator about a month prior to the move to look at this home. She did so, and felt that it was acceptable even though it was still a bit far from the CTP office. (It was, however, more convenient than the home they were in).

As elaborated upon in the First Year Progress Report, community objections arose in March, 1967 from a minority of parents belonging to a neighborhood teen center. These parents objected to the presence of the home, feeling that the group home boys would be a "bad influence" on other youngsters within the neighborhood. The D's response to this situation was to indicate to the Coordinator their desire to move the home. The community group was not aware of this desire. The Coordinator at that time advised them that it would be better, primarily for the benefit of the group home youngsters (for them to participate in working through this type of problem without "running away" from it) to wait and try to resolve the community problems before making any move. The D's complied with this demand even though they seemed uncomfortable with the idea. When the community problem subsided through the efforts of the Coordinator and Agent, they asked again about moving and were given the go-ahead to look for other housing. The Coordinator felt assured that from this experience the D's would be aware of her concerns in regard to the implications a move would have on the group home youngsters.

²This boy, a fairly disturbed I₃ Mp, had been in the home since it began. He had made a good adjustment in the home and was beginning to feel very good about the D's as people. He seemed to have started feeling as though he was part of a "family".

¹ See Appendix D for detailed explanation of these items. Appendix E summarizes the tables for the three long-term care homes (Protective, Containment and Boarding). Appendix I is a chart of the placement patterns in the Type II, Containment Home.

to be based on: (a) the fact that the previously mentioned I₃ Mp had, about three weeks earlier, reacted negatively to the idea of moving; (b) the D's also wished to "start over again", by cutting off ties which the boys had made in the old neighborhood, (c) they (particularly Mrs. D) did not want to have to deal with any "arguments", etc., with the boys;¹ and, (d) they felt that staff might not keep their plans secret since one of the Agents using the home had given one of the boys the group home telephone number, which they had asked him not to do. The D's were quite accurate in regard to (d): staff would not have approved or gone along with their plan to move in the way they apparently planned to do.

When staff talked with the D's about the inappropriateness and possible harm their action seemed to have, the D's seemed quite closed to hearing about this. They seemed to feel that staff was being "conned" by the boys (e.g., by staff's believing the boys in regard to how they (the boys) felt about the move).

Two of the boys refused to go to the home's new location and were placed elsewhere. The third boy in the home at the time was in temporary custody and indicated no particular investment in specifically where the home was to be located. Until September, 1967, this latter boy was the only one in the home. In September and October, three Cfc boys were placed in the home by a new CTP Agent (and an Mp boy who had been in custody for some time was replaced in the home briefly).

In a sense, this new Agent very rapidly came to be the principal Agent using the home: the other Agent withdrew to an extent, since at this time he had only one boy in the home (a boy whose adjustment was marginal) and had no other likely candidates for placement. This shift - both in Agents and youngsters - began to have an impact on the group home parents; it brought out in them a number of rather inflexible, "tunnel-vision" types of attitudes and/or ways of adjusting to a situation which, from their point of view, was now somewhat less satisfactory than before.

The D's stated that they had been quite comfortable with the first Agent's views and methods of dealing with them, and with his boys in the home. Basically, this Agent had taken a non-directive stance with the D's, allowing them to share in decisions relative to "how the home is run", and following through quickly and directly with the boys if they were not responding to the home's program. This Agent was hoping for the home to develop to the point where meaningful relationships could be developed between the boys and the D's - relationships which might contribute (as an "essential" ingredient) to the meeting of dependency needs and to helping the boys to grow.² His manner of dealing with the D's, and with

¹The D's said that they had received suspicious and threatening phone calls - directed mostly toward the boys. In addition, Mrs. D preferred to not have the youngsters' friends know where they had gone, so that these friends could not cause "any trouble" by coming to the new location.

Staff was not aware, at the time, of these apparently strong feelings by the D's (in regard to (b) and (c) above). The clues were "present", but only in retrospect and only after the D's had moved and were pressed to explain why they had handled it as they did.

²As will be discussed later, this line of thinking added a new dimension to the Containment Home model - one that was not apparently considered when the model was developed, but one that is currently given much more consideration.

the boys, was designed around the goal of letting the D's involve themselves in a natural way with the boys. The Agent was prepared to continue using his authority and relationship with the boys in order to "hold" them in the home until meaningful relationships had developed between given youngsters and the D's.

In retrospect it appears that the new Agent reversed this process by being, on the one hand, more direct with the D's and, on the other, more non-directive with his boys in the home.¹ The new Agent was working primarily with Cfc youngsters, and - by means of his natural style - was attempting to employ some of the more recent Cfc treatment thinking. This included taking a positive stance toward defining a given ward's "program" - a situation in which the demand or pressure for conformity or "performance" (as distinguished from non-delinquent behavior per se) was increased gradually through time, with numerous efforts being made to develop a relationship between the ward and the Agent prior to the time that the Agent would be "really bearing down" on the ward. This approach would hopefully give the ward something to "fall back on", hopefully allowing him not to feel completely the object of simple performance demands. This, in turn, would be less likely to result in his "folding" under the pressure in terms of his running away or committing a serious delinquent act.

This approach really required that the group home parents alter their roles, expectations, and rules in terms of being more flexible and patient in their dealings with the boys. In addition to the confusion resulting from, in effect, a change of Agents, the D's were not, "philosophically", as compatible with the new Agent's approach as with that of the earlier Agent. We are referring here to the D's consciously held beliefs and attitudes regarding "right" and "wrong" ways of responding to youngsters, and the sorts of interactions and/or conditions which would make a positive contribution to the growth process. The D's, e.g., feel quite strongly that a rigid, military form of operation is essential - one in which it is demanded of youths that they conform quite closely to a set of preconceived standards. Nonconformity, they feel, should be met immediately with some form of action designed to "teach" the youngsters the consequences of their behavior. While this attitude is represented in society by no small proportion of people, it appeared, in the case of the D's not to be accompanied by an ingredient that is being given increasing significance in CTP in connection with the treatment of Cfc and Mp youngsters. This ingredient relates to the attempt to draw these youngsters into what would range from a fairly close to a close interpersonal relationship, or to otherwise convey a good deal of concern for, and trust in, many of the youngsters' underlying feelings. This is in some contrast (at least in terms of timing and relative emphasis) to constantly keeping the focus of the relationship of the themes of distrust, power and/or visible evidence of improved behavior or achievement.

Mr. and Mrs. D seemed to totally ignore this aspect in their dealings with their group home youngsters except possibly in the case of a couple of boys who - after having been revoked from parole - wrote and praised Mrs. D. This pleased her a great deal, and she seemed to have developed a personal interest and involvement with them. In addition, interviews just prior to termination of the home

¹Another Agent had used the D's home from March 17, 1967 to May 8, 1968. This Agent's style was also different from the above Agent's. This had produced some problems, but no major issues concerning the D's had emerged in connection with that period of time.

indicate that while Mr. and Mrs. D could verbalize about the type of experiences the boys may have needed, they nevertheless did not involve themselves directly or personally in providing for these needs. The impressions they presented was that the Youth Authority and/or the Agent should be meeting these needs.

In the actual operation of the home, Mrs. D did seem to become more involved with the boys; but Mr. D never really invested himself with the youngsters.¹ Mrs. D seemed able to involve herself over a period of time, but only after a given youngster had shown appreciation, attention, etc. toward her. It seems to be extremely difficult for Cfc and Mp youngsters to do this and, at the same time, maintain their "cool", aloof stand. The two boys toward whom Mrs. D responded most favorably - a Cfc and an Mp - were able to consciously see the benefits of playing up to her in order to "get points".

The existence of these conditions gradually became more apparent as Agents began to press for greater involvement on the part of Mr. and Mrs. D, and for a flexibility that could allow for more of an accommodation between their rules and expectations and those of the Agents. In February, 1968, staff met to evaluate the home. Even in view of the existing problems, the Agent using the home felt that he had no better placement alternatives for the boys in the home. It was decided then to embark on a two- to three-month effort to try and have some impact on the D's and to determine more accurately what dynamics were involved and what results could be attributed to what specified efforts.

These efforts included increased contact by the Coordinator and Agent and weekly meetings in the home. (Included in these meetings were the D's, the wards, the Agent and the Coordinator.)² The overall approach was not directive - in the sense of making it a "job requirement" that certain things happen (e.g., relating "better" to the boys) or not happen. Instead, it focused upon exposing the D's to information - (e.g., treatment thinking; interpretation of ward behavior, etc.) - and situations - (e.g., purposely not shielding them from legitimate demands made by wards) - in order to identify the natural ways in which the D's would then respond to the wards. In addition, staff attempted to support the idea of the D's responding on more of a "professional" level - one which might allow them, if necessary and possible, to obtain rewards (such as recognition, support and acceptance) more from staff than from the group home youngsters themselves.³

¹Early in the group home experience, it was preferred that Mr. D - for treatment purposes - not "move in" too quickly. However, it was later felt that he was continuing to "hold back" well beyond the time when it was more appropriate to attempt to "move".

²In addition to the every two week "Management Staffings".

³Cfc and Mp youngsters very seldom provide positive feedback to those who may be trying to help them. Their often sullen, often hostile attitude frequently makes them difficult to relate to in a "natural" (give-and-take) way. This fact provided additional frustration for the D's who, after a time, began to show signs that they really did not "like" or enjoy this type of youngster - apart from the difficulty which they were having in accepting several things that staff was suggesting they (the D's) do with these wards. Individuals who deal with these types of youngsters need to be able to find something they can enjoy and/or value in these youngsters, and/or in the technique of dealing with them - something that can provide a source of either personal or professional satisfaction.

The D's seemed to be expecting that the boys should respond more maturely and more "normally" e.g., respond on more of an I₄ level in regard to perceptiveness, reliability, responsibility, etc., subsequent to their having simply received a set of demands for certain behaviors. They were unable to accept (even though they seemed to comprehend) staff views concerning the nature of the problems and the techniques of dealing with the Cfc and Mp youngsters.

The D's became increasingly frustrated - feeling that the primary Agent was "coddling" the youngsters - and at that point they began growing more rigid in regard to their responses. At this point, the interactions seemed to be largely on the level of "who is in control" or, "whose principles will be followed". In addition, the D's began to find more things about the youngsters' behavior and attitude which, in their opinion, would appear to provide justification to resist as well as resent staff information, suggestions and demands.

The D's also began to be more complaining and indolent in their attitude toward research obligations, toward providing transportation for the boys, and toward many of the general routine matters of operating their home. These were further clues that efforts to "help" them were, on the contrary, representing pressures and demands which were creating frustrations of a type that interfered with their ability to willingly perform routine, previously performed tasks.

At the same time, staff began to find what appeared to be an increasing quantity, and quality, of legitimacy in some of the group home youngsters' complaints. The boys saw Mrs. D as "O.K." at times; but they saw Mr. D as an "old grouch". It also appeared that the boys had formed an effective coalition against the D's. Some wards began viewing the D's as "phony" - feeling that the D's were operating the home for the money and making up artificial reasons for rules, etc. that the boys felt were solely for the convenience of the D's.

When staff met in late May, 1968, to evaluate current conditions in the Type II home and to review the previous two to three months, it was observed that the situation had become worse. It appeared that on most - if not all - of the central issues the D's and staff were locked into positions which were strongly opposed, and there appeared no hope of reconciling the differences. It was also observed, however, that had staff been able to comfortably support the original Type II research model as being completely appropriate for Cfc and Mp wards and had they been able to allow the D's to operate the home with no "interference" from staff, the D's might then have been retained.¹ However, in view of current treatment thinking relative to Cfc and Mp youngsters, and - most specifically - in view of a feeling that opportunities for growth were not being made available in the home - it was decided unanimously - by several levels of research and operations staff - to terminate the D's, to modify the Containment Home model, and to try to develop another Type II home along lines of these modifications.²

This general, abstract discussion of experiences with the D's does not contain the specifics of the operation of the home, and the specific points.

¹It will, of course, remain a matter of speculation whether or not an arrangement of this nature would or would not have been successful.

²The modifications in question are discussed later.

of concern. The following account is designed to convey a flavor of what the home was "like" during the past year.

This home has had the most structured program of any of the DTED homes. It was anticipated - and in many ways encouraged - that it would be so. However, many of the rules, or "understandings" came to be seen by the D's as "ends in themselves"; some also had considerable relationship to meeting the D's needs or their convenience, rather than as "means to ends" which related closely to the wards' needs.

Mrs. D arose about 6 a.m., awakening the boys shortly after that. Following a joint breakfast, those boys who did not take a bus to school were taken by Mrs. D either to their school (e.g., special continuation school) or to the CTP office. Generally, the boys returned to the group home in the late afternoon via either the CTP transportation officer or a Community Agent.

At times, Mrs. D did not seem to want the boys around the house during the day since she felt it restricted her in working around the house or in leaving to go shopping. In addition, she felt that Mr. D, who worked nights (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.) as a janitor, might not be able to sleep. Supper was not a "family" affair. Mr. D, upon arising in the late afternoon, often ate before the boys did; and the boys generally ate by themselves. During the evenings the boys could go out or remain around the house, but they had to be in bed by 9:00 p.m. and "settled down" (no noise, talking, etc.) by 9:00. The reasons which were given for this early bed time, were: (1) Mrs. D felt that the boys were too hard to get up in the morning when they went to bed at a later time, and (2) Mr. D did not want the boys up when he went to work at 9:30 p.m. because he did not feel comfortable leaving Mrs. D alone with the boys at night.¹

One night a week the D's took the boys to a laundramat to do the washing. (The boys were responsible for the general care of their clothing). Aside from taking care of their own belongings and rooms, the boys were assigned chores on a rotating system usually by the D's rather than by a list. The D's never really were able to find a way to obtain the boys' consistent cooperation in regard to chores. Their stance in regard to this is a fairly good example of how they handled issues of control with the group home youngsters.

¹When the home began, Mr. D was not going to work outside the home except in connection with part time, general handy-man jobs. It was not financially possible to continue this due to the D's personal indebtedness. Routinely, staff pressed Mr. D to switch to a day job in order to alleviate this concern, free the home up during the day, and, most importantly, to give him more time to interact with the group home youngsters. While stating that he did wish to make such a change, he made little actual effort to change jobs. Except for realizing that his age (59) made job-seeking more difficult, it never became certain why he did not follow through with this. Speculations were made that it might be that Mr. and Mrs. D's relationship was more compatible as a result of this type of arrangement, and/or that Mr. D "preferred" not being available to the boys. In addition, the D's tried to keep Mr. D's hours and days (and location) of employment a secret from the boys. They kept this up even though Mr. D recognized that the boys would have to be very unobservant not to notice the times he was at home, and that he slept days.

If a request or demand was made for a boy to work and the boy refused, the D's found few, lasting, ways to counter this. Cigarettes might be withheld, but, more typically, the Agent was called or the D's would threaten to call him. The D's were not able to (or did not want to) see themselves as people with authority who were in control of a given situation.¹ In addition, if a boy did the assigned chore but did it with a negative or sullen attitude, the D's were not satisfied. Then, if the Agent did not take their side in some subsequent, related dispute by means of a verbal reprimand to the boy, or by placing the boy in temporary custody, the D's were upset with the Agent. Mr. D, particularly, felt that the only "power" they (the D's) had rested with the Agent, and that without his full support they had no authority in the perception of the boys.²

During the last year, weekend activities were handled much differently than during the previous year. During the previous year the group home youngsters generally spent weekends at the home although they would (with some exceptions), independently of the D's, pursue their own interests. During this last year the new Agent - to accommodate demands from wards to go home weekends and partly to accommodate demands from the D's for time away from the boys - arranged for the boys to go to their own homes Friday p.m. and return to the group home Monday p.m. (later changed to Sunday p.m.). In effect, the boys were "in" the group home Monday evening through Friday morning.

If the D's were gone (not just on weekends) and a boy wished to return to the group home he would have to wait outside until the D's returned. The D's would not allow any of the boys to be in the house at any time when one of them was not there. If a boy was at the home and the D's wanted to go somewhere, and if the boy did not want to go where they wanted to go, he would have to hang around the neighborhood until the D's returned. This "lockout" practice was often difficult for staff to really support, and this approach was discussed with the D's on several occasions. These discussions had no impact on the D's.³

¹That is they wanted to define what the limits were but not to be personally responsible for following through. They wanted the Agents to do this when (and in the manner) the D's requested. Thus, the D's would be able to direct what was happening but with no personal involvement.

²The D's did receive some support in regard to their rules and means of operating the home in an attempt to back them up. However, Agents did not feel that they could do this when the rule or the infraction did not, to them, seem to warrant the degree or type of support that the D's requesting or demanding of them (e.g., temporary detention). In other words the Agents did not support the D's (on issues they differed on) while trying to help the D's understand (and respond to) the Agents' point of view. The Agents did try to work with the D's but in a rather direct, confrontive manner. (This was the case primarily with the most recent Agent to use the home.) This form of approach seemed to be, for the most part, an impersonal, communication to the D's of the Agent's demands, expectations, etc. rather than more of a "working through" approach.

³Early in May, 1968, the D's began to see the need for some of the group home boys to remain at the group home on weekends as these boys were getting into trouble on the weekends. They offered to allow the boys that needed to stay at the group home; however, the Agent did not alter the arrangement. He later stated to DTED staff that he felt that the D's would not have been able to stand this additional involvement without becoming more irritable and thus contributing to additional conflicts with the boys.

Though a general practice of leaving group home youngsters alone frequently for long periods of time was not considered appropriate, staff felt that some flexibility here was necessary to meet emergent needs and to begin to take some risks in developing trust. The D's "lockout" policy existed because, as they had stated, they simply did not trust the boys. A boy, in their view, would have to "earn" trust. However, the D's were quite vague about what would have to happen for them to trust a boy. It now seems that the D's were basically not open to developing trust either with the boys or staff. This underlying attitude of "distrusting until proven otherwise" was evident in many areas. It appears in retrospect that even with staff, the D's were distrustful and suspicious and handled themselves so that their interests would be protected. It appeared that they based a good deal of their ability to feel secure in interpersonal situations on being relatively distrustful of others.

Although - during the first eight months - there were indications to the contrary, the D's were not able to and/or not willing to develop a group-like situation in the home. In contrast, it became apparent that the D's were trying to keep their "personal life" and their dealings in operating the home - i.e., "their job" - separate. This, of course, became impossible to do especially when the D's were pressed to be more open, honest and trusting, and to let the youngsters into their life to a greater degree.

For the most part, the boys felt that the D's (particularly Mrs. D) approached them "like we're little kids". In addition, there were few instances in which the D's appeared - to the CTP staff - to be dealing with the group home youngsters on an older-adolescent level. For example, compliance with curfew and other responsibilities were kept on a posted "scoreboard". Each week of conforming behavior was noted with a star, and a month's worth of "stars" was rewarded with a "treat" or a "surprise" (clothing, money, or some special food item). This external form of a check and reward system was seen as a good idea - and a few youngsters (who seemed to enjoy being more dependent, in child-like ways) responded positively to it, and seemed to enjoy using it as a gauge for how they (and others) were doing. However, except for these two or three youngsters, the other boys were condescending and rejecting of this method.

The focus of this reaction appeared to come from Mrs. D's attitude toward wards (viz, that of mother-to-young child) in her implementation of this procedure. Even though her attitude and approach could be stated, or admitted to, by some boys as being an expression that she "cared", their overt reaction was to remain aloof - largely in an effort to maintain their self-image of being "cool" and as not needing any sort of dependent relationship. Mrs. D was unable to understand, and/or accept, these dynamics and defenses. The boys' reactions to her other overt attempts to approach them as though they were eight or nine years old, frustrated her; and she could not, naturally "feel good" about these boys or demonstrate basic trust toward, and/or acceptance of, them.

Mr. D had little success in dealing effectively with the youngsters when they were in a time of crisis or were acting surly or unruly. His main responses were to "give-up", to defer to the Agent, or to "give the boy a break" and not

say anything about it.¹ (He would hope that a given boy would be "appreciative" of having received a break, and would become more cooperative). Mrs. D, on the other hand, seemed at her best when major behavioral problems would arise. For example, there were several instances when youngsters appeared in the home intoxicated (glue, liquor, etc.). She could under these circumstances (and also on occasions when a boy would be openly hostile) deal directly and openly with a boy in the form of a confrontation which could get him to back down or to at least settle down.

Mr. D commented several times that he could not be like his wife in this respect. He seemed to defer to her when it came to managing the home and to dealing with the boys.² Staff was unsure as to whether Mrs. D put herself in this role in order to exclude Mr. D (in connection with factors related to competition with him), or whether Mr. D preferred and encouraged her to assume most of the responsibilities (with Mrs. D assuming a "protecting" stance toward him).

Regardless of the reasons, however, it was not considered appropriate. Staff felt that the group home father should be the more dominant person, or at least be equally dominant.³ Mr. D often spoke of feeling "bad" about having so much responsibility fall onto his wife; but, as with many things, this feeling was never translated into any lasting effort. He would on occasion become quite vocal and forceful in expressing himself with staff - usually in regard to complaints over the amount and nature of group home responsibilities, the fact that they were short on money, concerns over the way staff was handling them and the boys; he would also specifically express his concern in regard to the wear-and-tear on Mrs. D.

As previously mentioned, when staff began to press for changes, it became evident that the D's had strong emotional investments in their methods of operating the home and in their way of evaluating and understanding the boys. At approximately this same point, the D's became increasingly irritable, rigid, and resentful toward the boys and the Agent. In addition, it appeared as if they were attempting to convince staff that all the boys were "basically bad", in an effort to get

¹Some six to eight months after the home started Mr. D's responses to crisis situations became more of a concern to the Agents. Up to that time, the Agents had wanted (because of Cfc and Mp resistance to male adults) Mrs. D to be more active than Mr. D in dealing with the boys. When the Agent (and Coordinator) began to point out that his responses only made him appear weak in the boys' perceptions, and when they encouraged him to become more actively dominant and controlling, it became apparent that he was not comfortable operating this way.

²Most major problems arose in the evening, when Mr. D was at work and not available. His continued resistance to making arrangements which would allow him to be more available indicated to staff he really did not want this in spite of his "guilt" (his word) about knowing Mrs. D was carrying the major responsibilities for the home.

³This is considered to be important for Cfc and Mp youngsters since their experiences within their own families frequently involve a passive, ineffective father and a strong, dominant mother. As indicated in footnote 1, above, a strong involved, but not domineering, mother figure is felt to be desirable, i.e., in and of herself - and not at the expense of her husband who, as an individual in his own right, should also be strong even though he may be quantitatively less expressive than his wife.

staff to align themselves with the D's and against the boys. Following notification of termination, Mr. D commented he was "sorry" that other opinions (those held by staff) were given more weight than their own had been given - and that "all that theory sounds good, but it doesn't work".

There was an obvious ideological and personality clash between the Agent (the most recent one to use the home) and the D's. The Agent had handled them poorly on occasion (e.g., consistently being late to meetings, spending little time informally in attempting to develop more of a positive relationship with them, placing boys in the home with little or no notification or preparation, providing little positive support or feedback). This seemed to contribute to - although it did not always initiate - many of the problems. The D's felt estranged from the Agent and were unable to understand, or feel comfortable, with him. They frequently complained about his attitude and approach, and would contrast their experiences with him to those of the first Agent who used the home (with whom they felt very comfortable). Even though the D's would probably not have been retained if the Agent had developed a better relationship with them, these circumstances did not lend themselves to a good "test" with reference to the question of what kind of impact could staff have upon the D's in trying to alter their approach to the operation of their home.

The Agent was obviously frustrated about the D's; but at no time did he press for them to be terminated or imply that if certain changes were not made, he would then remove the youngster from the home. He felt that the home had some positive points - mainly providing a stable, structured program. The first Agent to use the home felt that the essential point was that the D's (particularly Mr. D) were not able to form meaningful relationships with the group home youngsters. The Supervising Parole Agent felt they had, on one or two occasions, "set kids up" to expect a relationship and had then withdrawn. DTED staff felt that the situation with the D's was not subject to significant change within a period of 3-6 months, under the present circumstances, and that the Project should try to develop a different Type II Home - one in which the people, and their methods of dealing with youngsters, were more compatible with staff and Community Treatment thinking.

The impact on the ten youngsters placed in the home since November 1, 1966 is difficult to assess. One might expect that under the aforementioned circumstances the youngsters would have departed rather quickly. In view of this, it is difficult to evaluate why five of these boys completed from eight to twelve months in the home. Although most of the boys resented spending a good deal of time around the house or with the D's, only one official AWOL seemed directly connected to a reaction "against" the home. A recent speculation is that many of the youngsters could accept the home as a "condition of parole" - tolerating it on that basis rather than (or more than) because the home and the D's came to be seen as a place and/or a set of individuals, with whom the boys wanted to relate. The home did provide certain basic controls and a very important communication network. As such, it did allow the Agents to work, more than might otherwise have been possible, within still other significant areas with the wards. In addition, Mrs. D's approach (those aspects which emphasized interactions at a child-like level) could be more

¹Including: What the D's were like; what the D's needed from Agents; and how the D's looked at dealing with youngsters; what the Agents felt was appropriate in dealing with Cfc and Mp youngsters; the Agents styles of handling the D's.

easily rejected by the boys than could an age-appropriate invitation for a meaningful relationship - something which might have been more psychologically threatening.

In terms of obvious signs of growth, only one boy (the first to be placed in the home) seemed to change for the better. However, if the home has had any negative impact on any of the group home youngsters, it was also with this same boy. At a time when he seemed to be getting close to the D's, their secrecy about re-locating the home set him back.¹ Even though the other boys seemed to be getting little out of the group home experience - except for some meaningful degree of stabilization which resulted from being exposed to a very structured program - some staff were concerned about the D's "setting kids up for a possible relationship that would not materialize or would be withdrawn".

The best assessment that can be made at present is that for most of the boys in the home, their placement in the Type II was neither damaging nor helpful in establishing circumstances that would contribute to growth. On the other hand, their placement probably contributed quite a lot from the standpoint of stabilization and control. In view of CTP treatment objectives in utilizing a group home for Cfc and Mp youngsters, a home which seemed incapable of promoting growth - particularly in relation to youths who seemed capable of expanding their interpersonal horizons - was, stabilization and control notwithstanding, in the long run, far from acceptable.

The D's were interested in continuing some sort of foster home program, discussed this with the Coordinator and the Director of the Youth Authority, and it was suggested that they contact the local Welfare and Probation departments to see if what they could offer might fit into one of those programs. One of the CTP Agents who had used the home also intimated he might use them on occasion - on a regular foster home basis - for certain youngsters.

In looking ahead to the establishment of another Type II home, DTED and CTP staff will be guided by the experiences with the D's - experiences which have been fruitful albeit not successful except in terms of some of the more rudimentary standards (control, etc.). Some modifications have been made in the research model in an effort to include the major areas of difference between current thinking and that which was stated in 1965, when the group home models were first formulated. The modified model is as follows:

Type II Containment Group Home (6/68 Modification) for six Cfc and Mp Wards:²

This type of home is envisioned for youths of two subtypes: middle maturity manipulators (Mp's) and cultural conformists (Cfc's). These youngsters need considerable structure and control. Initially, they

¹Later, when the boy wanted to return to the group home the D's refused, stating that he needed more help than they could offer him. They also appeared "closed" to the suggestion that this boy had been "hurt" by being led to believe he "had something going" with the D's, only to be rejected by them.

²The parts which are underlined represent areas of content addition. The major deletion from the original model is: "This type of home would operate on a 'non-family' basis, since these children are unable or unwilling to respond to adults who are seen as parental images." For the complete, original model statement, see Appendix A.

operate largely on the basis of external codes of behavior, which they perceive as having the support of social power. Opportunity for growth is thought to rest in the youngster's forming atypical (for them), healthy relationships with adults, within the context of the above controls.

The home will represent concrete and realistic demands by community and society for conforming and productive behavior. In addition to providing a high degree of structure and supervision, the group home parents will try to provide an atmosphere in which meaningful interpersonal relationships can develop. The structure or formality of the home might later be modified in the case of individual youngsters who seem ready to handle additional responsibility, or more personalized relationships, and who may be in the process of transferring standards of behavior and control from an external to more of an internalized source. Additional techniques might involve the use of the peer group (e.g., guided group interaction) as pressure for behavior modification and as an opportunity to increase social perceptiveness.

Agents seem to want group home parents who can develop clearly structured, yet flexible and predictable modes of interacting with Cfc and Mp youngsters. This, hopefully, would promote growth toward an I₄ level of maturity - yet all the while recognizing that the youngsters, when first placed, still need to be dealt with at the I₃ level with reference to external structure, control, and uncomplicated or direct expressions of interest and concern. In addition, the group home parents will need to naturally like or basically enjoy these types of youngsters, or at least enjoy (non-destructively) the process by which they deal with the youngsters.

Finding people such as this (including professional people) will be no small task. If they are found, we may be able to evaluate: (1) whether this kind of group home interaction (as currently modified) can contribute to growth and maturity with Cfc and/or Mp youngsters; (2) whether the "containment", "conditioning", "non-involved" elements of the original model may turn out to be the more feasible and appropriate of the approaches; (3) whether the same model (either the original one or the modified version) can apply to both Mp's and Cfc's; and (4) to what extent a group home for these types of youngsters can become a significant factor in their treatment and growth (and to what extent and in what ways is this so).

Type III Boarding Home - (Mr. and Mrs. B)¹

Mr. and Mrs. B began operation of the Type III home on 2/20/67. By most estimates they have been quite appropriate. In some regards, they have had unusual success in dealing with I₄ wards. By virtue of its natural development, the home has evolved into something quite different than the original model of the Type III Boarding Home had suggested. With several youngsters the B's home has indeed become "home" - much to the satisfaction of the boys, their Agents and the B's. For them (and for staff) the B's represent far more than a "YMCA Hotel" or conventional private boarding home.

Nine boys have resided in the home during the past year. A total of eleven have been placed since the home started. Four are currently in placement - with three of these having been in the home for over a year (one left for two months but returned to the home).² The fourth boy - just recently placed - was for a time living in the Type II home. Other boys have experienced fewer months in placement, ranging from only a few days to six months. Six boys were placed in the first two months. Since that time, the use of the home for additional youngsters has not been as great: five boys have been placed between 6/15/67 and 6/24/68.

Table 4, page 38, contains information relative to age, race, and a number of other variables in regard to the youngsters who have been placed in the Boarding Home in the sixteen months of its operation (through June 30, 1968). Eleven boys have been placed, representing twelve separate placements. Five of the twelve placements (41%) were made at the time of parole to CTP. Each of the twelve placements has, thus far, averaged about five months in duration; five placements have been for 60 days or less (this includes one boy placed in May, 1968). Half of the placements have had no official breaks in placement - (official breaks have averaged 1.5 per placement). The majority of boys placed (64%) have been Negro; and, no Mexican/American boys have been placed thus far. The average age for all placements (17 years - 0 months) is slightly lower than that of the Protective and Containment Homes.

At this time last year CTP and DTED staff were quite pleased with the B's and with what the home was providing. Even in the short period of four months the B's had met most - if not all - of the staff's expectations relative to dealing effectively with difficult neurotic youngsters.

The B's live only four blocks from the Community Treatment office in Sacramento, thus providing easy access between the home and the office for both youngsters and Agents. The area is one of the oldest residential areas of the Sacramento area, is racially mixed but predominantly Negro, and is considered to be the major "ghetto" area in Sacramento. There have been some minor incidents of civil disturbance in the area in the last two years.

The group home is quite large, having 14 rooms which includes a complete flat upstairs and a complete flat downstairs. Each floor has three bedrooms,

¹For a maximum of six wards classified at the I₄ maturity level: Neurotic, Acting-Out - Na; Neurotic, Anxious - Nx; Situational Emotional Reaction - Se; and Cultural Identifier - Ci. See Appendix A for the original model for the Boarding Home.

²He was in the interim diagnosed as an I₄ - having moved, in connection with treatment, from the I₃ Mp classification.

TABLE 4

TYPE III BOARDING HOME: POPULATION DATA¹
Mr. and Mrs. B, 2/10/67 - 6/30/68

A		B		C Age				D Race			
Number of Wards Placed	Number of Placements	15-5 and under	15-6 to 17-5	17-6 and over	Average Age	Cauc	Mex/Am	Negro	Other		
11	12	1	7	4	17-0	3	-	7	1		
		8%	58%	33%		27%	-	64%	9%		

E I-level*										
	Aa	Ap	Cfm	Cfc	Mp	Na	Nx	Se	Gi	I4 U*
N	-	-	-	-	-	4	5	-	1	1
%	-	-	-	-	-	36%	46%	-	9%	9%

*Undifferentiated as to subtype.

F Months on Parole Prior to Placement					G No. of Breaks in Placements							
	0	1-6	7-12	13-18	19 & Over	0	1	2	3	4	5	6 & Over
N	5	2	2	2	1	6	3	1	1	1	-	-
%	41%	17%	17%	17%	8%	50%	26%	8%	8%	8%	-	-

H Days in Placement														
	0-30	31-60	61-90	91-120	121-150	151-180	181-210	211-240	241-270	271-300	301-330	331-360	361 & Over	Ave
N	4	1	-	1	1	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	2	154
%	34%	8%	-	8%	8%	-	17%	8%	-	-	-	-	17%	

I Wards in Home	
on 6/30/67	on 6/30/68
4	4

J Placements	
through 6/30/67	7/1/67 - 6/30/68
7	5

¹See Appendix D for explanation of these items. Appendix E contains summary tables for the three long-term care homes. Appendix J is a chart of the placement patterns in the Type III, Boarding Home.

a living room, dining room, kitchen, bath and utility area. The B's have made their home on the second floor - this being somewhat larger. One of the bedrooms downstairs is occupied by Mrs. B's brother, who boards with them.¹ (He was living with the B's at the time the home was started.)

Since the downstairs had not been used very much, this area was not, at the time the group home started, in as good a state of repair as the upstairs. Thus, the youngsters lived upstairs until December, 1967, while the B's remodeled the downstairs area. It is now a very comfortable, wood-paneled living quarters. Each of the two bedrooms for group home youngsters downstairs has three beds. The living room is available for the youngsters to entertain in; it has a television set and lounge area away from the sleeping area. In addition, Mrs. B has completely furnished the kitchen and keeps it stocked with food so that the youngsters can, if they wish, cook for themselves. Many of them do cook, although they generally eat their meals with the family upstairs.

The downstairs has two entrances, both from the outside of the house. The boys are allowed free movement in and out of the living area.² Even with this type of an arrangement, the B's are quite aware of the youngsters' movements in and out of the home. The boys also have free access to the upstairs area.

This home has hardly any formal structure. It seems to operate on the basis of general "understandings". Issues are handled on an individualized basis rather than as a group. Problems with one boy do not cause the B's to then impose a general rule which then is to be applied to all the boys. The youngsters are allowed to come and go with almost unrestricted movement. Occasionally, on an individual case basis, an Agent may decide to place a youngster on a curfew or more regimented program; however, this has occurred only infrequently. Mr. and Mrs. B prefer to handle most situations themselves, and to call Parole Agents only when behavior becomes chronic or extreme.³

The youngsters are not asked to do any routine chores around the home, other than those involved in maintaining their own living quarters. Even this has not always been easy to accomplish, and Agents have on one or two occasions interceded to support the B's and to enlist the cooperation of the youngsters. Mrs. B has shown all the youngsters how to handle the washing machine and dryer, which are near their living quarters. The youngsters take care of most of their own clothing.

¹Mrs. B's brother has remained to himself for the most part. On one occasion he became involved with two of the boys over his clothes having been borrowed; on another occasion he became involved when one of the boys was trying to "act tough" with a knife. He handled these incidents quickly himself and has achieved an "understanding" with the boys; they go their own ways now; with little interaction.

²Also downstairs, off of the utility area and completely separated from youngsters' living area, is a small bedroom that Mrs. B has transformed into her "antique room". She occasionally sleeps there.

³The B's "read" the boys quite well and vice versa. For example, Mrs. B knows how to approach the boys when she wants them to know she means business -- they know "by the look in my eye." The boys, on the other hand, recognize this "look and realize they can no longer take advantage of her flexible nature. The B's recognize also that after a flare-up (in which they may have "kicked up a lot of sand"), some boys may need to pout or spend time to themselves before everything is going to get back to normal.

There have been some problems with so-called "borrowing" of clothing belonging to other boys; however, this has centered mainly around just one boy.

Mealtimes are generally scheduled, but they are also flexible. This allows anyone to eat at almost any time of the day that he wishes. He may, however, have to cook for himself if it is not convenient for the group home mother to do so.¹

Unless given youngsters are working or involved in school (usually the special CTP school), they are allowed to sleep as late as they want and to stay up as late at night as they want, as long as they do not disturb those who are sleeping. The B's usually keep irregular hours themselves - (e.g., up late at night and sometimes napping during the day), so they are very understanding and permissive in regard to given youngsters' schedules. Aside from expressing their own viewpoints to the boys (who can then "take it or leave it"), the B's do not demand that a boy go to school or work (with, e.g., the expectation that if a demand is not followed there will be some form of "punishment").

Although involved with each of the youngsters in the home to varying degrees, the B's generally do not push themselves onto the youngsters. Instead, they let the boys "set the pace" of the relationship with them, and they generally let the boys determine the manner in which they will use the home. While they encourage youngsters to work or go to school, they allow the Agent to determine the nature of each boy's program - again as an expression of the basically individualized way in which the B's attempt to relate with the youngsters. The B's support a youngsters program (e.g., by making sure they go to school or work and have transportation).

Mrs. B is more frequently and directly involved in running the home. Mr. B - even though he works two different jobs - is involved in his own quiet, unassuming way. He has remarked that he did not expect to become as emotionally invested as he has - but that, nevertheless, he "wouldn't have it any other way."

This home seems to have become much more than just a boarding home. Agents are reluctant - in fact, would probably resist - attempts to structure, control, or interfere in some way with whatever relationship the B's would naturally develop with the boys. The B's have become, for some youngsters, almost substitute mother and father figures; and in short, the group home has become - psychologically - almost a real home for them.

Thus, to some extent the initially stated Agent goals of using the home as a place in which a youngster moves toward independent placement - this has become either delayed or has taken on the status of a secondary goal, i.e., secondary to allowing a youngster to use the home and the B's in whatever way they can, in order to continue growing. Thus, the manner in which Agents and wards "use" the home has evolved into what the B's now refer to as a "family home". It is clearly not an impersonal group home. The B's have the capacity, flexibility and evident interest to make themselves, their home, and their entire family life very explicitly open and available to youngsters; and, they seem to obtain their greatest degree of satisfaction when they feel that a youngster becomes a part of that. Together with all of this, the B's allow the youngsters a good deal of age-appropriate independence.

¹Mrs. B is an excellent cook - cooking is a means of expression of giving for her. Staff has also been invited over for luncheons.

The evolved use of the home does not closely fit the original model description for the Type III Home. The model itself is, in a way, vague and - in terms of real-life people - potentially contradictory. It states, on the one hand, that the home should be "like a YMCA hotel"; on the other hand, it states that it should be operated by individuals who have a great deal of understanding, patience, ability and willingness to deal with youngsters in various stages of development, and to interact effectively with them.

Thus, except for the semi-impersonal atmosphere suggested by a YMCA hotel, the B's have met and, in fact, have exceeded a set of relatively difficult criteria for group home or foster parents for I₄ youngsters.

By August, 1967, it was also apparent that, at any point in time, there would be relatively few I₄ wards (15% at the very most) who really would be in a position ready to work on becoming completely independent and autonomous. In addition, it was felt that many of those youngsters who were (or might be) at such a point, should probably be placed independently rather than in the group home. After reviewing this with CTP staff, DTED staff felt that the research guidelines for admission to the Type III Home should be broadened to make the home potentially available to a greater number of I₄ wards (and to take advantages of the strengths of the B's in being able to contribute to the growth of I₄ youngsters by providing more of a "family-like" environment.¹

Under the revised guidelines (developed August, 1967), a youngster to be admitted to the home need only to have some potential (that the Agent wishes to work on) to achieve a degree of independence and autonomy. In other words, the youngster does not have to have any pre-existing specified quantity of independence and autonomy prior to being eligible for placement within this type of home. Thus, even though a boy may have a very poor prognosis in terms of becoming fully independent, he can be placed in the Type III Home when the Agent wants to utilize the group home to help the youngster achieve whatever level of independent functioning he is capable of.

During part of July and August, 1967, the group home mother went on a month's trip to visit her mother in Kansas City, Missouri. She left the overall management of the home in the hands of her husband, while her older daughter handled meals and other routine household matters. This arrangement worked out quite well. The oldest daughter (age 20) is almost a carbon copy of her mother. She handles her relationships with the group home boys - who are not too much younger than she is - quite well and quite appropriately. The boys are not threatening at all to her. She has been able, on occasion, to call the boys on their behavior and to "needle" them effectively in ways that most adults could not. The group home youngsters seem to accept her.

Last summer (when the group home mother was gone), there was some civil disturbance in the area of the home, and Mr. B felt that this might become more serious. On his own initiative, he took time off from work and discussed with

¹It would have been very difficult to try and "de-emphasize" the B's abilities in this area as CTP Agents view emotional growth as being of primary importance. Thus, the utility of the original model within the present setting, using the B's, could not really be explored.

Agents how to insure that the youngsters in the group home were safe, and also his desire that they not be involved in any of the disorder. A curfew was set for the home for the first time, and this was adhered to without any question by the group home boys. The crisis passed rather quickly, with none of the youngsters becoming involved in any of the disorders, even though the major part of the "disorders" took place only a few blocks from the group home.

The months from September to late January were without any serious incident and moved along rather routinely.¹ One of the youngsters in the home during that time was thought to be using marijuana or other drugs. The group home parents kept in close touch with the Agent on this point, and would let him know of any unusual activity or appearance on the part of this youngster. The situation at that time was handled on an individual casework basis between the Agent and the boy.

In late January, parole staff became aware of possible drug use by other youngsters in the home. They had been told by other wards that marijuana was being smoked in the group home, and that pills were being distributed by boys in the home. Almost immediately CTP staff, without adequately communicating with the group home parents or group home staff, held an "emergency meeting" in the group home. It appears, in retrospect, that this meeting was called to "shake up" the youngsters rather than to determine exactly whether the allegations were accurate. Seemingly, the intended message to the youngsters was something to the effect that, "If this is going on, and any of you are aware of it, you had better stop immediately because of the threat that it has to each one of you and to the operation of the group home". The group home parents, particularly Mrs. B, were somewhat mystified by this approach and became quite upset and angry. The group home boys were also angered. Apparently the B's felt that they were indirectly being accused of having been aware of what was going on, and of having suppressed the information. Mrs. B felt that if the Agents wanted to know what was going on, and had communicated their concerns to her (as they had done in the past), she could have then found out.

In addition, it was difficult for the group home parents to see why a "big issue" was being made out of suspected drug use when the suspected drug use of another youngster (mentioned previously) had been handled on an individual casework basis with the Agent. Even though it was later explained to them why the situation was handled differently (essentially, because it may have involved

¹In November one of the boys who had then been in the home eight months wanted to move out on his own. He explained that the B's were having marital trouble, that the B's might be terminating their home, and that he 'wanted out' before this took place. Subsequent interactions with the B's and staff did not seem to substantiate this concern. Staff had been aware that it appeared that the B's marital relationship had some "unusual" elements, in that Mr. and Mrs. B appeared to have reached some sort of unspecified, "mutual understanding". Although they do interact and combine efforts in relation to running their family and group home, they "go their own ways" in certain other areas (e.g., separate vacations, bank accounts, etc.). This has not been of too much concern, both because the arrangement seems satisfactory to the B's and because it does not seem to effect the group home youngsters or the general atmosphere of the home. Since this is a very personal area, staff has not, on their own initiative, viewed it as appropriate to probe this area directly. This may be done, however, if the conditions appear to be adversely affecting the boys or the atmosphere within the home.

all of the youngsters in the home), their feelings in regard to the way it had been handled made it difficult for them to hear this.¹

During the next month (February), the group home mother was thought to be involved in perpetuating or otherwise spreading some rumors about wards and staff. This was checked out and it appears that Mrs. B had related something to the boys that she recalled an Agent telling her some time ago. One of these boys checked it out with the Agent. Unwittingly Mrs. B had fed into a larger problem and she was briefly thought to be connected with it. The investigation cleared her. However, being "suspect" in this problem - taken in conjunction with the drug incident - undoubtedly strained the relationship with the B's in regard to the feeling of mutual confidence and trust that had been established. This may, in part, account for what followed next.

One of the new youngsters in the home at that time (placed in January, 1968) exhibited an extremely poor and condescending attitude, according to Mrs. B. He was, in her view, almost a "ghost" in the home. In addition, he was bringing friends into the home, and was feeding them downstairs. Mrs. B seemed (in retrospect) to be building up a general dislike and distrust of this youngster. In March, this boy was accused by Mrs. B of stealing a television set out of the downstairs area. Supposedly, some witnesses from across the street had seen him carrying it out of the house. When the Agent and the boy came to the house to talk this over with Mrs. B, she became irrationally angry at the youngster and demanded that he immediately be removed. The Agent took the youngster downstairs to get his clothing. Seemingly, Mrs. B was not aware of this (and/or was not aware that the Agent was intending to remove him) - and/or possibly she wished to make sure that the removal would be "immediate": she went to her room, took a revolver, and came upon the Agent (the boy was somewhere else at the time). Mrs. B made no threats or threatening gestures with the gun (nor did she point it at the Agent). When the Agent told her that she "didn't need that" and emphasized that he was removing the boy, she returned the gun to her room.

In discussion this incident later, it was felt that Mrs. B had no intentions of using the gun, and that she was mainly showing it as a way of emphasizing her feelings about having the boy removed immediately. In addition, not knowing the Agent very well, and perhaps being somewhat distrustful of him,² she did not want there to be any misunderstanding about her feelings.

While this somewhat rational, retrospective account may account for some aspects of this interaction, it does appear as though Mrs. B was acting very emotionally and, for the first time, irrationally. When Mr. B became aware of this and of staff concern over the incident, and over the presence of a gun in the home, he unilaterally (but without resistance from Mrs. B) removed the gun from the home before staff requested it.

CTP and DTED staff was concerned about the incident, but felt that it was related to the recent crises in the home. Staff wanted to continue using the

¹Later, one of the boys was strongly suspected of having hidden marijuana in the home. Except for this, the validity or invalidity or the original charges has never been determined.

²This Agent had been one of the objects of the above-mentioned "rumors".

home. They felt that this - when viewed within a context of their total experience with the B's - was a situational event, and was not in itself sufficient reason for terminating the home. Staff did feel they would in the future need to be more perceptive of and responsive to Mrs. B's feelings, particularly if a youngster similar to this one were to be placed in the home again. In meetings with group home and CTP staff, Mrs. B was able to ventilate a great deal of her feelings in regard to the incident; and it appeared as if the situation had been "worked through."

The remaining months in the home have been generally uneventful, with the home appearing to have returned to more of the previous year's status quo. Recently, Mrs. B's daughter gave birth to a son and she and her husband are temporarily living with the B's. This, to some extent, has distracted Mrs. B from as much involvement with the group home as she had had before.

The home has had some very striking, direct impact on several youngsters placed there. Indirectly, it has also given Agents a placement alternative to discuss with other youths who are struggling with whether to make a separation from their families, and/or who are frustrated in their attempts to live independently - but who, nevertheless, do not want to return to their own families. These youngsters are now less likely to feel "trapped" - in the sense of feeling as though they had no place to go.

Relative to the goal of becoming independent and autonomous, only one of the youngsters has achieved this to any extent. He has been working for the last eight or nine months very steadily. Just prior to the first of this year, he tried, for two months, to make it on his own. He recognized that he had moved out too soon, and then came back to the group home. He is now in the process of preparing to leave again and to make it on his own. The B's were quite instrumental in helping this boy deal with his personal problems (centering mainly around a girlfriend) as well as helping him to explore and find out about taking care of himself before he moved out. He visited the B's frequently during the two months he was on his own, and continued to use them as a resource for information, advice, and support. When he moved back into the group home the B's supported the move, but in such a way as to not make the boy feel he had "failed."

With the remaining youngsters who have been in the home for any length of time, there has been very little success in terms of their being consistently employed. They have, nevertheless, achieved a substantial degree of stability, investment, and involvement in the home and in their relationship with the B's. Agents recognize that their original objectives in placing these boys with the B's have been side-tracked. Yet, they implicitly encourage the level of involvement the B's have had with the wards, and they see this as an important element in long-range growth objectives. (These objectives were not being actively pursued at the time of placement because adequate conditions were not present for doing so).¹

¹It would appear that Agent preferences for utilizing the potentials of the B's for contributing to long-range growth, have also reduced the incidence of strong overt pressure on the group home youngsters to - very quickly - begin to start (and to continue) to function independently (e.g., working) with the implication being that if this did not happen, then "something" (e.g., lock-up) would happen as a result of the Agent's initiative.

In follow-up research interviews, the attitudes of wards to the home and the B's is very positive. None of the youngsters have expressed any concern about dislike of the B's - in fact, quite the contrary. The youngsters had expressed enjoyment of the "free", informal, and trusting environment which they feel does exist.

There is little doubt that the B's will continue as a DTED group home for the life of the Project. However, the extent to which it will be used, and the extent to which this use will be congruent with the Boarding Home model is somewhat unclear at present.

During the past eight months (11/1/67 - 7/1/68) there have been only two staffings for purposes of placement of youngsters into the Boarding Home. This compares with twelve staffings (and nine placements) during the preceding eight months (3/1/67 to 11/1/67). This drop-off in frequency of use of the Boarding Home may be related to the following dynamics (none actually exclusive):

- (1) Since the home has for several youngsters evolved into a long-term "family-like" placement resource, the home may not be seen as an appropriate, or the most appropriate, placement for youngsters striving for independence and autonomy.¹
- (2) DTED demands for involvement with the group home parents and in the development of the home (including, e.g., participation in various staffings, participation in informal ongoing communication) may not be compatible with the stance of given Agents in regard to their involvement with given youngsters' placement.²
- (3) Related to (2) may be the inter-Agent dynamics and the intricacies of trying to coordinate their differing demands and treatment styles. Perhaps Agents prefer not to have to compromise their own position, and/or do not wish to "stir-up" existing interpersonal differences.³

¹During the last six to eight months Agents have placed several youngsters (of varying I-levels) into a privately operating boarding house. This house has several non-YA adults residing there as well. Although the B's are still highly regarded by staff, it may be that the private boarding house is more apt to give youngsters an experience of semi-independent living than the Type III Group Home - possibly because the private boarding house is not directly connected with the Youth Authority or CTP. (Wards are placed on rent orders.)

²The time and emotional commitment would appear to be equal or greater in the event that an Agent utilized a foster home instead of the B's home; yet it would probably be less in the case of the private boarding house. At times, it appears that, with some youngsters, some Agents prefer not to become too greatly, or directly involved in the area of placement. They may prefer to deal primarily (or exclusively) on an individual basis with the youngster - helping the youngster to deal with issues in the placement, by means of assuming a counseling or advisory role with the youngsters.

³It is possible that the management of this home should have been handled almost exclusively by the Coordinator who directly - in conjunction with the group home parents - would define "what the program is", and who should coordinate this with the Agents. (Agents, in turn, might then have little direct contact with the group home parents.) This form of management is being used in the Type IV, Temporary Care Home (discussed in later sections). One complication, however, centers around the fact that this home is, by intent, loosely structured... and that there is not very much by way of a "program".

- (4) A racial element may be involved. The group home parents are Negro and live in a predominantly Negro neighborhood. Except for one Caucasian boy who was in the home for six months, the boys who have been in placement for any length of time (over four months) have all been Negro youths. While the B's have in no way expressed any racial feelings, some Agents¹ have stated that they might hesitate placing a Caucasian or Mexican/American boy with the B's if that boy did not want to be placed there (or, if he wanted to be removed) because of the boy's feelings about either living in a Negro home and/or in a predominantly Negro neighborhood.²
- (5) Some Agents have expressed concern in placing some of their wards in the home because of the presence of one boy (an I₄ Na) who has been quite aggressive and, at times, intimidating.
- (6) At least one Agent has expressed concern over the physical accommodations. He feels that many I₄ youngsters need privacy (by having individual rooms) - something which is not available at the B's. (This is due to the size of the B's family and the fact that only two bedrooms are available downstairs for the group home boys).

Related to the question of "what the home is like" (relative to the research model) is the question of: in what manner have Agents generally involved themselves in the ongoing operation of the home and/or, in a sense, attempted to give direction to the home's program? (The set of factors which are involved here may interrelate with some of the points raised above.) By and large, Agents have not dealt with the B's (and DTED staff) in regard to developing informal, ongoing relationships (a) in and through which routine, up-to-date information is communicated, and (b) in terms of which involvement is expressed relative to developing the home's program apart from the needs of the specific youngsters who may be living in the home at any given point in time.

In other words, it does not appear as though Agents have been directly involved in the process of defining or implementing, in the abstract (or even "in general"), "what a 'Boarding Home' should be" from the perspective of a general resource for I₄ wards. Most, if not all, of the impetus for this kind of focus has come from DTED staff. General questions such as, "Should there be any set rules and/or policies in the home" (and, "What should these be?") - these have apparently not been too great a concern to Agents, judging from the relative lack of interest which has been spontaneously expressed relative to discussing this question. When this general issue is brought up in regard to specific

¹Of the six male agents in the Sacramento CTP office, four are Caucasian, two are Negro and all have placed youngsters in the B's home.

²This issue has been present to varying degrees with all of the Caucasian boys placed, but Agents have felt that these were just "convenient" excuses - particularly on the part of certain Na youngsters who at the time were looking for superficial excuses, rather than examining their true feelings. In one or two cases, a youngster's parents have expressed dislike that their son was being placed with a Negro family. (This factor alone has not been directly involved in the non-placement or removal of a ward.) Agents have "absorbed" these feelings and have tried to help the boys deal objectively with their parents' and their own - feelings.

issues (e.g., policy regarding the handling of clean-up responsibilities and chores; having group meetings with the B's and group home boys, as a way of handling management issues), noticeable inter-Agent differences become evident. The net result has been to avoid making any firm, conclusive "policy" decision that might be satisfactory to and/or binding upon all participants.

As a result of the above, the B's have been left to develop their own program - something which, even though it is quite satisfactory in the present instance, is nonetheless not generally congruent with the Boarding Home research model. The B's are seen as adequate, appropriate individuals; and Agents, understandably, may feel that as such they should operate their home in a way which is most natural to them.¹ The B's, to be sure, have not expressed a great deal of frustration over this arrangement. Mrs. B, e.g., has remarked that she has enjoyed running the home in part because she could fit it into her normal way of life. However, the B's have expressed some feelings about not knowing "what the Agents want", or exactly where the Agents (collectively) stand on certain issues so far as the general operation of the home is concerned.²

This general method of dealing with the B's - allowing them to "be themselves" in dealing with youngsters - may have some benefits. There are, however, some apparent disadvantages (aside from that of having the home evolve away from the originally outlined research model). The main one seems to be that the present quantity and quality of involvement can allow too much to be taken for granted, so that - in times of crisis (e.g., the January, 1968 to March, 1968, problems) - sufficient degrees of trust, comfort, and/or mutual communication may not be felt to be present to serve as a foundation upon which problems can be easily worked out.

DTED staff is of the opinion that it would have been "better" if the Agents' relationships had been different - e.g., more frequent and more involved. More involvement would have probably increased the quantity and quality of information from Agents in describing what the home is like. Beyond this, however, it is difficult to speculate as to just what kind of involvement by the Agents would have (a) effected the development of the home in such a way that the home would be different or better than it is at present; (b) increased treatment opportunities with youngsters placed in the home.

The questions and issues raised here will continue to be explored during the coming year. This next year's experiences with the B's may also give clues as to the characteristics and styles of foster parents that contribute to growth in I₄ youngsters. The B's have demonstrated this ability while at the same time providing initial placement stability for I₄ youngsters.

¹In varying degrees, some Agents may be slightly threatened by the B's evident self-confidence and adequacy... and/or, they may feel that few, if any, needs exist relative to training or structure within this home.

²Overall, the B's have expressed satisfaction in the handling of specific issues with specific youngsters.

Type IV - Temporary Community Care Home - (Mr. and Mrs. F)¹

At this time last year, we had just terminated the use of the home of Mr. and Mrs. N in Stockton, who from 3/17/67 to 7/1/67 operated this type of home on a trial basis. They had originally been selected to operate the Type I home and had been switched over to the Type IV home when their operation of the Type I home was considered inappropriate. Their operation of the Type IV home was quickly seen to be lacking with respect to the basic care and supervision of youths placed there. During May and June, 1967, seven wards had been placed with the N's, thereby demonstrating the existence of a need for the temporary home. However, staff felt they would rather do without any home than continue with the N's.

We had anticipated being able to re-establish this home, at least by September or October of 1967, but were unable to locate any interested, appropriate individuals until February, 1968.² Mr. and Mrs. F were screened during March, 1968 and they began operation of their home in Stockton on 4/1/68.

Staff thinking about the necessary qualities for the Type IV group home parents were not as specific or qualified as in the case of the long-term placement homes. Basically, it was felt that aside from being able to provide necessary care, supervision and feedback to Agents, the Type IV group home parents should be able to operate a program suitable for all types of wards and be able to provide initial, basic acceptance and support. In addition, the group home parents should be able to involve themselves with youngsters, yet do so within the limits of providing only temporary care, and in this manner come to support, rather than interfere with, given Agents' future treatment and placement planning.

Mr. and Mrs. F are Caucasian, ages 74 and 53, respectively. They both have grade school educations only. Mrs. F has a vocational nursing certificate. They are of the Protestant faith, and attend church rarely. They both have one previous marriage: Mrs. F's marriage ended in divorce, and Mr. F's first wife died in 1961. They have had no children from their present or previous marriages.

Mr. and Mrs. F had three foster children residing with them at the time they were being evaluated as candidates for operating a Project group home. Two of these were county wards (one was considered mentally retarded) and the other - then just recently placed - was a Stockton Community Treatment ward. In the preceding four years, Mr. and Mrs. F had had a total of 15 youngsters (all boys) placed with them through county Probation Departments, and they had been licensed previously by three California counties. They have obtained a great deal of satisfaction and enjoyment in the role that they were able to play with all of these youngsters, even though some of them were unusually difficult to deal with. They had been contacted by the Coordinator initially in February, 1967,

¹For a maximum of five wards of any I-level classification. The maximum of five was determined by the size of the F's home. See Appendix A for the original model for the Temporary Care Home.

²Two other sets of candidates were contacted in Stockton (in August, 1967 and in October, 1967). The first couple withdrew because of their concerns about their neighbors reactions if they were to accept Negro youngsters. The second couple was rejected by DTED staff following completed screening (the man would not have been very available and the woman appeared neurotic and potentially unstable).

in regard to operating a group home. (They were rejected by Mrs. H, Type I Home) - but at that time did not feel that they were in a position to do so because of the Probation youngsters who were living with them. However, both Probation youngsters were due to leave fairly soon and at that point the F's reapplied with the Project.¹

Mr. F, in spite of his age, is an alert, intelligent, open and friendly individual. Although he admits that he is at times easily irritated, he nonetheless seems to enjoy interacting with youngsters, and seems able to develop rather quick, comfortable relationships with them. He seems quite self-confident and perceptive, and can apparently look at his role as a group home or foster father abstractly and rather objectively. In addition to this, he feels that his wife obtains a great deal of enjoyment from being a foster parent and feels that it gives her a sense of purpose - something with which she can continue once he is gone.

Mrs. F is a talkative, friendly person who seems to have a genuine warmth toward, and ability to relate to, youngsters. She seems to handle most issues fairly directly and explicitly. Both she and her husband feel that rules, while necessary, are not ends in themselves and, instead, mainly fill a need most youngsters have. They also feel that rules are also of help in managing a home.

Mrs. F is somewhat nervous but not distractingly so. She has a slight speech impediment which does not seem to bother her. She does seem a little less confident than her husband, and perhaps not quite as perceptive. At times, statements have to be repeated with her lest she misunderstand or misinterpret them. She feels that part of her reason for wanting to have, and enjoying having had, youngsters in her home is that she never had any children of her own, and that this gives her an opportunity to express what seem to be some fairly strong maternal feelings. She feels that she may not be able to see the youngsters make much progress, or grow while they are in her home. Nevertheless, her stance is that if she feels she has contributed something to one of the youths - i.e., something which may have a bearing on the individual's adjustment as an adult - she will then be more than satisfied. (Mr. F shares these latter feelings).

At the present time, neither Mr. nor Mrs. F is employed outside of the group home. Mr. F has been retired for the last ten years. He has held a variety of occupations - most recently having operated a dry cleaning business. In the

¹In February, 1968, the Coordinator referred a Stockton CTP Agent to the F's as a possible individual placement resource; the CTP Agent in question placed a sixteen year old, Na boy into the home. The F's expressed renewed interest to the Agent in operating a group home, and the Agent relayed this message to the Coordinator. The F's appeared fairly well suited for temporary care but the CTP boy had been placed on a long-term (open-ended) basis. His placement with the F's appeared to be stabilizing, and it seemed quite inappropriate to require the Agent to remove him. DTED research decided to allow this youngster to remain on in the home on a permanent basis as a non-study case under a regular GYA foster home contract. Research felt that this arrangement would not unduly effect the research design of the home. In addition, since no other candidates were available for the Type IV home it was considered more appropriate to use the home under these circumstances than face the possibility of having no Type IV home to study. If this youngster is removed from the home he would be permitted to return only on a temporary basis.

1930's he worked for 100 years at Alcatraz Federal Prison as an instructor in their trade training program. Mrs. F, at the time the group home began, was employed full time as baby-sitter and housekeeper. She has, however, recently terminated this employment in order to spend full time on the operation of the group home. Their income is slightly less than average, coming mainly from Social Security and payments on local rental property which they own.

The group home is located in a semi-rural, lower economic area in southeast Stockton. The area is populated predominantly by Caucasians and, to a much lesser extent, Mexican-Americans. This area is generally not noted for its acceptance of Negroes, a condition about which the F's have expressed some concern. Aside from their concern about Negro project youngsters themselves at times being uncomfortable living in this section of town, they have no objections to accepting Negroes in their home.

The home itself is somewhat small, is in a fair state of repair, and is adequately furnished and cared for though slightly sub-standard. The home has only two bedrooms at the present time. Mr. and Mrs. F have made a makeshift bedroom for themselves at the rear of the house; and they hope in the near future to have built an additional bedroom and bath. The two main bedrooms are used for the youngsters. The larger bedroom has a bunk bed and one single bed which are being used for three youngsters. The smaller of these bedrooms will have one bunk bed in it. The physical structure of this house has prevented it from being able to accept six youngsters; instead, an absolute maximum has been set at five. The home will be somewhat crowded even under those conditions, but since it is for temporary care only, this arrangement was thought to be acceptable. The group home parents have two rental houses adjacent to the group home itself - one of which is to the rear of the main house. There is adequate yard space for outdoor recreation. In addition, Mrs. F raises chickens and rabbits at the rear of the yard.

Even though the F's have been licensed for foster care in previous years by three counties, including the one in which they presently reside, the local county will not consider a new license for them. This is solely due to Mr. F's age, which is now beyond both state and county limits. This factor could restrict the use of the home since, even for temporary placement, a home must be licensed for youngsters under 16. However, it is anticipated that the majority of youngsters who may be able to make use of this home will be 16 or older.

The F's enjoy fishing and camping. They plan, when possible, to take group home youngsters on outings of this nature. Mrs. F already has become a regular fan of the part-ward, part-staff GIP softball games, and she brings her group home youngsters with her to these events.

Initially, staff was not sure about the extent to which this home would be utilized, particularly since they had gone without such a home for quite some time, and also due to the fact that the Agents had generally become accustomed to making other types of arrangements. However, in the first months of operation a total of five youngsters (one of them on two separate occasions) have been placed into the home. Since this home can be used only on a temporary basis, it is anticipated that over short periods of time - the average population will fluctuate a great deal.

Table 5, page 11, contains information relative to age, race, and a number of other variables in regard to the five boys who were placed in the F's Temporary

TABLE 5

TYPE IV TEMPORARY CARE HOME: POPULATION DATA¹
Mr. and Mrs. F, 4/1/68 - 6/30/68 (3 months)

A		B		C Age				D Race			
Number of Wards Placed		Number of Placements		15-5 and under	15-6 to 17-5	17-6 and over	Average Age	Cauc	Mex/Am	Negro	Other
5*		6		N 1	N 5	N -	N 16-6	N 2	N 3	N -	N -
				% 17%	% 83%	% -	% -	% 40%	% 60%	% -	% -

*Includes one ward also placed with N's in 1967.

E
I-level

	Aa	Ap	Cfm	Cfc	Mp	Na	Nx	Se	Ci
N	-	-	-	1	-	3	1	-	-
%	-	-	-	20%	-	60%	20%	-	-

F
Months on Parole Prior to Placement

	0	1-6	7-12	13-18	19 & Over
N	-	5	-	-	1
%	-	83%	-	-	17%

H
Days in Placement

	0-15	16-30	31-45	46-60	61 & Over	Ave.
N	2	2	2	-	-	24
%	33%	33%	33%	-	-	-

I
Wards in Home

on 6/30/67	on 6/30/68
*	2

J
Placements

through 6/30/67	7/1/67 - 6/30/68
*	6

*Home began 4/1/68

¹ See Appendix D for explanation of these items. Appendix K contains these same tables describing the population in the first Type IV Home (Mr. and Mrs. N). Appendix L contains a chart of the placement patterns for the F's Type IV, Temporary Care Home (and for the N's short operation of a Type IV Home).

Care Home during the first three months of its operation. Thus far, none of these youngsters has been placed in the home at the time of their parole to CTP - five of the six placements were made during their first six months of parole. Most (80%) have been classified at the I₄ level of maturity. Time in placement has averaged about three weeks. To date no Negro youngsters have been placed in the home. Caucasian and Mexican/American boys have been placed in approximately equal numbers. The average age (16 years - 6 months) is lower than in any of the three long-term care homes.

Aside from the obvious uses that the home can provide, it has already provided the context for a couple of unique and unexpected uses. One is with a youngster who is to report to the CTP office each morning, but whose only way there would otherwise result in his arriving an hour and a half before the office opened. To alleviate this, the boy's mother drops him off at the group home early in the morning. There, he may eat breakfast; and he is afterwards brought to the CTP office with the other group home youngsters either by the group home mother or by the CTP transportation officer.

The other unexpected use occurred when one of the Agents was confronted with a situation in which a youngster was placed in a foster home some distance from Stockton and had a job in Stockton, but had no means of transportation to and from his foster home over the weekends. Arrangements were made for this individual to stay over the weekends in the temporary care home, returning to his foster home during the week.

Previous use of this type of home also included placement of new CTP wards who are awaiting final parole plans and who would otherwise remain at the Youth Authority's Northern Reception Center and Clinic (45 miles north of Stockton). To date, however, the F's home has not been used for this purpose.

The first youngster to be placed in the home was placed prior to a final decision as to whether or not the F's would be operating a temporary care or, instead, a long-term care home. Although the youngster and the group home parents were advised that if the home was to be used on a temporary care basis he would have to be placed elsewhere, this youth and the group home parents formed a rather strong attachment to one another; and, both the group home mother and the youngster tried to convince staff that the placement should be allowed to continue on a permanent basis. The group home mother became quite involved in this issue. However, from discussions with both the Coordinator and Agents, she came to understand the restrictions which prohibited the youngsters from staying in the home permanently.¹ Since then there has been no similar incident.

Another incident which occurred during May, but which did not become known to staff (or the group home parents) until June, was the fact that or of the youngsters had brought some marijuana into the house, had distributed it among

¹The Coordinator is the principal person involved in the training of the group home parents in connection with the development of the Type IV home program. This is in contrast to the long-term placement homes, in which Agents also participate directly, and, in fact, share these responsibilities. This arrangement was decided upon because of the need for greater coordination of intra-agent needs and demands relative to the use of this home. Also, because of the temporary nature of placement within this home, it was recognized that no one Agent would be utilizing the home on very much of an ongoing basis.

the boys, and had participated with them in smoking some of it in the house. This was investigated by CTP staff - who became more acutely aware that they could not take for granted what was going on 'behind closed doors'.

The home operates fairly informally. A few, very general guidelines or rules were developed early in conjunction with the Group Home Coordinator.¹ These are regular times for breakfast and supper. There is a set curfew time for all of the youngsters, unless they must be in at some earlier time at the request of the Agent. With approval, they can stay out later. As yet, Research has not been directly involved to any great extent in evaluating the general atmosphere or environment of this home. However, information relayed by the Coordinator and Agents suggests that the home, at least thus far, is fairly flexible, easygoing, and quite acceptable. All of the youngsters placed thus far appear to enjoy the group home parents, and to have made a fairly quick and easy adjustment to the home. Although some of the boys have expressed an interest in staying on in the home, there seems to be generally good acceptance by wards that it is for temporary care only.

Due to the nature of the home, a great deal of impact is really not anticipated except in terms of its being able (a) to provide a comfortable atmosphere where youngsters who may be in a time of crisis, can stabilize to some extent effectively, and (b) to provide an atmosphere which permits Agents to plan more rationally and/or to proceed under less pressure, relative to treatment and future placement issues.

Since the home has been operating only three months, a great deal of information has not been gathered pertaining to its overall appropriateness. However, information collected from the Agents on the boys who have been placed in the home indicates that the home has, in many instances, exceeded their expectations in meeting the objectives of temporary care. (In all cases it appears to have met their objectives for temporary care.) In one case, e.g., a youngster who had previously been unaccepting of a foster home placement was placed on an emergency basis in the temporary care home. Following about a month in the home, this boy, on his own initiative, requested a foster home placement. The Agent feels that the experience in living with the F's assisted the youngster in being able to take another look at what a foster home might have to offer, by way of providing a number of contrasts with the rather poor relationships which existed within his own home. This experience seems to have highlighted some of the things that might be in store for him if he returned to his own home.

This attempt to establish the Type IV Home has started out well. The home probably has the potential for becoming an increasingly valuable resource. It is expected that the next year will provide many illustrations of the various ways in which this type of home can be utilized.

¹See Appendix M for a description of the rules which were established for the Type IV Home.

Type V, Temporary Restriction Home¹

Twenty months of attempting to find interested, appropriate individuals to establish this type of home were unsuccessful, and efforts to establish it were terminated on 5/31/68. The search included both the Stockton and Sacramento areas.

During that time only one couple was located (in Stockton) who might have been appropriate for this type of home. However, the woman in the home was at the time working at a nearby Youth Authority Institution; and there exists a general Youth Authority policy which prohibits Youth Authority employees from taking Youth Authority wards into their homes unless the Youth Authority Parole Board authorized their doing so. A request was made to the Youth Authority Parole Administration to take the matter before the Youth Authority Board. This request was not well received - the stated reasons being that: (a) being under formal contract for a parole operation while at the same time working within the institutional Division of the Youth Authority might, somehow, result in the woman employee's having a "conflict of interests" (between the Division of Parole and Institutions)²; (b) if this woman had to deal with youngsters both on and off of her formal job, it would give her little or no time for relaxation and might not allow her to devote full energies and attention relative to her work within the institution; (c) it may not be possible for CYA employees to receive "compensation" from a group home contract (State funds) over and above their regular salary. (This particular question still remains unanswered). Though there remained some possibility of pursuing this further, informal communications indicated that Administration was definitely not in favor of the proposal, and the matter was closed.³

In addition, during the past year operations and research staff had expressed ongoing concern over the question of whether this type of home was still "really needed" to the extent that it appeared needed a number of years ago. Although short term restriction was, and is still being, utilized as a treatment technique within CTP, resources other than the Short Term Restriction home had become available to operations (parole) staff for this same purpose, early in 1968. (Bed space had become available at a local Youth Authority facility which opened subsequent to the start of the Project - the O. H. Close School for Boys.)

Beyond these considerations, within the total range of ward-subtypes being referred to the Youth Authority from the geographic area under consideration, the proportion of individuals with whom the technique of short term restriction would most likely be utilized was found to be progressively and - in absolute numbers - greatly decreasing throughout the past two or three years. Thus, it was doubtful that - even if established - this type of home would be utilized to the extent previously anticipated.

¹For a maximum of six wards, all I-levels. See Appendix A for the original model for this home.

²The nature of the possible conflict(s) was never specified.

³In addition, the woman did not wish to give up her institutional position in favor of just operating a group home.

Even if appropriate candidates were available to start operating this type of home as early as September of this year (which was doubtful), very little time would have remained to do the required quantity and quality of research.

In its design and purpose, the home was the most unique of all five group homes. It is unfortunate that we will not have an opportunity to study its potential.

With the monies remaining in the DTED budget for the Type V home, we have proceeded to develop a sixth type of home (Type VI, Individualized Group Home) for I youngsters. In addition, with some of the then remaining monies, we are pursuing the possibility of doing some basic research in a girls' group home which is currently being operated in the Stockton CTP unit.

Type VI Individualized Home - (Mr. and Mrs. U)¹

The model for this type of home grew out of discussions with Community Agents in regard to current I₄ treatment and thinking, and out of placement needs and experiences associated with the Type III Boarding Home. Even though the research requirements for entrance into the Type III Boarding Home had been made more flexible, the Boarding Home continues to be unavailable as a possible placement resource to youngsters who, by virtue of age, maturity or direction of treatment, are not in a phase of development where attempts are being made to help them become independent and autonomous.

Since it was known that this type of home would be utilized by the Stockton CTP unit, Stockton Agents had for some time been directly involved in discussing their general placement needs relative to I₄ wards. This eventually led to the development of a definitive model by DTED staff. As the model indicates, Agents felt that there was a great need for a treatment resource which could meet a wide range of needs. The model - although well-articulated - remains at this point highly theoretical, as well as complex.

Staff thinking in regard to the needed characteristics of the group home parents for this type of home included: (a) the presence of a very compatible marital relationship; (b) maturity which expresses itself in terms of openness, understanding, and - particularly - flexibility in dealing with youngsters; (c) ability to make themselves available for relationships with youngsters while being cognizant of the reasons why given youngsters might resist forming a relationship or might become involved in neurotic "games" within a given relationship; and (d) within the context of the above, providing for the basic care and supervision of the youths and adequate feedback to Agents, and, finally, cooperating in as well as taking initiative in developing a general home program.

In April, 1968, we began screening Mr. and Mrs. U, who reside in Modesto (which is located approximately 30 miles south of Stockton).² They were selected on 6/25/68 as the individuals who would develop the Type VI home. They appeared, in many respects, "tailor made" for this home. Their contract is due to become effective on 8/1/68. One CTP ward will probably be placed with them prior to that date.

At first it was thought that the home might be located in Stockton. However, the U's were not in favor of moving to Stockton; and, since most of the newcases coming to the Stockton CTP unit are wards who have been committed from Modesto, it was decided that these would be adequate justification for locating the home in that area.

¹The Type VI Home is for a maximum of six I₄ wards (Neurotic, Acting-out - Na; Neurotic, Anxious - Nx; Situational Emotional Reaction - Se; and Cultural Identifier - Ci. The model for this home is part of Appendix A.

²Due to severe dropoff in new commitments from the Stockton area, the metropolitan area of Modesto (Stanislaus County) was included - beginning 9/13/67 - as part of the geographical study area for the Stockton CTP unit.

Mr. and Mrs. U, ages 26 and 25, respectively, are Caucasian. They have been married for 6½ years and have 2 children, a girl age 3½ and a boy age 1½.

Mr. U is a tall (6'7"), outgoing, pleasant, intelligent young man. He has an Associate Arts Degree in Industrial Engineering and has one additional year of University study in Mechanical Engineering. He is presently employed by a construction company working on a dam project some 50 miles east of Modesto, and is earning an average income.

Mrs. U is a very pleasant, calm and perceptive young woman. She has one year of college education. Although not presently employed, she has previously worked as an apartment manager and as a part-time secretary.

Mr. and Mrs. U are of the Protestant faith. They attend church quite regularly and are active in directing young peoples' groups (high school and college age) for their church. They are quite religious and feel that caring for problem-youngsters is a lifetime commitment - something which for them represents, in their words, a "religious calling". They moved to the Modesto area a year ago in an attempt to begin actualizing their desire in the form of developing and operating a small ranch-type setting for problem-youngsters.

Although they did not have prior experience with foster youngsters, they have worked summers at a boys camp. Mr. U worked in such a setting both as a camp counselor and in a supervisory capacity (for three months in the summer of 1966). Mr. U did follow-up work on the youngsters who were at the camp, contacting boys and their families relative to assisting them in school and in other areas. In addition, their work with young peoples' groups in their church has involved helping some of the youngsters during a period of crisis. As such, as young adults, the U's seem to have considerable familiarity with, and understanding of, both the present adolescent generation and their own role in relation to trying to help youngsters.

Mr. and Mrs. U have spent much of their time and energy in exploring various ways of caring for (e.g., taking in) foster children until such time that they (the U's) would be in a position to try to develop the above mentioned, small "ranch". They also feel that - in the interim - they need experience, as well as guidance, and training by experienced people. They have in the past year made contact with the Superintendent of one of the Youth Authority institutions near Stockton. After this individual referred them to CTP, and ultimately to DTED, they began to receive many of the CTP and DTED reports, thereby coming to be fairly conversant with the Community Treatment Project.

Mr. and Mrs. U are remarkably similar in terms of their major preferences and motivations. They appear to have developed a very introspective attitude toward themselves, and toward youngsters as well. They have come to know a good deal about themselves and their interaction with others - even, to some degree, with respect to concepts relating to "positive- and negative-transference", and the like. They appear to understand one another quite well and their relationship appears very good. As might be expected in connection with their lack of foster home experience, they (particularly Mr. U) are somewhat unsure of what their "role" with CTP wards might consist of. In general, however, it appears that they are presently oriented toward establishing some type of "adult-to-adolescent" relationships with wards.

During the screening process the Merced County Probation Department (located 35 miles south of Modesto) placed a 15-year-old probationer in the U's home. Their early experiences with this youngster suggested that the U's were indeed open to new information and might be more than willing to "stick it out" with somewhat difficult, delinquent boys.

It was preferred for research purposes that this youngster not be in the home. However, (a) due to Mr. and Mrs. U's feelings that they had made significant progress with the boy, and since (b) the U's were considered as being quite appropriate for this type of home, it was decided to not insist that the boy be removed as a precondition for DTED use of the home... provided however, that the Merced Probation Department had no objections to our plan to develop the home, and to develop it primarily along lines required by our theoretical model.¹

Group Home and CTP staff met with Merced Probation officials to discuss any concerns or objections which they might have. They were extremely cooperative and felt that it might be beneficial for this youngster to have the experience of living in a group home, and of receiving the additional services that would be provided indirectly - services which, by itself, Merced Probation was not in a position to provide. They asked only that their ward not be excluded from any general program of the home (e.g., outings, group meetings, etc.), and they were assured that this would not happen.

At the time of this writing, Mr. and Mrs. U have located a possible facility for the group home some 10 miles south of Modesto, somewhat out in the country.² Even though the additional distance provides some problems in regard to school and work, it nonetheless seems quite acceptable to all staff. The home is an older estate-type of house having some 3,500 to 4,000 square feet, 5 bedrooms, a workshop, a barn, and a swimming pool. It is on the school bus route to a local high school in Hughson, California (5 miles from the home) - the location of a fully operational, experimental educational program.³ The house would be leased. If arrangements go according to schedule the U's will move to the new location about August 1, 1968, and placement of additional youngsters will begin shortly thereafter.

¹In addition, it was known that this boy had been classified by the Probation Department as an I₄ Nx. It thus appeared that his personality, placement needs, etc., would be congruent with the Type VI model.

²Their present home is too small for their own family plus six wards.

³This educational program involves programmed instruction that develops each student's individualized course material, and each student works at his own speed.

In August, 1967, the woman Agent working out of the Stockton CTP unit began developing a group home for her CTP girls. Since that time, this home has had at any one time up to 7 girls in placement. The home has experienced a unique degree of success and it appears that the Group Home Project's overall fund of information could be enhanced by researching this home. We are presently pursuing this matter in an effort to provide a basic retainer to the home (\$200 a month), in exchange for research involvement with the group home parents.

Since there is only one woman Agent in each CTP unit, she must handle all experimental girl cases regardless of I-level classification. Essentially for this reason, girls of all subtypes have been placed into this group home, both for permanent or for temporary placement. In addition, only one Agent has been (in conjunction with her treatment supervisor) involved in the recruitment, training, development and ongoing maintenance of the home - this being in contrast to conditions which have existed in the DTED homes.

If we are able to do research in this home, the home will not be contracted in the same manner as other DTED homes. Presently, each youngster placed in the home is subsidized on a regular Youth Authority contract.² Thus, the NIMH retainer in exchange for research time would simply supplement what the Youth Authority is able to pay at the present time. In addition, we will not be bringing this home under the project as an "official" project home, but would rather research it "as is". Thus, the Coordinator would not become directly involved in the home; and DTED staffing procedures would not apply except when needed for specified research purposes. This would allow for a comparison between this home - its manner of operation, and so on - with DTED homes and procedures. It would also allow us to gather important information concerning a non-I-level restricted home, and to make comparisons ³between a girls' home and the DTED homes - each of which contains boys only.

The Agent who developed and is utilizing the home has written a paper describing the home's development as of June, 1968, which will appear in the Fall issue of the Youth Authority Quarterly. The Agent also plans to do additional writing in regard to this home which will appear in future CTP and DTED publications.

¹For a maximum of eight female wards, all I-levels.

²Due to the lack of funds, it has not been possible to place the girls' home under a regular Youth Authority group home contract.

³Youth Authority Administration has voiced no opposition to this plan and research involvement could theoretically have begun by now except for the fact that the Accounting section of the Youth Authority felt that since this appeared to represent a substantial departure from the original proposal, written approval from NIMH should first be obtained.

By

Sharlene E. Haire
Group Home Coordinator

Introduction

The development of a relationship between a group home parent and any given ward is, in itself, insufficient to meet the total "relationship needs" which exist within a given home. Unlike the single foster home arrangement in which the Agent and the foster parents work independently - and sometimes in opposite directions - group home environments must be developed by Agents, staff, and group home parents working together in the same direction toward the same ultimate goal. How staff and group home parents interact is observed by wards. It would appear, then, that the best possible relationships would be those which were based on mutual participation in home development and ward treatment. For these reasons, our efforts in this project have been strongly influenced by the belief that the development of treatment homes depends on the extent to which those involved are willing and able to commit themselves to developing relationships which will enhance open, clear communication of issues and will facilitate resolution of conflicts and problems.

Recruitment of Group Home Parents

Our major resource for candidates continues to be foster parents who have had experience in caring for delinquent youths - primarily California Youth Authority wards - and who are familiar with our agency's operations. Many candidates have been referred to us by Institutions and Parole staff who have known and worked with them or who have learned from friends and colleagues of their interest in developing group homes.

Tables 6 and 7 present a breakdown of the overall referral picture from July, 1966, to August, 1968, in Sacramento and Stockton. Of 74 referrals for one or more types of homes, 41 were made by other Youth Authority staff. Ten of the total number had been licensed previously by a public agency to provide home care for children, aged, or mental health patients, and 37 had prior experience.

Of referrals to the Type I home, 55% were received from other YA staff, 22% from news ads, none from other group home or foster parents, and 22% from miscellaneous others. Of the Type II referrals, 56% were made by other YA staff, 6% by news ads, 3% by other group home and foster parents, and 33% by miscellaneous others. Forty-one percent of the referrals to the Type III home were made by other YA staff, 16% each by news ads and other group home and foster parents, and 25% by miscellaneous others. For the Type IV home, 44% of the referrals were from other YA staff, 22% each from news ads and miscellaneous others, and 11% from other group home and foster parents. Sixty-seven percent of the referrals to the Type V home were by other YA staff, with 16% each by other group

TABLE 6

Selected Characteristic and Sources of Referral to Project by
Type of Home^a

Home Type

I - Protective

Source of Referral	Number Referred	Previous License	Previous Experience	Hired	Fired
Other YA Staff ^b	5	1	2	2	1
News Ad	2	1	1	0	0
Other Group Home and/or Foster Parents	0	0	0	0	0
Other (Misc.)	2	1	1	0	0
Total Referrals	9	3	4	2	1

II - Containment

Other YA Staff	17	0	6	2	1
News Ad	2	0	0	0	0
Other Group Home and/or Foster Parents	1	0	0	0	0
Other (Misc.)	10	0	8	0	0
Total Referrals	30	0	14	2	1

III - Boarding

Other YA Staff	5	0	1	0	0
News Ad	2	0	0	0	0
Other Group Home and/or Foster Parents	2	1	1	1	0
Other (Misc.)	3	0	2	0	0
Total Referrals	12	1	4	1	0

^aSome individuals were referred to Group Home Project in connection with more than one type of group home. There was a total of 74 "home referrals", but the total number of individuals referred was 59.

^bNon-Group Home Project personnel.

TABLE 6 Concluded

Home Type

IV - Temporary Care

Source of Referral	Number Referred	Previous License	Previous Experience	Hired	Fired
Other YA Staff	4	1	4	1	1
News Ad	2	2	3	0	0
Other Group Home and/or Foster Parents	1	0	0	1	0
Other (Misc.)	2	0	1	0	0
Total Referrals	9	3	8	2	1

V - Restriction

Other YA Staff	4	1	1	0	0
News Ad	0	0	0	0	0
Other Group Home and/or Foster Parents	1	0	0	0	0
Other (Misc.)	1	0	0	0	0
Total Referrals	6	1	1	0	0

VI - Individualized

Other YA Staff	6	2	5	1	0
News Ad	1	0	0	0	0
Other Group Home and/or Foster Parents	0	0	0	0	0
Other (Misc.)	1	0	1	0	0
Total Referrals	8	2	6	1	0

Total Referrals All Homes

Source of Referral	Number Referred	Previous License	Previous Experience	Hired	Fired
Other YA Staff	41	5	19	6	3
News Ad	9	3	4	0	0
Other Group Home and/or Foster Parents	5	1	1	2	0
Others (Misc.)	19	1	13	0	0
Total	74	10	37	8	3

home and foster parents and miscellaneous others, and none by news ads. In the Type VI home, 75% of the referrals were from other YA staff, with news ads and miscellaneous others each contributing 12%, and other group home and foster parents contributing none.

The greatest number of referrals for any one home was to the Type II (30), with Type III (12) second, Types I and IV (9) third, Type VI (8) fourth, and Type V (6) having the least number. Of the eight homes developed during the past two years, we have had two Type I homes, two Type II, two Type IV, one Type III, and one Type VI. Of 22 single women and five single men who were screened, none was hired due to general inappropriateness for a particular home type which might have been under consideration at the time of screening - i.e., the home model required a husband and wife combination. Of the 47 husband and wife referrals, nine were staffed and eight were hired.

Primary reasons for rejecting any referral, single or married, included inadequate living space, unfavorable prior arrest reports, potentially insufficient participation with wards and staff in home development and management, advanced age, poor health, racial issues (i.e., either referral or neighborhood would not accept Negroes and/or Mexicans), referral employed by Youth Authority and prevented by departmental policy from providing foster care to wards. Most referrals who withdrew did so for comparable reasons, or because they preferred girls for whom Project homes were not being developed.

Newspaper advertisements have generally been most ineffective, and we have received but few prospects from Probation and Welfare departments in either Stockton or Sacramento. Reluctance on the part of these agencies to share potentially appropriate candidates may be due mainly to the fact that they, too, are developing group home programs which require a reservoir of available group home parents.

An additional factor, occurring particularly with County Welfare departments, seems to be the qualitatively different evaluative criteria by which the appropriateness of candidates is determined: Welfare workers usually assess existing conditions, e.g., the home environment, physical fitness, emotional stability and general appropriateness of candidates according to specific, pre-defined Boarding Home Manual standards as set down by the State Department of Social Welfare. Unlike ourselves, they place much less emphasis upon the potentialities of candidates and homes which are still to be developed into appropriate, specific treatment resources. This difference in our initial screening process may contribute to the paucity of referrals from Welfare Departments, and it also may have created some of the problems we have experienced in licensing some of our homes.

Training: General

At an early stage, group home parents must be made aware of agency policies in general. This is accomplished primarily by the Coordinator in individual meetings. Group home parents are instructed to consult with the Coordinator on matters directly relating to home management (budgeting, contracts, meals, etc.) and directly with the Community Agent regarding ward management.

Because community reaction is important to the development of our homes, we have requested that group home parents report any public pressures or attitudes of which they become aware and which might have adverse effects on wards in the home or on the group home generally. Supportive community reaction is also important to relay so that staff may be kept informed of all public attitudes. If difficult situations do arise in the community, the group home parents and staff work together to resolve them. The primary approach in all aspects of our interaction with and training of group home parents is one of close teamwork, so that the group home parents, together with staff and members of other agencies who may have direct and important contacts relative to particular wards, may establish a system of communications which will most effectively create the required treatment environments.

General Considerations Relating to Communication: Of primary concern in training group home parents is the development of a milieu in which they and staff are able, and are required, to communicate closely and regularly all information which is thought to be pertinent to the treatment of wards in placement. It is our firm belief that only through close, constant, personal involvement with staff can group home parents come to grasp our treatment philosophy generally - and also come to understand it with reference to specific types of wards.

In the Type II (Containment) and Type III (Boarding) homes, we have introduced I-level theory by way of having our group home parents talk about their interactions with their boys rather than by first having us label the boys with an I-level subtype and telling the group home parents how they should be interacting with them. This approach seemed best in these homes in view of the natural tendency of the group home parents to talk enthusiastically about interactions in the home, and because information presented at this level was easily assimilated.

In the Type I (Protective) and Type IV (Temporary Care) homes, we have begun with a more systematic, didactic approach - that of presenting specific information relative to I-level subtype characteristics, long-range and short-range treatment goals, placement plans, varying treatment stances, and treatment techniques for various subtypes.

This change in presentation to the Type I home parents was based on their needs to identify more closely with staff, and because they were able to and interested in communication in fairly abstract, hypothetical terms. For the Type IV home parents, this approach discourages developing close ties with short-term placements and sets a more appropriate, "temporary" tone for the home.

The nature and frequency of interaction between Agent and group home parents depends mainly on ward subtype, stage in treatment of ward, Agent stance, the group home parents' present level of development, and our ultimate goals for the home. For example, a ward who may be fairly well advanced and who is progressing nicely in treatment may not require daily contact by his Agent; however, the group home parents may still be inexperienced and "new", to the point of requiring frequent contact. As a second example, an Agent who is new to the Community Treatment Project or to using a particular home may be anxious to such an extent that he "needs" to be in very close contact with his ward and the group home parents. As he comes to trust given group home parents with greater responsibilities, and as he becomes more aware of their overall capabilities, he then can begin to relinquish increasing degrees of ward management to them.

Because several Agents may be using a given home at the same point in time, they and the group home parents meet, on a regular basis, with group home staff anywhere from one to four times per month to discuss treatment issues and to clarify and resolve prevailing problems. In this way, the Agents set the tone of the group home, and they help group home parents develop specific treatment techniques to be used with each ward on an individual basis. As they grow more comfortable in their role and in their relationships with staff, group home parents begin to function fairly independently of close Agent direction and most of them appear to become more aware of dynamics, and are less encumbered by structure.¹

Because group home parents are able to see a less guarded, more intimate picture of the ward in daily living situations than that which the Agent sees, it is important that they be regarded as integral parts of treatment planning and implementation. During the initial phases of training, the Coordinator and Researcher encourage the parents and Agents to discuss treatment techniques by asking direct questions about the behavior of specific wards and about group home parents' reactions and responses to those behaviors. The primary responsibility of the Agent here is to evaluate the group home parents' methods, to instruct when necessary, to support when appropriate, and to explain and interpret dynamics when possible. The group home parents' responsibility is to recall as accurately as possible all ward behavior and interactions and to describe their feelings about a given ward and his behavior.

The interviewing and testing of group home parents which is done by the Researcher adds to the conditioning and development of their treatment attitudes toward our delinquent population, although this is not the underlying objective of the interviews or tests. Many of the questionnaires and interviews which the Researcher completes with the group home parents tend to influence their attitudes and behavior relative to certain areas of their own development - more generally, (a) as responsible adults, and more specifically, (b) in their interactions with wards. Included would be such areas as discipline, trust, and the like. For example, they may begin to perceive, because of the content of certain questions, that we perhaps consider it important to trust youngsters and that we probably

¹Mr. and Mrs. D (Type II, Containment Home) never reached this stage of development, which seriously deterred development of their home.

would prefer that they, too, trust them. Because of the nature of the interaction which the Researcher routinely has with the group home parents (an interaction which is focused around eliciting particular information and, in effect, forcing them to look very closely at their relationships, feelings, attitudes, etc.), he thus assumes a very important role in the continual, ongoing process of education and/or conditioning.

Frequently, interactions which take place during group meetings and staffings with Agents make us aware of particular problem areas which involve - or focus upon - either or both of the group home parents directly, but which are occurring independently of many or perhaps most of the remaining members in the home. An example of such a situation would be that of a group home mother who in connection with increasing anxiety is experiencing difficulty in interacting with other family members or with Community Agents. Such situations - which cannot effectively be discussed in general group meetings - would be handled, not through the usual "team" approach, but directly by the Coordinator with the particular mother, with the aim of relieving anxieties and tensions, of helping her to evaluate her interactions with others in the home, and of helping her to develop more effective or satisfying ways of interacting with particular others. In view of the intensive, close interactions which group home parents experience with staff and wards, it is important to provide them with adequate means of relieving tensions and anxieties, thereby preventing possible major upsets. The Coordinator needs to be sensitive to potential difficulties in the interactions of staff members with group home parents, and needs to be available in order to act as a "safety valve."

The expressed concerns about and requests for information from Community Agents, group home parents, and project staff accentuated the need for standardization for some procedures, on the one hand, and, on the other, highlighted the need for creativity and flexibility with regard to other procedures. Thus, as a supplement to the above described personal interactions, we have developed written guidelines for Agents and group home managers. These, hopefully, provide a fairly explicit, albeit general, statement of our concerns and needs relative to our attempts to develop each home. While not intended to provide ready answers to all questions, the guidelines do attempt to answer the more basic concerns and issues which are likely to arise during the early development and use of a home. (Refer to "Guidelines for Parole Agents and Group Home Managers" in Appendix N).

Agent Orientation: Prior to the development of DTED, Community Treatment Project (CTP) Agents carried the primary responsibility for developing out-of-home placements. They were concerned mainly with the development and maintenance of foster homes for single ward placement. Multiple placements were unusual, and although the establishment of group homes had been explored, only a very limited degree of experience had been accumulated.¹

In view of this, it has been necessary for everyone to work together to try to develop effective ways to implement our program. The demands which we

¹ One home had been developed in Stockton by CTP Agents. See First Progress Report of the Group Home Project, page 18. None had been established in Sacramento for CTP wards prior to DTED.

have made on Community Treatment Agents to become active participants in this process have been many. For example, during the initial stages of each home, Agents are requested to regularly attend from one to two meetings a month for management staffings, and to attend maintenance staffings at least once a month. They attend periodic emergency staffings as well. The number of Agents in attendance at any given time varies according to the number of boys that each Agent may have in a home and also as a function of his other, prior commitments.

Due to the routine demands which are made on Agents apart from their participation in the DTED program - demands by wards, school personnel, employers, parents, etc. - Agents' time is very dear, and does not always allow for regular attendance at our DTED staffings. Thus, the Coordinator and the Researcher try to keep Agents aware of important information, developments, and techniques, and to encourage group home parents to communicate their own concerns directly to them.

Often the Community Agent has been accustomed to telling given foster parents what he, the Agent, wishes to be done for his ward. But here, he must also learn to listen to group home parents and to discuss and share treatment techniques and methods with them. Ideally, their interaction should become such that each can second-guess the other and anticipate with a reasonable degree of accuracy and confidence how a given situation should be handled. The goal of attaining this type of communication is approached in varying degrees, and this, in turn, is a function of certain other factors, such as demands upon the Agent's time, group home parents' perceptiveness, and so on. The amount of personal interest an individual agent has in a given home and the extent to which he is able and willing to invest much of himself in the relationship are also important factors.

Providing a placement resource for Community Agents is important. However, Agents - like group home parents - must be oriented to use these homes and to work together to insure maximum effectiveness. Just as group home parents are made aware of an Agent's stance and attitudes, so the Agent must come to understand the group home parents' role in working with his boys, as well as with the other boys in the home. For example, in the Type II home, which receives I₃ Mp and Cfc wards, it is essential that there exists a communications network which insures a united front against the possibility of ward manipulation and circumvention of house and parole rules. Such a united front can be maintained only by constant contact and communication.

Having more than one Agent involved in home development and ongoing servicing can create pressure and conflict for everyone. Most problems, however, can be resolved in management and maintenance staffings when the participants can accept a team approach - that is, when they recognize their collective roles and responsibilities and can recognize the kinds of skills and limitations each may bring into the picture. Because CTP Agents have - within broad limits - enjoyed the freedom to develop and implement treatment styles which may be quite personalized and in many ways unique, it is often extremely difficult for some Agents to clearly or effectively communicate and to share their techniques with group home parents or even with other Agents. It is equally difficult for some Agents to relinquish major decision-making responsibilities to group home parents until they have sufficient confidence in their own, and the group home parents', capabilities as treaters.

Together with the Agent's freedom to individualize treatment techniques has come an increased burden of responsibility for "doing all, being all, giving all, and receiving all" of the good or bad repercussions of a ward's behavior. For example, in the course of one day¹ perhaps even with only one boy - an Agent may expand his stereotypic "Parole Agent duties" of surveillance and supervision to include such roles as therapist, tutor, parent, policeman, transportation officer, friend, counselor, etc. By means of these roles he may address himself to virtually all of the boy's needs rather than refer the boy to others. By doing so, there are few others who share responsibility for this boy's maintenance or behavior.

However, sharing this load with group home parents can, to some extent, free him emotionally to concentrate more on ward growth and problem-solving. This shift in emphasis, in turn, provides the boy with an opportunity to see the Agent in different terms - e.g., as more of a friend or a warm, caring male rather, and not so much as a manager of all aspects of the ward's external affairs.¹ The Agent and boy may then have more of an opportunity (both emotionally and realistically) to develop an interaction which is less oriented around the "authority-figure vs. uncontrollable boy" dimension. When the group home parents meet the bulk of the boy's physical needs, many Agents are thus more free to gradually move in on the boy's emotional needs to the extent, and at the pace, that this may be deemed possible or necessary.

A major effort in the area of Agent orientation involves focusing their attention on group home elements which could allow them to become more actively involved with their boys on a level that is not feasible in other types of placements. For example, by having the group home parents see to such management affairs as clothing purchases, money allowances, cigarettes, medical and employment appointments, school conferences, and transportation - affairs which they usually manage alone in foster homes, boarding houses, and some own homes - the Agents can spend more time interacting with their boys in more relaxed, enjoyable activities. Frequently, in most placements, Agents expend considerable energy trying to meet needs which the parent figures may have and often, as a result, damage or dilute their own relationships with some of the boys. In most group homes, however, the occurrence of comparable situations may be minimized given staff involvement with group home parents.

Training: Events, Interactions, and Techniques Related to Group Home Development and Impact Upon Wards Within Specific Homes:

Type I Home (Protective): Development of this home began approximately four months before our first contract became effective. DTED staff began working with Mr. and Mrs. H to develop the physical environment - which, at first, involved their moving into and equipping a larger house. Involvement at this level provided opportunities to begin developing relationships which would later be critical for more intensive interaction. It also provided contacts within which the H's could begin interacting with wards.

¹This latter being a perception (and role-constellation) which might, to be sure, be quite appropriate at certain stages in the treatment of some types of youth.

The first boys (two Cfm's) were placed prior to the above move to the H's new home. This made it possible to involve the boys in the transition. Almost immediately, they began to be emotionally involved with the H family in the development of "their home." They were very much a part of redecorating the interior and renovating the yard area. These group activities were calculated to enhance the relationship between Mr. H and the boys - particularly since Mrs. H was already interacting closely with each boy in relation to activities away from home, such as checking out employment, attending CTP school, and participating in other Project activities.

The kind of interaction we hoped Mr. and Mrs. H could develop with these two Cfm's was based on the method of working with very immature, dependent wards which Cfm workers most often used - viz., an action-oriented approach. We believed that involvement in activities together would provide a means for all to interact in ways that would, on the one hand, avoid initially very close or overly-threatening interpersonal relationships but which would, on the other hand, achieve the primary goal of providing the boys with structured family activities as an acceptable way of conveying basic interest, acceptance, and support.

The youthfulness of Mr. and Mrs. H enabled them to interact quite actively at an age-appropriate level. (Both of the Cfm boys were over 18 years of age.) However, because of the vigor with which Mr. and Mrs. H would usually approach most situations, it soon became necessary to familiarize them with the primary characteristics of Cfm's - in particular, their perception of self as "low man on the totem pole", their immaturity and dependency, and their general lack of motivation to actively tackle life and to rapidly achieve adulthood. It became necessary to suggest non-threatening ways for the H's to be warm, accepting and tolerant while at the same time providing the structure and routine which the Cfm requires in order to function. This type of specific information concerning Cfm behavior and appropriate treatment techniques was presented to Mr. and Mrs. H slowly and systematically by the Community Agent during his participation with them in group activities, and during the course of a number of other contracts which he had with them.

To supplement their contacts with the Agent and Treatment Center staff, management staffings were conducted for the purpose of evaluating the activities of the boys as well as the interactions of all members of the household.¹ During this same period of time, the H's were also involved with the Group Home Coordinator and Researcher separately several times a week, for one reason or another. The nature and extent of their interaction with staff has contributed to the development of an atmosphere in which all parties are able to offer forthright expressions of divergent attitudes, and are able to discuss the frequent, delicate issues which need to be considered when attempting to resolve various immediate, and potential long-range, problems.

¹Management Staffings began in June, 1967, and were scheduled for the 2nd and 4th Monday of each month. Maintenance Staffings were scheduled for the 1st and 3rd Monday. This pattern continued until approximately January, 1968, at which point Management Staffings were moved to the 2nd and 4th Thursday and Maintenance Staffings were reduced to one a month on the 3rd Monday. In addition to this schedule, which is currently in force, the Coordinator meets with Mrs. H every Monday a.m., for sessions of one to two hours duration.

TABLE 7

Screening Sequence^a and Marital Status of Referrals to Project by Home Type

Home Type

I - Protective

	Number	Screened By GHC ^b	Screened By Research	Staffed ^c	Hired	Fired
Husband-Wife	6	6	3	2	2	1
Man	0	0	0	0	0	0
Woman	3	3	1	0	0	0
Total	9	9	4	2	2	1

II - Containment

Husband-Wife	18	18	2	2	2	1
Man	1	1	1	1	0	0
Woman	11	11	0	0	0	0
Total	30	30	3	3	2	1

III - Boarding

Husband-Wife	2	2	2	1	1	0
Man	2	2	1	0	0	0
Woman	8	8	0	0	0	0
Total	12	12	3	1	1	0

^aIn point of time, the screening sequence begins with the Group Home Coordinator, then continues with research, and concludes with a decision by DTED and CTP staff to hire or not hire.

^bGHC = Group Home Coordinator.

^cStaffed = Comprehensive discussion by Researcher, GHC, Parole Agents, Supv. Parole Agents.

TABLE 7, Concluded

Home Type

IV - Temporary Care

	Number	Screened By GHC	Screened By Research	Staffed	Hired	Fired
Husband-Wife	9	9	6	3	2	1
Man	0	0	0	0	0	0
Woman	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	9	9	6	3	2	1

V - Restriction

Husband-Wife	4	4	2	0	0	0
Man	2	1	1	0	0	0
Woman	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	6	5	3	0	0	0

VI - Individualized

Husband-Wife	8	8	1	1	1	0
Man	0	0	0	0	0	0
Woman	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	8	8	1	1	1	0

Total: All Home Types

	Number	Screened By GHC	Screened By Research	Staffed	Hired	Fired
Husband-Wife	47	47	14	9	8	3
Man	5	4	3	1	0	0
Woman	22	22	1	0	0	0
Total	74	73	18	10	8	3

A slight shift in the focus of training, from a predominately external to more of an internal orientation, began in October, 1967.¹ This shift occurred when the home was made available to selected I₄ Nx's (and Na's). It was agreed that no more than two I₄ N's would be placed in the home at any one time and that two spaces would always be available for I₂'s and Cfm's. The first I₄ youngsters were selected on the basis of their relative immaturity as well as their openness to developing a positive relationship both with Mr. and Mrs. H and with the other wards in the home. The needs of these youths, both Nx's, were generally comparable to those of the Cfm's; and as a result, no major change in technique or treatment stance appeared to be needed.²

The calm, quiet though (psychologically speaking) strong, mannerisms of Mr. H contrast sharply with the more verbal, somewhat hyperactive, and frequently impulsive characteristics of Mrs. H. These qualities, which may enhance their appropriateness to work with immature, dependent youngsters, may also cause them to under-react and, in other contexts, to over-react, to given wards. Thus, for example, Mrs. H's verbal, hyperactive forcefulness may be appropriate when she is involved with a ward in looking for employment, developing a school program, or participating in recreational activities; but it could be most inappropriate when dealing with disciplinary measures or during early relationship development with Cfm (and many I₄ N's) wards - individuals with whom it would be more appropriate to move slowly and softly. Through individual and group contact we have tried to maintain an appropriate balance in their relationships with wards and staff.

For example, by soliciting and respecting his opinions regarding ward behavior, staff have encouraged Mr. H to become more assertive and forceful as the father figure and authority in the home. Or, if Mrs. H becomes too aggressive or unreasonable in her demands on Agents or wards, the Coordinator tries to smooth out difficult situations through direct counseling which is tempered in order to support and meet her needs for attention in addition to helping her to become more appropriate in carrying out her responsibilities within the home. Being the only female among as many as ten, and often more, males, at times has caused Mrs. H to feel left out of many activities and/or overruled when family fun was being planned. At such times, if she reacts very immaturely and inappropriately in her attempts to gain control and attention, the Coordinator helps her regain proper perspective.

Throughout our experience with Mr. and Mrs. H, we have tried to share with them information which might help them to know and understand us better as individuals and as members of a project whose objective is focused upon giving help to troubled youngsters. In our efforts to become more intimate and

¹Until that time, staff had been concerned primarily with providing structure and control for Cfm's, and with developing ways in which Mr. and Mrs. H could cope with Cfm immaturity (particularly behavioral expressions of immaturity). However, when the Nx's arrived, staff became more involved in helping the H's to understand the reasons for Nx behavior patterns and for interpreting dynamics. Also more interpretation of the H's own behavior was begun at that time.

²Of the placements in the home since May, 1967, five have been Cfm's and two have been Nx's.

productive, we have moved our staffings and group meetings from the Project office to the home. On such occasions, we are able to interact with the boys as they wander through the house during our meeting times; also, we are able to visit, play pool, participate in other home recreation with them and with the H's. While sharing experiences we can observe and evaluate the nature of the interactions of the residents, and can develop and evaluate treatment methods and techniques more effectively than is possible if it were necessary to rely solely on the reports of the H's who, because they may be unaware of the significance of some information, may minimize, distort, or forget data. Closer interaction has allowed us to develop awareness and understanding of the ways in which these people interact, so that we have been able to move more naturally into the more internally-oriented approach mentioned earlier.

We are now able to observe and participate in some of the interactions in the home and can - in all likelihood - more adequately identify and compare differences of ward characteristics and develop and evaluate treatment methods and techniques with Mr. and Mrs. H.

Given the present level of development of Mr. and Mrs. H, the Community Agent is now able, with some degree of comfort, to turn over to them primary ward management - including disciplinary matters relative to things which occur within the home setting. This has allowed the Agent to more effectively use his time and talents as treater or therapist relative to the individual wards. By relinquishing these responsibilities, the message of confidence which he has conveyed to the group home parents, and particularly to Mr. H, has greatly enhanced their relationship with the Agent and has contributed to the aura of unity and stability which pervades the household.

Mrs. H has begun to exhibit more self-confidence than she had previously demonstrated. She has also become less demanding in her direct interactions with the Agent, who in turn, appears more relaxed and enthusiastic than he had been for several months relative to this home.

The boys appear happier with this major shift in Agent stance. They appear to have progressed in their development to the point where they are now able to visit with parents or relatives on a "furlough" basis over weekends or for holidays, and/or are able to participate in family vacation trips. The opportunities for such periods of "respite" have been provided to them in the form of realistic goals, which they may achieve by completing such household chores as washing dishes, vacuuming, doing yard work, cleaning the cars, and so on. The furloughs also provide periods of some relief - for all members of the household and for the Agent as well - from pressures and anxieties which may have built up over time. They also make it possible to gain a new perspective on things - e.g., subsequent to periods of emotional crisis.

While many factors have contributed to the present level of development of the home, the willingness of Mr. and Mrs. H to take direction - together with their amenability to very intense, often painful introspection - has been paramount.

Type II Home (Containment): At the time of their referral to us by a Community Agent in the Sacramento CTP office, approximately four months prior to the actual development and finalizing of their group home contract, Mr. and Mrs. D resided in quarters provided by their employer. Thus, when they were selected

to develop the Type II home, it was necessary for them to locate a house large enough to accommodate themselves together with a maximum of six boys, and to begin furnishing and equipping it. Because they (and we) were beginning from "scratch" and were our first home, many problems and questions arose as to how they would finance the first month's rent, purchase furniture, utensils and household supplies, and, in general, sustain themselves until monies became available from the State.

Because the D's were totally involved in setting up the home, the extent of initial training to prepare them to receive their first boys was limited. However, the Coordinator began by helping them to develop skills appropriate to working with CTP wards in such matters as maintaining control of various situations by being "one step ahead of a boy" at all possible times, by remaining calm, imperturbable and consistent during all interactions (particularly crises). They were cautioned against allowing themselves to be drawn into power struggles with CTP Agents - struggles which the boys, particularly Mp's, might try to set up - and against being caught in a trap of becoming angry or discouraged by the counteractive, hostile attitudes of some of the boys.

Both Mr. and Mrs. D appeared capable of perceiving the boys' behavior reasonably accurately and were able to develop skills sufficient to maintain consistent firm controls. During the process of this level of training, the Coordinator was also helping them set up the home and developing a contract.

Due to the number of modifications which were requested by our Administration prior to giving approval to the group home, the development and eventual approval of this first contract created many anxieties and pressures for Mr. and Mrs. D as well as for group home staff. Some of these, we believe, influenced the nature of the relationship which we were able to develop, and affected the level of confidence in us which they were able to achieve. For example, although from the earliest beginnings of our association with these people, staff tried to represent our program in complete honesty by indicating that because no policies or procedures had really been established, it would be necessary for us, with their help, to develop our own approaches within the general context of CTP. We asked that they be frank, that they cooperate with us and trust our decisions regarding various issues, and that they help us develop the basic home program. They were enthusiastic and appeared to be emotionally committed to close participation with us. However, each time we were delayed in connection with Administrative complications, or had to make related changes in plans which they had helped develop to get the home operating, the D's seemed to lose some of their enthusiasm and confidence in us.

Their primary contact with staff during these early months was with the Coordinator, although they had begun interacting with the Researcher as well. Contact with the Community Agent began in a routine, concentrated manner, following placement of the first ward into the home in November, 1966.

Because our contract with Mr. and Mrs. D was not actually approved until the end of December, 1966, we were essentially asking them to become intensively involved with us in the training program (and - in the broadest sense - in developing their home) at a time when, strictly speaking, we could give them no assurance that the contract ultimately would be approved. Nonetheless, with the placement of three I₃ Mp wards during November and early December, Mr. and Mrs. D began keeping records as we had requested. They also began to attend regularly scheduled

staffing and training meetings in the Project office. These meetings were, at the time, our principal method of developing appropriate treatment stances and methods, once our focus began to shift away from the physical aspects of the home environment.

Initially, Mr. and Mrs. D appeared comfortable in sharing information with staff. We believed that we were communicating well with one another, and that we were accurately assessing the development of the home. Mr. and Mrs. D were both open to suggestions; they cooperated with the Agent in exploring various treatment techniques; they were able to develop a network of communication which was seen as an essential element in the treatment of Mp wards.

Staff tried to demonstrate to the D's, as well as to the boys, that we could be trusted to support and assist them at all times. This was done by means of frequent visits to the home and telephone conversations at all hours of the day - simply to inquire how things were going - and by trying to anticipate and prevent potential problems before crises developed. While we considered trust and an overall atmosphere of solidarity necessary to prevent the Mp wards from circumventing house rules and manipulating the group home parents, we also considered trust to be extremely important throughout our interactions and to our ability to interact and communicate effectively with Mr. and Mrs. D.

Throughout the first four to six months of our involvement with Mr. and Mrs. D, our efforts appeared to be paying off. Most of the wards were relating relatively effectively and appropriately and were beginning to develop close relationships with the group home parents. Some of these relationships were beginning to resemble those of a child to a parent (see First Progress Report). However, two major incidents occurred at about the fourth and seventh months - incidents which drastically affected our rate of progress and which seem to have set the primary tone for future development relative to the home.

The first of these incidents occurred in March, 1967 with the introduction to this home of a second Community Agent - one who presented a contrast to the first Agent. This contrast was particularly strong with regard to the newer Agent's direct, authoritarian demeanor - a stance which seemed to cause Mr. D to become progressively guarded and closed. Communication with Mr. D became increasingly difficult and created problems in our attempts to maintain a particular stance and continuity of treatment. In addition to this, difficulties arose because, prior to the new Agent's placing Cfc wards in the home, only Mp's had resided there. As a result, our training efforts had to that point been focused upon the Mp subtype almost exclusively. The second Agent interacted with his Cfc boys in ways which were quite new to Mr. and Mrs. D, and the demands which he made on these boys, together with the privileges which he requested for them, were often in conflict with already-existing house rules. Efforts to achieve harmony were made by modifying some house rules and making a number of other modifications.

Throughout this situation, group home staff, the Agents, and Mr. and Mrs. D tried to identify and resolve conflicts and to prevent new crises through group and individual discussions. When these measures proved inadequate, the Coordinator returned to the approach of counseling alone with Mr. and Mrs. D, to try to help them increase the quality of their interactions with the new Agent to that seen in their relationship with the first Agent - a relationship which had been very

productive and congenial. They also needed a means of ventilating their feelings so that they would not express them to the original Agent, who was being placed in a very difficult position when they verbalized their conflicts to him.

Although this situation continued in varying degrees of intensity throughout the next few months until August, 1967, when the second Agent left CTP, other factors were by that time beginning to affect developments within the home, so that even with the departure of the second Agent we were never able (given the presence of the new set of factors) to rectify the newly emerging conditions. Combined with the earlier factors, these latter factors (described next) had lasting, destructive effects on the total development of the home.

The second major incident which contributed to the deterioration of the home was a sudden move which Mr. and Mrs. D made in July, 1967, without advising staff or the boys who were in the group home at the time. Staff had been aware of the desire of Mr. and Mrs. D to move and had discussed such concerns as location and home size. The Coordinator had even looked at the "new" house with the D's and had generally approved of it prior to the move. At that point during our looking around and discussions, however, the D's only gave the impression that they were investigating the possibility of purchasing the house but had not yet made specific arrangements to do so. However, they did purchase the house before consulting with staff; and, a few days later, while the group home boys were at the Project office, as per routine, they made the move even though they were aware that it was very important that staff be kept informed of all plans so that the boys could be prepared emotionally for the transition and could participate in the planning.

The security which the boys had begun to experience in their original home was shattered along with most of their respect for and confidence in the D's. The emotional closeness which had developed between some of them and the D's was, beyond question, broken.

The secretive manner in which the D's had completed the entire process - from planning to purchasing the house to the actual move - created several impressions and possible interpretations: (1) they did not trust staff to accept their choice, (2) they were not significantly emotionally involved with the boys to want to include them in the plans, and/or (3) they did not wish to function as members of a team, but preferred to function alone in most areas except ward discipline, which they perhaps expected the Agents to manage. Their stated reasons for having made the move in this way were that they did not want to upset the boys, and that they wanted to remove the boys from unfriendliness which, without question, did exist in the former neighborhood.

Immediately following this incident, the D's became quite secretive about such issues as Mr. D's hours of employment on a night job - they indicated they believed the boys were more controllable if they thought Mr. D was in the house - and by guarding their unlisted telephone number because they wanted to avoid the possibility of the boys' divulging it to persons from the former neighborhood who might use it to annoy or harrass them. During this period of time, they also began making unrealistic demands on Agents to discipline and control wards in such ways as calling late at night to request that they come to the home to quiet the boys at bedtime or take them off to temporary detention

for minor infractions of house rules. Such demands seemed unrealistic for at least three reasons: (1) because of the excessive distance which the Agent was required to travel to tell the boys what the D's could very well say, (2) because the Agent usually did not consider temporary detention to be appropriate, and (3) because most of the incidents were not emergencies and could have been handled by the D's, although they were generally, by this time, becoming quite tense and rigid in their interactions with staff and wards.

Although the impact of the second Agent became less powerful during the five months following his introduction into the home, a general feeling of dissension and distrust had set - and was rapidly setting - in. This made it impossible to develop the kind of general atmosphere in the home in which to create opportunities for the boys to begin to develop trust and responsibility.

Attempts to reconstruct a positive, productive relationship with Mr. and Mrs. D were made by Agents and Project Staff through such supportive efforts as arranging time for them to have a few days alone away from the boys, by occasionally transporting the boys home from the office, by being very careful to consult with them regarding home issues, and by honoring various wishes and requests when possible. Staff tried to involve them with the boys in group activities such as camping or fishing trips, or swimming parties at a nearby lake. Mr. and Mrs. D talked about participating with them but never did so. They appeared to be emotionally unable to develop appropriate situations or participate in activities which would promote the emotional growth of the boys.

A third and final major change took place, which - while it was extremely influential - did not seem to be as dramatic as the first two. Nonetheless, it created a need to again modify our training techniques. This concerned the replacement of the second Agent mentioned above with a third Agent - one who had assumed responsibility for the second Agent's wards in the home.

Conflicts comparable to those described with the second Agent developed between Mr. and Mrs. D and this newest Agent, so that, once again, effective communication was never achieved.¹ Due to the greater number of wards in the home at this time, more serious problems arose relative to ward discipline.²

As a final measure to save the home, the Agents and the Coordinator began weekly group meetings in the home with the group home parents and the boys. These meetings progressed relatively well for a time in that some of the disagreements were corrected and certain problems were resolved. However, Agent No. 3,

¹The D's believed that this Agent, like the second Agent, was too liberal with the boys (Cfc's). They felt that he should employ stricter measures to discipline them than he was using. They felt, e.g., that a boy should be placed in temporary detention to sober up from a glue sniffing or drinking party. The Agent believed the boy should be cared for and tended to at home as a way of expressing a message of concern.

²By this time, the population in the home had become almost exclusively Cfc.

who by this time was the only Agent with wards in the home, was involved in a battle for control of the boys with the group home father. He developed a pattern of tardiness in arriving at group meetings until the other participants, including the boys, became increasingly frustrated and angry, and still greater conflicts would then appear.¹ His stated reason (which he revealed after the home was no longer in use) for adopting this pattern was that he had hoped to force the D's into closer communication and interactions with the boys while they were awaiting his arrival at these meetings. His plan was not successful, although it might have been, if he had shared it with the Coordinator, who, as an active participant in the meetings, could undoubtedly have supported him in various ways.

Again, however, our efforts to resolve such difficulties were unsuccessful. It became evident that Mr. and Mrs. D had reached the limit of their ability to withstand the pressures of the demands - for closer emotional involvement with, and trust of, Cfc wards - which staff and wards were making upon them. We were unable to provide them with enough emotional support and reward to sustain them throughout the very trying times which are routine with Mp and Cfc boys, or to see them through difficult growth processes with staff. The types of growth and change in question would doubtlessly not have occurred within just a matter of months, even under conditions of considerable emotional support.

Mr. and Mrs. D had without doubt been able to provide an excellent and appropriate Containment Home for many months. However, for a variety of reasons - not all of which were external - they became too rigid in the sense of being unable to adapt sufficiently to the changing developmental needs of the boys (Mp's as well as Cfc's, in addition to perhaps having a great deal of difficulty in accepting most Cfc wards as compared with Mp's). The poor relationship which they had with Agent No. 3 began to seriously affect their relationship with the boys in placement. We were unable to help them develop attitudes appropriate to achieving the flexibility which the Containment Home required for maximum development of the wards. In June, 1968, it was necessary to discontinue the home.²

Type III (Boarding) Home: The initial steps in developing the Type III home, which began operation in April, 1967, were far less complicated than those for the previous two. Mr. and Mrs. B were situated in a home which was already large enough to accommodate their family and our six boys. The home was adequately equipped and was located in a neighborhood very close to the Sacramento Community Treatment Project office. With the exception of a few minor modifications in the downstairs area, very little had to be done by way of modifying the physical environment. As a result, we were able to concentrate more of our energies on indoctrinating and preparing Mr. and Mrs. B for placement of the first boys.

During weekly staffings in the Project office, information pertaining to each ward is ordinarily discussed and evaluated as a means of helping the group home parents to become aware of, and more comfortable with, the treatment styles of the different Agents who utilize their home.

¹The original Agent had more or less pulled out of the home by this time and was reluctant to place his boys there.

²Efforts to develop another Type II home are presently being made.

Our training of the B's has been quite comparable to that utilized with the other group home parents. However, we have placed less emphasis on the development of particular techniques. This is basically due to the presence, in Mr. and Mrs. B, of a great degree of natural ability to relate effectively with I₄ boys. Experiences with their own youngsters (they have three daughters, age 12, 18 and 20, living with them in the home), and with the many neighborhood teenagers who are frequently in and out, have also helped to prepare them very well to relate comfortably and easily with our teenage boys.

Many of the concerns which the other group home parents had initially had about such issues as discipline, did not arise with Mr. and Mrs. B. They are sensitive to differential discipline needs and have been competent and prudent in their handling of most issues. They communicate easily with our boys. The boys seem to accept their authority and direction to a significant degree, perhaps because of the sincere and direct way in which they present themselves to, and accept, each one of the boys. While the Boarding Home feature of this home does not, in itself, require or encourage close, family-type relationships, the majority of the boys placed in the home have come to relate to the B's in this manner.

The home is seen as a "medium-range" placement situation - that is, not as permanent a placement as are the first two homes. The home's population changes relatively often, so that different Community Agents may be interacting with the B's at different times. Thus, attendance at management staffings varies anywhere from one to several Agents, and may involve different Agents at different times. Because of this and because the Agents have varying and sometimes infrequent patterns of home contact (many of their boys are seen predominantly in the office setting), the boys usually do not develop the dependent type of relationships with the group home parents which we have described for boys who reside within the Type I home.¹ The home is located close enough to the Project office so that the B's and staff can exchange visits fairly spontaneously and Agents do have periodic individual contact with them. (Group activities - e.g., group meetings - within the home are generally not utilized as a technique with these boys).

There have been few occasions when the B's required specific instructions relative to appropriate treatment for any given subtype. In view of this, we have presented very little I-level information to them and our role has focused upon supporting and facilitating communications between them and the Agents. Recent efforts to enhance communications include conducting ward staffings in the home. The B's efforts in the direction of developing congenial relationships with staff have included luncheons in their home to which staff has been invited.

We consider feedback from the Agents to group home staff and group home parents, relative to a boy's overall development and progress, to be essential. However, there have been times when Agents have not shared information with the

¹The Type I, Protective Home approximates normal family living as closely as possible and tries to meet the dependency needs of very immature youngsters. The Type III, Boarding Home boys are less emotionally dependent and require less home-centered activity.

B's as readily as would have been desired, and a few tense situations have ensued. As a result, the primary functions of the Coordinator and the Researcher have been to identify and define the problems as completely as possible, the Coordinator then attempts to repair any temporary damage to relationships which may have come about.

The B's are very straightforward and honest in their communication with staff; and they expect and demand the same from staff. If they perceive staff members becoming the least bit surreptitious, they are likely to tackle the situation with direct, often uncomfortable confrontation, or else they may make very firm demands for clarification. This quality has enabled us to work more effectively and directly with them, even though it has placed uncomfortable demands on Agents to exchange more information with them.

Generally, we believe that our approach with Mr. and Mrs. B has been effective. Basically in view of the people they are (namely, unusually well adjusted, flexible, and comfortable), the nature of our approach also appears to be appropriate. We do not foresee any major changes in approach at this time.

Type IV (Temporary Care) Home: The Type IV Temporary Care Home in Stockton is operated by Mr. and Mrs. F, who were referred to us by Mrs. H (of the Protective Home), who had been acquainted with them for many years. Mrs. H was aware that they took foster children through the Probation and Welfare departments and CYA, and believed that they might be appropriate to develop one of our homes.

Our screening information indicated that they would probably be most appropriate for the Type IV home, due to Mr. F's advanced age, which would prevent him from being able to bear up under long-term pressure, and because Mrs. F seemed better suited emotionally to short-term placements.

The F's previous experience had been with more than 17 boys from Probation, Welfare, and CYA on a long-term basis. They felt comfortable that they had had experience with most types of boys and had learned to work through most difficulties with them.

In view of the nature of this type of home - one which does not require (and, in fact, tries to avoid) close emotional relationships - our approach in beginning to indoctrinate and instruct these people has been very different from that used with the other group home parents. Unlike the other homes, we do not participate in scheduled staffings, either with the Agent or with the group home parents. The only regularly scheduled contacts are weekly home visits by the Coordinator. These meetings usually last from two to three hours, but can extend for longer periods if necessary. The various Agents who use the home contact the F's spontaneously; in addition, they may stop in to visit when they are collecting or returning the boys to the home. On occasions of this nature, Agents communicate directly regarding matters of ward management and ward progress. Contacts with the Researcher are scheduled by him as necessary to accumulate various data.

Meetings with the Coordinator concentrate on the physical development of the home, e.g., remodeling the existing structure, and other home management matters. Since this home receives wards of all subtypes, we are instructing the F's in I-level theory and treatment techniques in a more didactic manner than has been used previously. The Coordinator tries to present I-level

information about current wards and - when more than one subtype is residing in the home at the time - to compare and contrast the behavior of the differing subtypes.

The F's have been given printed I-level material, and this frequently provides a basis for discussions. We usually move slowly to prevent confusion and to allow time for them to assimilate the information so that they can make their own observations and comparisons of their boys.

Since this home has been in operation for such a short time, our knowledge of Mr. and Mrs. F's complete range of capabilities is limited. As a result, we are still experimenting to develop the most appropriate ways of working with them. However, we have agreed that the Coordinator will assume the principal role in I-level training and in handling most issues that may arise in the home, so that Agent involvement at that level will be minimized. While Agents usually advise the Coordinator when difficulties arise so that she can handle these issues directly with the group home parents, there are often many minor issues which Agents themselves can handle spontaneously and adequately with the F's. Major issues concerning the operation and design of the home will be handled by the group home staff, together with Agents.

Ward pre-placement staffings are not conducted - this being a factor which allows Agents a great deal more flexibility in placing and removing wards. For example, Agents may consult directly with the group home parents to determine if space is available and to provide them with very brief information about a boy. They may then go ahead and arrange the particulars of his placement.

We have experienced no major crisis in this home. However, it has been necessary to try to keep Mrs. F focused on the temporary nature of the home, so that she does not become too emotionally involved with particular wards or placed in binds by some who might attempt to use the relationship in harmful ways. Mr. and Mrs. F both appear able to accept direction and counseling extremely well. They often express ideas, attitudes, and feelings about adolescents which are very similar to those of some staff. We believe that Mr. and Mrs. F are in tune with our program and can be developed into a good temporary care resource.

Type VI (Individualized) Home: This home, which will be operated by Mr. and Mrs. U, is presently in the earliest developmental stages. Our contract is currently being processed through our Administrative Services for an effective date of August 1, 1968. With the location of this home in the city of Modesto (approximately 75 miles from our main - Sacramento - office, and approximately 30 miles from the Stockton CTP office), we will require special techniques in communicating important information and keeping participants adequately informed. We expect to conduct most routine business by telephone. Nevertheless, we will establish regular management and maintenance staffings, once we begin officially operating the home. Although Mr. and Mrs. U are looking for a larger house, we have placed one boy with them already and may place another prior to the actual approval of our contract with them. Their home will ultimately accommodate a maximum of six boys.

The U's are young and vigorous. They consciously see themselves as having dedicated their lives to working with young people. Consequently, when they became aware of the differential treatment techniques and I-level classification

system utilized at CTP, they felt that the program, with these elements as its basis, would be one in which they could obtain valuable experiences and could perhaps implement some of their own ideas. They appear to be more intellectually sophisticated and astute than our other group home parents, and both have had some college training. They have devoted a good deal of time and effort to studying publications of CTP and descriptions of other special programs in the Youth Authority. They come to us with a fair degree of knowledge about I-level theory. They have met with staff in the Stockton office and have begun to relate comfortably and meaningfully with the Agent who will be working most closely with them. He has had experience in our other group homes and is extremely effective in his ability to develop rapport with group home parents and draw them into the mainstream of Project activities.

At this point we have not developed a specific training program for this home. However, it is likely that we will use some of the basic methods which have been effective in the other homes and will make necessary modifications once the home is in operation. We expect to have frequent contacts and meetings in the home setting and plan for the boys to be involved in frequent and varied activities with the staff and the U's. Participation in recreational activities with wards and staff will give the U's additional opportunities to observe Agent treatment styles and help them gauge their own appropriateness and effectiveness.

SUMMARY DISCUSSION OF RESEARCH GOALS AND EMERGING ISSUES

We will now discuss - in a general way - our experiences and impressions to date relative to the four basic questions and objectives of the Group Home Project: Feasibility, Taxonomy, Impact on Wards, and General Worth and Utility. A full discussion of any one of these areas, and of the interrelationships among areas, becomes a very complex and involved process. With this in mind, an attempt will be made here to isolate what appear, at the present time, to be some of the most important, specific aspects within each question and/or objective.

Feasibility

In the First Progress Report six "areas" were designated for the purpose of discussing issues relating to feasibility: (1) Group Home Manager (parents), (2) Community Agents, (3) The Community, (4) The Youth Authority, (5) NIMH, and (6) The Group Home Project itself. In the present report (4) and (6) are combined into one area - "Team Management Approach". This will be presented at the end of the section on feasibility.

Group Home Managers (Parents): The major question here is: Can individuals in the community be found who are willing to develop a group home and who appear appropriately matched with a particular group home model, and with the kinds of youth that are to be placed in that home? Secondly, once such individuals are found, can they continue to operate a particular type of home in such a way that the operation of the home is considered to be (a) within acceptable limits of appropriateness as judged by CTP and DTED staff; (b) within the limits of the research model for the particular home; (c) acceptable to the group home parents in that these individuals will, over time, continue to want to operate their group home? A further question would be (d) is there a sufficient, demonstrated need for a particular home operating within the confines of the Community Treatment Project - in the event that (a) and (b), above, are true?

In regard to (a), above, individuals have been located in the community who are willing to operate a home for delinquent youngsters. However, we have not found a large number of these individuals; and, selection has been done on an "absolute" rather than a relative basis.¹ In contacting local Welfare Departments, the Coordinator has found that they, too, have experienced difficulty in finding a large number of individuals who are interested in providing foster care, and who - by their "absolute" standards - would be considered appropriate

There has been variation - within a given type of home, and across-types of homes, as well - in regard to the degree to which group home parents have met or exceeded minimum standards, at the time of selection. None of the

¹That is, individuals are evaluated and selected according to how well they appear to match up to the general as well as specific requirements of a particular type of home, rather than in terms of how well different individuals compare with each other in regard to operating a specific type of home. To date, only one set of candidates have been evaluated at the same time for any specific type of home. In brief, we have not had situations in which two or more candidates have been available to choose between, at any given point in time.

candidates selected thus far have been thought to be "ideal" from every standpoint. However, staff confidence, at the time of selection, has been fairly high in regard to the potential of all of the accepted candidates for any given home.¹

In the Protective Home, Mrs. H was seen as less appropriate for I₂ and/or Cfm youths than her husband, due to her known tendency to be impulsive. On the other hand, her previous efforts in investing her time and energies in youngsters' behalf indicated a basic sincerity in wanting to deal effectively with youngsters. Mr. H's calm, non-threatening approach combined with his desire to be firm and reasonable, and to see youngsters grow - appeared quite well-matched with Cfm youngsters. In addition, Mr. and Mrs. H very much wanted the youngsters who would be placed with them to become part of a total family group.

When Mr. and Mrs. D (Containment Home) were selected, they both appeared to be well suited to operate the home for Cfc and Mp youths - not so much because they seemed well-matched with Cfc and Mp youngsters, specifically, but because their basic attitude toward the operation of a home reflected an emphasis on structure, supervision, and control. Little emphasis was given to the question of their ability to form relationships with Cfc and Mp youths, since - at the time the D's were selected - the Containment Home model de-emphasized this aspect of the home.

In the case of the Boarding Home (Mr. and Mrs. B), the group home parents seemed very well "tuned in" to older adolescents, and to the "predicament" experienced by these individuals relative to their being, in more than one sense, neither adults nor children. Mr. B's quiet, calm, yet strong demeanor seemed quite well suited for Nx youngsters. Mrs. B seemed to prefer youngsters who would be more passive and cooperative (e.g., I₄ Nx's); and, she expressed (in the questionnaires) some reluctance about dealing with youths who would be more assertive, verbally aggressive and more openly rebellious (e.g., I₄ Na's).²

Mr. and Mrs. F (Temporary Care Home) seemed quite well suited for the Temporary Care Home. Their prior foster home work had given them a wide range of experiences with differing types of youngsters - i.e., they appeared to be ready to expect and to deal with "almost anything". Though Mrs. F stated otherwise, it appeared likely that she would obtain the greatest emotional satisfaction from long-term relationships - those in which she could involve herself, and see youngsters grow. Her enjoyment of and interest in youths, taken together with her conscious recognition of the temporary nature of the Type IV Home - these indicated that she could probably offer much to youngsters at a time of crisis and could probably utilize staff in order to receive the kind of support that

¹The Project's screening procedures (interviews and questionnaires) have provided information which has proved useful in gaining a perspective on each candidate in regard to his particular strengths and weaknesses. However, these procedures, by themselves may not be indicative of eventual success or failure, since relative success or failure is dependent on many other things (e.g., candidate's ability to relate over time to delinquent, oftentimes disturbed, youngsters; staff's ability to fulfill the group home parents' needs for information, support, etc.).

²However, Mrs. B has been quite effective with I₄ Na youths - particularly in the area of her open, direct, honest (i.e., "no games") approach to them.

could offset possible frustrations related to her seeing the youngsters come and go. Mr. F also enjoys youths; yet he, by way of some contrast, seems to prefer friendly, interested, but non-involved relationships.

Mr. and Mrs. U (Individualized Home) are youthful, spirited people - and the Type VI Home seems almost "tailor-made" for them. Though they are inexperienced in dealing with disturbed delinquents, they have an openness and eagerness to experience new situations and to learn. Mr. U is an outgoing, assertive, verbal person; he appears well suited for I₄ Na's. Mrs. U is a calm, quiet and "low pressure" individual whose demeanor seems appropriate with I₄ Nx's. Their desire to help youngsters and to involve themselves in the helping process is more on a "professional" level than in the case of any of the remaining group home parents. In addition, (considering them individually and together) their compatibility plus the manner in which they complement each other in their strengths and weaknesses - these factors are present to a degree which clearly surpasses that found in all remaining group homes.

There has also been a range of inter- and intra-home experiences relative to the question of the extent to which the operation of the homes has been, (1) within acceptable limits, as judged by CTP and DTED staff, and (2) within the limits of the research models as well. These aspects of appropriateness are not mutually exclusive since DTED research attempts to consider current treatment thinking and current placement needs and issues, when assessing whether a given home's operation falls within acceptable limits relative to an originally stated model. Neither of the two homes which have been cancelled thus far, have been terminated solely because they did not meet research requirements. While research evaluation was involved in the final decisions, primary consideration was given to the assessment by DTED and CTP staff of the home's appropriateness in relation to its meeting or not meeting the treatment and placement needs of the types of youngsters for whom that type of home had been designed.

Some of the homes have evolved in such a way that their method of operation, use, etc., is not totally within the implied limits of the original model statements (e.g., Boarding and Containment Home). However, except for some "hard and fast" restrictions such as I-level and short or long-term placement, research interpretations of the original guidelines have generally been flexible, so as to allow Agents and group home parents to move along a course that is most advantageous to the type(s) of youths for whom the home had been designed.¹

Thus it has not been the case that a given home is cancelled simply because of that home's incompatibility with the research design - provided that the home is, at the same time, seen as being acceptable to treatment staff in terms of its appropriateness for the types of youths for whom that type of home had been intended. It is, of course, also conceivable that a home might be meeting the requirements of the research design, but in a way that is unacceptable to treatment staff.

¹Eligibility, short or long-term placement, etc., - these are, by design, not allowed to vary. As such, they represent carefully controlled conditions. However, how to deal most effectively with those youths who are placed into a home, and how to best operate a home - these issues are not as subject to control. Nor would it appear that they should be "controlled" in an arbitrary, absolute sense, if we are to develop meaningful taxonomies of group homes.

The latter, - (except for one major difference, or factor) - did in fact, occur in the case of the Containment Home. There, the D's approach, plus the general way in which they operated the home, seemed, on the surface, to be compatible with the research design. However, the major difference was that the D's (primarily Mr. D) were not able to any substantial degree, to be effective agents of control and discipline independent of the Community Agents. Other than this, the D's Containment Home had most, is not all, of the essential ingredients implied or expressed in the original model. This model, however, lacked the increasing emphasis on relationships and growth that is now present in Cfc and Mp treatment thinking.

The H's operation of the Protective Home falls somewhat short of meeting research and treatment staff requirements in some areas. In other areas, it is satisfactory. For example, a great deal of patience and tolerance is not consistently demonstrated by Mrs. H; and, the home does not yet really seem to be a "family" despite considerable evidence that a degree of "groupness" does exist. On the other hand, the H's have been able to provide - for most of the youngsters placed - basic acceptance, supervision, control and placement stability.

Mr. and Mrs. B (Boarding Home) have become involved with group home youths in such a way that the B's have been able to develop much more than a "YMCA Hotel" atmosphere. They have contributed to some youths' stability and growth to an extent not originally considered to be the "primary mission" of the Boarding Home. Though DTED research might have tried to alter the direction in which this home was moving, it appeared quite inappropriate relative to what was considered to be the best treatment direction to take in connection with the type of I₄ youths that had been placed into the home. In addition, efforts to keep the Boarding Home "strictly on the track" of the original model would have interfered with the natural and - to all indications - treatment-relevant ways in which the home was developing.

None of the group home parents have initiated any request to terminate their home from the project.¹ Once the D's (Containment Home) were cancelled, Mr. D then indicated that there had been times when he was tempted to "call it quits" due to the increasing degree of frustration which he and his wife were experiencing. On one or two occasions, Mr. and Mrs. D had given some hints that they were approaching such a point. In retrospect it appears that the D's were "compromised" somewhat in that they had become dependent on the group home subsidy to maintain the home in which they were living, as well as their standard of living. Following termination, Mr. D indicated that they would probably not be able to continue living in their present home since it was a larger place than they actually needed (and, also, too expensive for Mr. D to maintain on his salary alone).

In regard to "sufficient, demonstrated need for the home", each type of home developed thus far has been used to an extent that clearly demonstrates that it has been a useful, meaningful placement alternative for CTP Agents.² The amount of use that the homes have thus far had increases in significance in view of the fact that. (1) no one home was intended to fulfill all of the out-of-home placements needs of any given type of youth; and, (2) the numbers and

¹Nor have they shown signs of wishing to do so.

²See "General Worth and Utility", page 105 for further discussion in regard to the extent of use the homes have received.

percentage of youngsters potentially eligible (by reason of I-level classification) for the Protection and Containment Homes have been relatively small.¹

Except for the Type V (Temporary Restriction) Home, feasibility has been achieved in regard to locating interested, and seemingly appropriate individuals to operate each of the group homes. Even though there have been inter- and intra-home differences as to the appropriateness of the operation of the homes, the use of "average", "non-professional" members of the community to operate the group homes also appears to have been feasible.² Our experiences indicate that certain "special" or "unique" factors have to be considered when utilizing "non-professionals" for group homes.³ In addition, there are clear indications that appropriate matching of group home parents and youngsters (together with appropriate interaction between staff and group home parents) has considerable bearing on the relative success or failure of "non-professionals".

Even though an argument can be made for using "professional" people to provide foster care, unless the present "voluntary" concepts of paying for some types of foster care are altered (e.g., being "salaried" foster parents) it is unlikely that the use of professionalized workers will be realized to any extent.⁴ In addition, certain "over - (and under) - placements" may be avoided by the use of foster parents who have similar socio-economic backgrounds to those of the foster home youths.

The Community: Only one home has had any difficulty with the local neighborhood. During its first eight months of operation, the Containment Home was located in an area which had an organized parents' group. Apparently, the home was not even noticed for about six months; however, as the group home youngsters became more involved in neighborhood affairs this parents' group reacted quite strongly

¹As of 3/31/68, I₂'s and Cfm's in Stockton have comprised 19% of the unit's population (diagnosis at intake); 22% for Cfc's and Mp's in Sacramento. (Boys only.)

²Some refer to professional foster parents as those who are being paid for their services. We are using the work "professional" in referring to a degree of education and/or experience which has resulted in a fairly high level of formal knowledge and understanding of human dynamics and modes of intervention techniques.

³The other areas considered under "Feasibility" will contain further remarks relative to this subject.

⁴Whether professional or not, there seems to be increasing interest by DTED staff in the idea of placing some types of foster and group home care under civil service, and of paying the foster parents a salary.

against the presence of the home in the neighborhood. (This situation was described at length in the First Year Progress Report). Although the matter was resolved fairly well, and the home could have remained in the neighborhood, the experience did provide some of the impetus for the group home parents' decision to relocate the home.

During the 18 months of operation, none of the homes have been the target of any expressed criticism or concern from other agencies (e.g., police, probation, welfare, etc.). There have been no police contacts directly with any of the group homes in regard to incidents occurring within given homes or incidents involving youngsters who were - at the time - living in the homes. In fact, the Sheriff of San Joaquin County recently sent Mr. and Mrs. H (Protective Home) a letter of commendation with reference to their efforts.

Licensing: From the experiences of DTED staff in regard to the licensing of group homes, and from talking with other CYA staff and members of local probation departments, there is general frustration and dissatisfaction with local welfare departments who are at present responsible for licensing all foster homes for the Youth Authority and for local probation departments. In response to this, the California Chief Probation Officer's Association has spearheaded a plan to allow each individual probation department to license its own homes. Some years back, the Youth Authority considered, but rejected, the idea of licensing its own homes. This decision is presently being re-evaluated. DTED staff is of the definite opinion that the Youth Authority should obtain the necessary authorization to license their own out-of-home placement resources.

Most of the Project's experiences in working with local welfare departments in regard to the licensing of homes have been in San Joaquin County (Stockton). The Boarding Home in Sacramento was not referred for licensing due to the fact that it was very unlikely that any youngster under 16 would qualify, in view of research - eligibility requirements for placement to the home. The Containment Home in Sacramento was referred for licensing but the matter was dropped when a fire inspection showed that a good deal of money would have to be spent to get a fire clearance on the home.¹ In addition, it appeared unlikely that this home would be used for youngsters under 16. Because the matter was dropped we had no opportunity to determine what set of standards or guidelines the Sacramento County Welfare Department would use in connection with granting or denying a license.

In Stockton, the Type IV Temporary Care Home cannot be licensed because of State and local regulations on maximum age. (The group home father is 74, and the requirements specify a maximum age of 70.) Mr. and Mrs. H (Protective Home) had (some two years prior to their involvement with the Project) previously applied for a day care license. (They had also inquired about adopting youngsters.) They were at that time rejected on grounds of Mrs. H's background of instability,² as assessed by the welfare worker. However, the supervisor of child welfare in Stockton indicated to the Coordinator that they would re-evaluate the H's, as it was believed that there had been a personality clash between the welfare worker and Mrs. H. Then, for reasons which still are not clearly understood, the Welfare

¹This involves things that would not have been required for a family of eight in the same home.

²Both of her parents had been married several times.

CONTINUED

1 OF 2

Department refused to re-evaluate the M's in connection with the operation of a group home in the Group Home Project. After several conversations between the Coordinator and the Welfare Department, the supervisor of child welfare agreed to take an application from Mrs. H. This was then submitted by Mrs. H. The same day, Mrs. H was informed by the Welfare Department that she was "too young", and that they would not continue to process the application.

In an attempt to gain a general understanding of the licensing philosophy of the San Joaquin County Welfare Department (but not to press the issue of licensing the M's), the Research Analyst conducted an extensive interview with the supervisor of child welfare and the supervisor of the licensing unit in the San Joaquin County Welfare Department. This meeting was cordial; and it appeared that the welfare staff was familiar with, and understanding of, the unique placement problems and needs of Youth Authority wards. However, it also appeared that it would be extremely difficult to obtain from the Welfare Department increased flexibility in the interpretation of State regulations in the licensing of foster homes for the Youth Authority population. They indicated that some type of legislative action would probably have to occur for the Youth Authority's unique placement needs to be met.

Basically, it appears that the Welfare Department does not wish to license a given home that does not meet the specific standards that they use for licensing their own homes. They feel that, in a sense, (a) their reputation is at stake when a license is awarded, and that (b) if a license is to be withdrawn, it is going to fall upon them to take the responsibility for communicating this fact to the foster parents. Their previous experience has led them to the view that this can be very "unpleasant"; and, evidently, they wish to avoid this when possible. They also view with concern the fact that, in California, a foster home license (once granted) is considered to be a "property right" until it expires - and foster parents can challenge in court the Department's withdrawal of their license.

The Welfare Department's concerns are understandable - particularly if one focuses exclusively upon their own needs and staff limitations. However, there appears to be a need for a more pragmatic approach in evaluating the licensing of out-of-home placements, in the case of those types of youngsters (e.g., older delinquents, disturbed youngsters) for whom the "ideal" foster parents are only infrequently available. It is quite often necessary that a youngster be placed with less than ideal foster parents - in essence because that particular placement is, in the judgment of treatment staff, better than any of the other available alternatives (including institutionalization). In addition, greater flexibility would appear appropriate in licensing standards in regard to special (and/or experimental) program - where foster parents or group home parents receive much more than the usual amount of supervision, involvement, training, and ongoing evaluation by the placing agency (as is the case in the Community Treatment Project and Group Home Project) - i.e., more than is the case with most Welfare Department homes.

The San Joaquin County Welfare Department has stated that they can take these factors into consideration; however, except for the M's, a test of this has yet to take place.¹ However, feedback from other CTP Agents who have attempted to

¹This statement by the Welfare Department was made after they refused to do any extensive re-evaluation of the M's taking into consideration the factors mentioned above (e.g., amount of supervision, etc.). However, the Welfare Department did not want to reopen the M's case (it was implied that in their judgment the existence of a good deal of supervision, training, etc. would not cause them to reconsider their earlier decision to not license them).

work with the Welfare Department in connection with the licensing of individual foster homes indicates that the initiative to establish pragmatic criteria in licensing foster homes for the Youth Authority population will, in all likelihood, not be borne by the Welfare Department.

Approximately six months ago the San Joaquin Welfare Department's licensing practices were investigated by the State Department of Social Welfare subsequent to expressed concerns by the members of the Stockton community, in addition to those of certain local agencies who depend upon the Welfare Department for licensing. However, the study focused on the licensing practices for dependent youngsters and did not include an evaluation of licensing practices regarding delinquent youths.

One of the major conclusions of this study was that: "...The changes of too high standards, of failure to accept promising foster home applications, and of taking too long to study homes were, for the most part, without foundation. Child Welfare staff understand good professional standards and try to follow them. The standards of performance which they apply are sound and proper, but not too high as has been alleged..."

Even though it is difficult to argue against the need for high or good standards as a basis for developing specific standards for foster homes, an important, additional need clearly has to do with developing foster home standards in terms of their relevance, and utility, meeting the needs of many youngsters who must be placed in less than desirable circumstances (e.g., receiving homes, kept in a poor home situation, etc), when no foster home which happens to meet the "high professional standards" is at the time available. There appear to be many ways (increased training, careful supervision, close communication, personal relationship, etc.) of making a home both workable and acceptable. It thus becomes possible to increasingly approach the "ideal" within given homes, while at the same time meeting very real needs which might otherwise go entirely unmet. The fundamental choice thus appears to be between an "either/or" stance or one which consists of working on more than a single objective at one and the same time, by bringing to bear otherwise unavailable resources to help develop and improve a given home.

The Youth Authority: During the first year of operation of the Project (1966), Youth Authority Administration was quite concerned with cost-accounting and with maintaining a consistent population in some of the group homes. In addition, Administration was concerned with the specific and total amounts of money that were to be paid to individual group homes. These seemed to be their chief priorities. The flexibility that was called for in the present, exploratory study did not blend well with these priorities during the first year of the DTED program. While administrators were basically supportive of the program, considerable discussion was needed to help keep in focus - and in balance - all of the relevant priorities. One of the central issues was whether or not the group homes could, on the one hand, be a fully "operational" aspect of the Youth Authority's total program from the beginning; while on the other hand, allowing for sufficient flexibility to test a full range of conditions - i.e., exploring differing ways of setting up, and contracting with, group homes. Perhaps there is the concern - even in a clearly defined - experimental (i.e., "non-operational") program - to the effect that precedents can be established. Nevertheless, from a research standpoint the basic mandate of an exploratory study remains clear - viz., to explore and develop.

The thing which this project was to demonstrate, and evaluate, was first the worth of an approach to handling youths - and under what conditions this approach would be feasible. This necessitated having a fair amount of flexibility to experiment with "the conditions" within the overall (outer) limits which had previously been agreed upon by the Youth Authority in conjunction with NIMH.

Some of these concerns were in regard to the manner in which the money was paid (e.g., whether to pay a retainer or a "minimum guarantee"), and also in connection with whether or not the Youth Authority would be able to continue to maintain the homes (at the requested amounts of subsidy) once the NIMH portion of the group home subsidy would be withdrawn (1969). However, both of these concerns appeared to be irrelevant to the basic mandate.

The major concrete difficulty in discussing these issues - apart from the broader issue of differing priorities-of-concern - was the fact that there appeared to be no common basis for evaluating what was "appropriate", or even essential, to expend by way of group home subsidy. A 1966 Youth Authority survey of ten CYA group homes stated that group home subsidy at that time was without question inequitable.¹ Even so, it was difficult for many individuals to accept the idea of paying higher-than-usual amounts of money to group homes, even though it was never proposed for any given DTED home that the Youth Authority, and/or NIMH, contribute more than had originally been allocated for any of these homes, or contribute in a manner not in keeping with NIMH standards.

During the last year, few if any concerns have been expressed by Youth Authority Administration in regard to methods of contracting, and to the overall monetary amounts being paid to the group homes. Thus, the issues of contracting and payments seem to be resolved - at least for the life of the DTED project.² In addition, there may have been some indirect impact by the Group Home Project in terms of breaking precedent with the previous upper limits of group home subsidy, in that a recent request for the fiscal year 1969-70 includes proposed increases in foster home and group home subsidy.³

The Youth Authority plans to establish in the next year an out-of-home placement specialist who will attempt to evaluate the problems and issues relating to out-of-home placement in the Youth Authority program, to the end of making recommendations for changes in existing programs and, possibly, also in connection with the implementation of new programs and approaches as well.⁴ This would appear to indicate that the Youth Authority is renewing its concern and interest in an often-ignored, but relatively expensive aspect of its overall program of rehabilitation.

¹This survey was done before the Group Home Project began. The 1966 CYA group home subsidy was \$200 per month retainer plus \$94 per month per ward (based on a per ward per month budgeted rate of \$149). The present CYA group home subsidy is the same as it was in 1966.

²See Appendix B on Contracting for a description of the present form of payment to the group homes.

³Requested are: (a) \$300 retainer instead of \$200, and (b) \$110 a month for ward subsidy per month instead of \$94.

⁴E.g., Youth Authority doing its own licensing; having foster home specialists located throughout the State, etc.

NIMH: Here, the issue of feasibility centers around the question of doing this type of study in such a way that meaningful information can be obtained. The present study is exploratory rather than controlled in the sense that it does not involve random assignment to experimental or controlled conditions. Thus, the experiences of the Project cannot be regarded as clear "proof" of any particular point - i.e., as compared with specified alternatives. It is, however, felt that a large proportion of the Project's experiences (regardless of how difficult they may be to define and communicate accurately) are likely to be representative of many of the problems and issues that the Youth Authority, and other agencies, have faced, and will face in the future, in dealing with individual foster homes, group homes, part-way houses, and the like. Information resulting from the attempt to match group home parents with particular types of youngsters, and/or with particular types of homes, may have several implications in terms of a possible, future re-assessment of selection standards, and/or an evaluation of foster parents in terms of a supplementary, and possibly a more pragmatic frame of reference. In addition, the group home project's general methods of operation may bring to light some of the major (and preferred) alternatives available in connection with managing a group home or foster home program (particularly in the case where Agents do not transfer casework responsibility when and if a given youngster is placed out-of-home).

Group Home staff has spent a great deal of time trying to develop instruments that will assist in the description of the DTED population and of those experiences which relate to research goals. Unfortunately, few if any of these instruments - as presently used - have been standardized. Some of them do appear to have a degree of potential for use in (a) the matching of foster parents to particular youngsters, (b) the description of home environments, and (c) assessing the impact of foster home placement on youngsters.

The task of applying a large number and wide variety of instruments to the study of the present population has been difficult, and in some instances (particularly in getting cooperation of wards) close to impossible. It is felt, however, that a large quantity of meaningful information has been, and will continue to be, collected.

Team Management Approach:¹ In assessing and describing our experiences utilizing a team management approach in the operation of the Group Home Project and in the operation of any given home, we will follow a format similar to that used in previous sections regarding each type of group home. That is, we will briefly describe and evaluate our experiences within the context of a given "model" and a set of expectations.

This model statement is the result of our more recent thinking concerning not only what is done but, more importantly, the major areas, elements or objectives in question. It is a way of abstractly describing a number of concrete

¹The First Year Progress Report described the basic rationale for the development of this "cooperative effort" relative to the total project, and in connection with the operation of each given home. In summary, these points were: DTED staff felt that the hiring of group home parents and the operation of any given home should be congruent with current staff thinking concerning the placements needs of specific types of youngsters. Even if the Coordinator and Research Analyst (individuals who - prior to the DTED project - had been Agents in CTP) were familiar with I-level and its implications for treatment, it was felt that their opinions alone in regard to the selection of group home parents or in regard to "what a home should be like", could not be automatically assumed to be those of present Community Treatment Agents and Supervisors.

experiences and developments. These developments began during the early months of the project. At that time a number of expectations and agreements (explicit or otherwise) were informally developed and agreed upon among CTP and Group Home Staff - chiefly in regard to several different kinds of staffing and roles which would be played.

The management of the project and the homes is related to the broader issue of feasibility by virtue of the following questions: Can the operation of the project in general, and the homes in particular, (a) remain within acceptable limits relative to the overall research design; can it (b) continue to be congruent with treatment needs of individual wards and current treatment thinking of CTP staff; can it (c) be made compatible with the individual personnel and the administrative structure of CTP? With reference to questions of this nature, the issue of feasibility might not have been so great had the Group Home Project been a separate entity, rather than a supplement to the overall treatment program in CTP. This is, of course, still an open question. Nevertheless, our experiences to date may shed some light on the complexities of coordinating any given supplementary program within the context of an already existing, broader treatment program.

The "shared" responsibility involved in a team approach has been viewed with no small degree of skepticism both from within CTP and by people in other agencies. For example, treatment supervisors, the CTP project supervisor and some Community Agents have voiced their concerns as to whether or not this type of arrangement is theoretically and/or operationally sound. The skepticism seems to be similar to that often expressed relative to "functional supervision" - where lines of authority and responsibility are not clearly identified.

It has been only recently - after close to two years of operation - that the complexities involved in utilizing a team approach have emerged to the point where we have begun to systematically define certain significant elements of the team approach model. As this "model" becomes increasingly clarified, it will provide a more adequate perspective from which to describe and evaluate our experiences. The outline which follows is designed to point up some of the major areas, elements or objectives involved in a team management approach. After presenting this outline, we will briefly describe and discuss the Coordinator's role together with a number of experiences with Community Agents as well as group home parents. The purpose of this section is that of acquainting the reader with our perception of the complexities involved in the implementation of a team approach. Future reports will expand upon this discussion, and will contain a careful evaluation of the feasibility of such an approach.

¹Three kinds of staffings were established: (1) a Management Staffing which includes (for each given home) the group home parents, Community Agents, the Coordinator and Research Analyst; (2) a Maintenance Staffing which includes the individuals in the Management Staffing plus the Treatment Supervisor which but excluded the group home parents; and (3) a Group Home Administrative Staffing involving the Principal Investigator, Co-Investigator, Research Analyst, Coordinator and the respective Treatment Supervisors from Stockton and Sacramento. The general understanding as to roles was formalized in writing after approximately one year of operation (See "Guidelines for Parole Agents and Group Home Managers", Appendix N.)

Major Areas, Elements, or Objectives of a Team Management Approach:¹

I. Membership (composition) of any given team

- A. Indispensable (i.e., absolutely necessary)
- B. Desirable
- C. Unnecessary or undesirable

II. Communication with, and by, the team

A. Modes (manner/context in which communication takes place)

- 1. Formal (schedules) - conducted on a group and/or individual basis.
- 2. Informal (unscheduled) - conducted in a group and/or individual basis.

B. Content (what is communicated; what takes place)

- 1. Original, long-range planning with regard to a given home (e.g., development of goals for the home). What in general "should" a given home be like? Given certain individuals (managers and other staff), what predictions can be made regarding what the given home will be like (initial perceptions)?

a. Evaluate the particular home relative to the original research model statement for the given type of home. What adjustments, modifications may be necessary or desirable (e.g., size of the home; other foster home youngsters already in placement, etc.) relative to the original model?

- 2. Planning relative to any given youngster (goals; strategies; role of the home)

- a. Essential participants
- b. Desirable participants

- 3. "Feelings"...regarding (a) individual wards, (b) groupings of wards, (c) group home parents, (d) agents, (e) Treatment Supervisor, (f) Coordinator, (g) Researcher; and (h) feelings relative to various combinations of (a) through (g).

- 4. Dynamics (perceptions - by project staff and others - of what is happening relative to the ongoing operations/ interactions within the home).

- 5. Trends (what changes are taking place within the home on a long-term basis?)

¹A general management (or communication) plan across homes can result from these considerations, but in addition, each home (and its particular "team") needs to be evaluated separately in order that the management approach (within the context of a team approach) be tailored to fit the type of home and the individuals in the team. The Type IV, Temporary Care Home, is an example of this. (See discussion regarding the Coordinator's role following this outline).

6. Source and nature of communications

- a. Who should communicate what to whom; who takes the initiative in communicating what; what sort of information is (a) essential (e.g., changes in parole status of wards; is or is not a given ward still residing within the home at any given point in time); and what is (b) desirable and (c) optional only?

7. General Considerations

Communication should be a means to an end (viz., appropriate decision-making). (a) who makes which kinds of decisions, and when and how are these made (re: status of individual wards, atmosphere of homes, etc.) (b) who "complains" to whom, regarding which kinds of content; (c) who makes decisions regarding placements, removal and selection of individual wards and regarding termination of a home; (d) how much pressure (and by whom) is to be applied (when and to whom); (e) who-all should decide on strategy; (f) how hard should or must one press (e.g., for adherence to a particular home model or general treatment approach); (g) when, how and by whom are modifications made within the home?

Underlying all of the above, relative to the possible successful functioning of a team approach, are the attitudes of the participants (a) toward one another, and (b) toward the communication techniques involved - each of which can relate to their personal implicit "requirements" in the areas of sharing, compromise, etc.¹ The extent to which each individual's minimum expectations or demands come to be met undoubtedly contributes to his level of satisfaction. This, in turn, has a direct bearing upon the individual's attitude. Therefore, a major consideration is: what has to be done (and by whom) to achieve at least a minimum level of "satisfaction" for all of the participants involved in the home? Complicating this issue is the fact that minimum levels of satisfaction are generally not static - they may change over time. One additional question must also be considered can (or, must) certain standards of performance, or kinds of expectation, be lowered without significantly reducing the level of satisfaction.²

¹E.g., would given staff rather have an explicitly, pre-structured program - one which was to be developed and controlled by persons other than themselves - or would they prefer to share in the development of the program and in the program responsibility?

²By "satisfaction" we are referring to: (a) emotional satisfaction which is related to an individual's source of motivation for wanting to help or deal with others, (this may include particular kinds of things that an individual wants to do - his role - in seeking certain kinds of goals achieved as a result of his involvement - "pay-off"; and (b) intellectual satisfaction which is related to a person's sense of logic, fair play, and/or background of experiences, education or training (e.g., what occurs may have to remain clearly within the person's "limits" of intellectual "tolerance"). (a) and (b), of course, are not mutually exclusive.

Coordinator's Role: A discussion of the Coordinator's role, and the rationale behind it serves as one specific example of how some of the above dimensions and issues come into play.

When the Project began there appeared to be two basic alternative approaches to the Coordinator's role. The first alternative was for the Coordinator (a) to have direct responsibility for the recruitment and general training of the group home parents, (b) in addition, to have exclusive responsibility for specific training relative to the development of each group home, and, (c) in effect, to "stand between" the group home parents and the Community Agents, as a resource for each. Under such an arrangement - particularly in connection with (c) - the Coordinator would directly coordinate, and/or integrate, all Agents' interests, concerns, etc., with those of the group home parents. By means of this process, Agents and Coordinator would, together, define "what the home is like". They would, possibly, even develop guidelines for dealing with specific issues involving group home youngsters (e.g., consequences for given types of misbehavior). The Agents, under this kind of arrangement, would have little need for direct, ongoing involvement with the group home parents. While they would not have direct responsibility for determining and implementing training needs relative to the group home parents even though they had - together with the Coordinator - developed the above "guidelines" and "objectives" of the home - i.e., factors which, at least in part, would determine the content, scope, and focus of training.

In the second alternative - the one that is being used in the Project - the Coordinator assumes a position in which there are many opportunities for "role definitions" to become somewhat cloudy. Here, the Coordinator takes a "counseling" or "advising" position with both the group home parents and Community Agent, and also attempts to bring about meaningful and effective Community Agent/Group Home parent interaction. In addition, the Coordinator attempts to communicate general treatment concepts and general information about youngsters - and also handles functional problems relating to diet, budgeting, and payment problems with the Youth Authority administration.

Under this type of arrangement, when the Agents might find particular issues either too difficult to deal with or feel that the Coordinator should handle them, the Coordinator must determine whether this information should most appropriately come from her (as "counselor-advisor") - to the group home parents - or from the Agent (as the third significant person in the interaction). She must also assess the role which the Treatment Supervisor - i.e., the Agent's immediate supervisor - might wish to, and perhaps ought to, play in the given situation.

Thus, some issues might become a "hot potato" - with the potential of being passed from one person to another. In many instances it would seem easy for the Coordinator to fill gaps left by insufficient and/or inaccurate communications by Agents and/or supervisors; but by doing so there then arises an opportunity for the information which she might provide to then be incongruent with the Agent's and/or the Treatment Supervisor's point of view.¹ For reasons such as these, in

¹For example, in the Containment Home the Coordinator's views regarding the emphasis which might usefully be given to "structure", "control", and "punishment" appeared to be somewhat closer to those of the Agents than to those of the Treatment Supervisor. In this instance, a major question would be whether or not the Coordinator had "permission" from the Treatment Supervisor to openly and directly support a point of view to the group home parents that he did not, or quite possibly might not agree with' or, should this issue remain solely between the Agent and Treatment Supervisor - with whatever was resolved between the two of them in turn being communicated either by the Agent or by the Coordinator to the group home parents.

her attempt to maintain compatibility with current agent styles and treatment thinking (including that of treatment supervisors), the Coordinator attempts to encourage communication among concerned individuals, rather than being solely responsible for transmitting information from one person to another, and/or for taking independent action based solely upon her personal integration or interpretation of several points of view or of information which, in given instances, may or may not have been available to all interested parties. (This situation is further complicated when differing individuals have differing viewpoints as to just how involved each individual should be. It is complicated to an even greater degree when it is difficult to determine whether or not any given individual is especially interested and involved, and how consistent this involvement is likely to be.) This relates to the issue of precisely where, when, and how the Coordinator should take the initiative in group home matters and whether and when the initiative or action needs to be unilateral (e.g., the action completed prior to full communication with all parties). For example, in the area of training, there have been differing views as to how much and what kind of information should be communicated to the group home parents (and by whom); and whether certain items (e.g., wards drinking in the group home, I-level information, etc.) should be approached before youngsters are placed or whether these items should be handled when, and if, problems and/or concerns arise. In the opinion of some CTP staff the Coordinator should have been more "structuring" in regard to specific "dos and don'ts" rather than to wait until an issue arose.

In spite of the complexities involved in the Coordinator's role and the differing views as to what it should entail, the Coordinator's involvement seems to have had a good deal of importance in all of the homes developed this far. The nature of this involvement has varied both between and within given homes. In all of the homes, the Coordinator has been able to give general support and acceptance to group home parents. In some instances, she has helped the group home parents to deal with their emotional and attitudinal reactions to youngsters and Community Agents. In addition, Community Agents have at times been able to gain a better understanding and different perspective in regard to group home parents, as a result of discussions with the Coordinator.

The most important involvement that the Coordinator has had with any of the group home parents has been in the Protective Home.¹ By virtue of the relationship that the Coordinator has been able to develop with Mrs. H, many important items are being handled that have pertained to helping Mrs. H grow (and to help her see that she is capable of emotional growth). This approach, for the most part, relieved the Agent of this particular responsibility - thereby allowing him to deal more objectively with the operation of the home and the youngsters in the home.

In the other homes, the Coordinator's involvement has been gauged by the needs that were present at any given point in time. For example, Mr. and Mrs. B (Boarding Home) operate fairly well without ongoing support, acceptance and structure. Thus, the Coordinator has not had to become intensively involved with them in these areas. In the Containment Home (Mr. and Mrs. D), the Coordinator was involved primarily in trying to assist the D's to look at their operation more objectively; to try to deal with their feelings in regard to the youngsters and the Agents; to help the Agents to view the D's more objectively; and - where the Agents' demands or techniques were understood - to support these with the group home parents.

¹This was discussed to some extent in the section on the Protective Home. It is further described in the Coordinator's Section on the Protective Home.

As mentioned under the discussion of the Type IV Home, the Coordinator's role in this home is more in line with the first alternative mentioned previously. She is directly involved in defining the program of the home, in the ongoing training and supervision of the group home parents; and in the coordination of most of the Agents' concerns and interests. The major reason for this different approach appears to center around the nature of this type of home: it is for Temporary Care only. The Temporary Care Home, in contrast to the long-term care homes (Types I, II, III and VI), provides a temporary placement resource for Agents and, such, a given youngster is not placed with the intent that the group home parents involve themselves directly in contributing to the achievement of long-range treatment objectives. In addition, none of the Agents will have the opportunity for any sustained contact with the group home since their wards placed in the home would be there for only short periods of time.¹

Thus, in this home there is no need for the group home parents to become involved in the long-range treatment objectives of the Agents with a given ward. To be sure, there is a need for the group home parents (through ongoing training) to understand the nature of these long-range objectives, and to understand how the use of their home can and does help Agents in meeting these objectives. In addition, there is the need for communication with the group home parents in regard to the differing kinds of responses that the youngsters will have to the home (while maintaining a fairly constant, underlying program). In other words, some flexibility in the program may be necessary from time to time depending on the make-up of the ward population in the home; but there needs to be a good deal of constancy in terms of the basic program of the home and the basic stance of the group home parents. The group home parents, however, need to understand the differing types of youngsters so that they can understand and deal effectively with the various ways in which youngsters will react to living in their home.

Experiences with Community Agents and Group Home Parents:² This discussion will contain what appear to Group Home Staff to be some of the highlights of the major, possibly more solidly founded, observations. In general, we feel there have been wide differences among CTP Agents, group home parents and supervisors in relation to what may be termed meaningful participation and involvement in the operation of the Group Home Project and individual group homes.³ Although each

¹In addition, several Agents will be using the home for a wide range of differing levels of youngsters, thus, there can be no one treatment philosophy (for long-range objectives) that would embrace all of these youngsters needs. Also as stated above it would be incompatible with the research design (the intended purpose of the Type IV Home) if the home were to be used to try to achieve long-range treatment objectives for any given youngster (e.g., wanting a youngster to establish a long-range term relationship with the group home parents as a means of helping him grow).

²In terms of the outline presented on page 94, this discussion will focus on modes and content of communication, with particular emphasis on dynamics, trends, and other general considerations.

³The major speculations as to possible causes of the experiences which will now be reviewed - these are quite complex and difficult to present in any brief manner. Therefore, a complete discussion of probable causes and dynamics will be reserved for our final report.

member of a management team is important, it is felt that one of the most crucial elements essential to establishing adequate communication and a team spirit is the willingness and/or ability of Community Agents (because of their primary treatment role responsibilities) - as expressed in their attitudes and behaviors - to become meaningfully involved with group home parents and DTED staff (This appears to be less critical in the case of treatment supervisors, although their attitudes and level of support can, of course, be influential regarding Community Agents). Thus DTED staff have placed no small degree of demands and expectations on Community Agents regarding communication and involvement.

In the Protective Home (Mr. and Mrs. H) communications among the Community Agent, treatment supervisor, group home parents and DTED staff have been quite good. Compared to the other homes, the level of confidence regarding "what is going on" has been quite good. For example, the Community Agent has become involved in such a way with the group home parents that his impact on them and on the operation of the home has been rather dramatic. He has maintained an ongoing, frequent, non-crisis centered form of contact with the group home parents, not only in regard to treatment and placement needs of his youngsters, but in connection with activities with the group home parents (particularly the group home father) both within and outside of the home. In addition - because of his level of involvement with the group home - this same Agent has been able to informally, and in an ongoing way, keep other members of the team up to date in regard to dynamics and trends within the home. Over time it appears that within the Protective Home more of a team "spirit" has developed than in the other homes.

The other Agent who utilized the Protective Home was much less successful in establishing similar relationships. Both the group home parents and this particular Agent were quite frustrated in their efforts to work with one another.¹

Three Agents have utilized the Containment Home. The first Agent attempted to develop relationships involving mutual understandings and trust with the D's by allowing them to participate, and/or make some of the decisions regarding the operation of the home and by giving them a considerable degree of independence. His manner was generally of a very relaxed, friendly, informal nature. The other two Agents - although differing from one another in their styles of dealing with youngsters - seem similar in that they both preferred to develop casual, informal relationships with the group home parents. In addition, they did not seem to involve the group home parents to any substantial degree in their thinking or case planning and in regard to decision-making. They both seemed to operate on the basis of expecting certain things from the group home parents without fully taking into consideration the latter's personalities, needs, etc. - including, it would appear, a need for establishing some type of Agent/group home parent relationship within which demands or expectations are communicated.

The D's, as a result, complained of feeling a lack of support and "let off" from the Agents. There were few instances where Agents or the D's misunderstood one another regarding demands or expectations (what should be done - and by whom).

¹Within any given home (where more than one Agent is utilizing that home), the group home parents have seemed to be better "matched" with, and/or more comfortable with, one particular kind of approach or Agent, as compared with any other approach and/or Agent.

However, there was considerable disagreement as to expectations and demands between Agents and the D's.¹

Relative to DTED staff there were noticeable differences among the three Agents who utilized the Containment Home: The first Agent initiated communication on a more informal, open and ongoing basis than did the other two Agents. He also seemed more amenable to "hearing" information and perceptions of group home staff. With the other two Agents (particularly the more recent one) it was often times difficult to be up to date on such routine matters as whether a given youngster was in the home or not.²

Within the Boarding Home there has not been any strong evidence of Agent/group home parent "mismatching" as was mentioned in the case of the Protective and Containment Homes. However, a trend has emerged among the six Agents who have utilized the Boarding Home. Most of the Agents seem to prefer to not involve themselves directly with Mr. and Mrs. B in an ongoing, frequent, informal way. For the most part, the B's have been left to decide for themselves what the operation of the home will be like. There does not seem to be any consistent effort, among the Agents, to coordinate their varying ideas, and to express to the group home parents their consensus of opinion as to what the "general program" for the home should be.

Although there have been few occasions in which either the B's or the Agents have expressed dissatisfaction with this pattern of involvement, or direction, the above circumstances have not really allowed for the B's full potential to be tested or explored. Although the B's have questioned the reasons for the lack of Agent-direction (e.g., as to just what a given youngster's responsibilities might have to be within the home), the B's appear to have taken the initiative (e.g., in determining what is acceptable and what is not acceptable behavior within the home) largely as a reflection of the kind of people they are. In general, it appears that the Agents prefer to let the Boarding Home parents operate their home in essentially whatever way they choose and to deal with the youngsters within the home on an individual basis within the context of "what exists" within the home.

The level of involvement in regard to the Boarding Home as outlined above has also made it difficult for an ongoing, detailed exchange of meaningful information to occur between DTED staff and the total group of Agents who have utilized the home. On an individual basis, Agents have nevertheless been cooperative in sharing information with DTED staff; but except for crisis situations, Group Home staff has usually had to take the lead in initiating exchange of information. As in the Containment Home, information from the Agents to the Group Home staff (e.g., simply knowing whether a given youngster is or is not still residing within the home) has not always been consistently communicated by Agents.

¹For example, in dealing with behavior problems, the D's frequently wanted to decide what action the Agent wanted to take (e.g., temporary detention) whereas the Agent wanted control over determining whether he or the D's would provide needed discipline.

²While it is uncertain whether different types of relationships and communications among the Containment Home team would have "saved" the home, an approach more compatible with the personality and individual needs of the group home parents would, in any event, have perhaps made it possible to more fully evaluate the D's and their home.

The B's themselves are quite open with DTED staff and Agents in the area of sharing information; however, they are prone to wait until they are asked rather than calling frequently (unless there is an obvious crisis). As such, Agents wanting feedback or information need to approach the B's and cannot simply assume that the B's will initiate ongoing feedback.

Even though a certain, basic level of acceptance may exist between the B's and Agents regarding their relationships and communications, it is our feeling that some of the difficulties which have arisen could quite possibly have been handled more effectively and efficiently if ongoing relationships and communications had been of a somewhat different nature.

Within the Temporary Care Home (Mr. and Mrs. F) the need for involvement with individual Agents is not as great as in the long term care homes. Communications with Agents and DTED staff - relative to issues of ward's status in the home and "how things are going" - appear at this time to be quite adequate. With this home, the expectations for level or intensity of Community Agent involvement is not as high as in the long term care homes.

The above account may at first glance have the appearance of a strong criticism of many Community Agents. It is not intended to be such; instead we regard it simply as our best, present account of what we (Group Home Staff) have been able to perceive and understand relative to given group home circumstances... hopefully, not to the exclusion of the perceptions and needs of others (Agents). It has been suggested that some of the additional expectations and demands placed on given Community Agents in regard to group homes may have made their overall burden too great: In itself (i.e., apart from group homes) the Community Treatment Project is a place where Agents carry many complex demands in their community treatment assignments. The decision to operate the Group Home Project in conjunction with CTP - in a "team approach" manner - this was based upon the view that a high degree of involvement, flexibility and communication was essential on the part of all staff. Relative to necessary as well as desirable communication and personal involvement, the total quantity of demands placed upon Agents and other staff may - at least in some instances and with some but not all homes - simply have been too great. We will pursue this issue in detail in our subsequent reports.

Taxonomy

Discussions in regard to taxonomies will be both global (e.g., brief narrative statements concerning "what happens during a typical day or week") and quite

¹One example involved the drug issue in the Boarding Home in January 1968. In this case, a problem arose when Agents called an emergency meeting in the home with the group home parents and group home youngsters. The group home parents were not aware in advance of what the concern was, or of why the Agents were handling it in the way that they were. In addition, very little explanation was offered following this meeting. The anger, confusion and frustration which the group home parents felt following this meeting might have been avoided or lessened had there been better, pre-existing communication or better relationships between the Agents and the group home parents (and more adequate and/or more detailed, routine communication between CTP operations staff and DTED personnel), relative to the home.

specific, systematized or dimensionalized.¹ There are several problems and issues involved in describing what a particular home is like for evaluating across homes along the same dimension) in relation to developing a taxonomy of environments and in explaining what has accounted for the differences and similarities. One major problem is the fact that a complex set of variables is involved: (a) group home parent characteristics,² (b) marital relationships; (c) the presence or absence of group home parents' own children (and, their characteristics and ages); (d) the Community Agents and their characteristics, treatment styles and thinking; and, (e) the characteristics of the group home youngsters.³

It is difficult at this point to be certain which if any of these factors should be given greater emphasis in terms of explaining the overall home environment or any specific aspect of that environment. In many respects, however, the group home parents (their personality and their styles of interaction and modes of expression) have become a focal point of study relative to the goal of describing and accounting for what has come to exist in a particular home, as an expression of the various circumstances in which a home is being operated. Thus, given certain Community Agents, certain types of youngsters, and so on, one basic set of questions becomes: "What are the group home parents like as individuals? What is their relationship to each other? and, What seems most representative, over time, of the interactions and expectations which exist within their particular home?"

¹This report - in view of the previous discussions pertaining to each group home - will not go into extensive or detailed descriptions of the environments. Separate reports to be published in the coming year will expand a great deal on the general discussions included in the present report.

²Because of the Community Agent turnover, CTP has had experience with a variety of Agents dealing with the varying subtypes. As such, it has been able to form meaningful estimates of which major characteristics and treatment styles appear to have been more, or less, effective with what types of youngsters. In the DTED Project, we will not have accumulated this same range of experiences. Nonetheless, our experiences should offer the opportunity to form some definitive hypotheses in regard to what type of individuals and environments seem well and/or poorly suited for what particular types of youths.

³Tables in the preceding discussions relative to each type of home contain some descriptive information regarding age, race, etc. In addition, Appendix F summarizes this type of information for the three long-term care homes (Protective, Containment and Boarding). A total of 26 youngsters had been placed (through June 30, 1968) representing 31 separate placements. They have represented all but two (I₂ Ap and I₄ Se) of the eight I-level subtype classifications that have been worked with in CTP. Forty-two percent were released on parole directly to a group home, with an additional thirteen percent having been placed within their first six months of parole exposure. The average age (17 years - 2 months) of group home youngsters at the time of placement is a full year more than the average age of all youngsters released thus far to CTP (age at time of commitment). Youngsters of all of the three major ethnic groups have been placed in each of these three homes. Negro youngsters have comprised a larger proportion of the group home population than they do in the CTP population (38% vs. 19%). Caucasian youngsters have comprised a somewhat smaller proportion of the group home population (35% vs. 34%). Through June 30, 1968, the average length of stay was about five months, with almost half (48%) of the placements having had no official break in placement.

In order to focus upon the group home parents, research has conducted extensive interviews in the Protective, Containment, and Boarding Homes. Evaluation of this data is currently under way. This lengthy and detailed study of each group home along identical dimensions will be a major data source for describing and comparing the homes - including the expectations of the group home parents - at the time of the interview. Other instruments will help us focus more specifically upon the personalities of the group home parents (e.g., characteristics and behavior rating items, Parental Attitude Research Instruments).

For the present discussion, one broad area - that of structure, supervision, and control - will be used to illustrate some of the differing and/or contrasting features of the Protective, Containment, Boarding and Temporary Care Homes. The most structured, controlled - and, to all appearances, rigid - program has been that found in the Containment Home. The least structured program has existed in the Boarding Home. The Protective Home and Temporary Care Home seem to fall on different points between the other, more extreme positions.

It appears at this point that the Protective Home (while somewhat more structured and controlled than the Temporary Care Home) is more involved with these issues at least in terms of trying to help youngsters develop a sense of responsibility and involvement with the group home parents, as part of helping the youngsters grow emotionally. The Temporary Care Home, on the other hand, has fewer specified rules; instead, it contains more by way of general rules. Here, the attitude about rules and structure seems to be centered around, "How can the home be effectively and efficiently managed" rather than around the use of rules, structure, etc., as part of a longer-range goal of helping youngsters grow emotionally (through a change in perception of significant others; through the formation of a long-term relationship with an adult; etc.).

In the Containment Home it appeared as if the rules and structure were seen by the group home parents as "ends in themselves" rather than as "means to an end". At the same time, it is true that the D's did speak - in general terms - of wanting, through the use of structure to "teach youngsters responsibility". Within the Boarding Home, the limits have been more on the basis of implicit understandings rather than specific rules.¹ Limits which are set are usually in regard to a specific situation and reflect the limits the B's set on themselves in regard to deciding whether a youngster's behavior and/or attitude toward them or the home is acceptable.² However, the B's do little "directing" or controlling of the group home youngsters' general behavior and/or attitude (e.g., they do not communicate to the youngsters: "I am going to make you do such and such"). They let the

¹The Boarding Home is the only one in which the parents have not wanted to have rules written out and displayed in the home. (Also, Mr. and Mrs. U - Type VI Individualized Home - have not as yet suggested doing this.) The B's (Boarding Home) feel this gives them more flexibility to handle situations depending on the circumstances.

²Thus, youngsters are allowed a good deal of flexibility in regard to their behavior and/or attitude as long as a youngster is not, in a general sense, "taking advantage of" or "walking over" the B's. If the latter occurs, the B's directly and openly let the youngsters know how they (the B's) feel. The youngster is then left to determine what he will then do.

youngsters know how they feel or think about an issue and leave the final decision up to the youngster. Interestingly enough, this difference between the Containment and Boarding Homes has some similarities to the differences between many I₃ and I₄ treatment workers and the relative emphasis which is given by these individuals to the issue of structure and control.

One other area of "differences and similarities" has to do with the group home mothers. Except for Mrs. U (Type VI Individualized Home) all of the other group home mothers have, in differing ways and to differing degrees, been the more dominant person in relation to the primary or initial motivation to operate a group home. They have, in addition, been somewhat more dominant than their husbands in terms of overt assertiveness (as expressed in their attitudes and behaviors).

Although most of the group home mothers have been more verbal and assertive than their husbands, the group home fathers are not viewed as inadequate, weak males. Mr. D (Containment Home) might have been seen as weak or ineffectual; but he had some definite, strong characteristics, and would stick with the limits that he had placed upon himself. He was not easily "pushed around". Mr. and Mrs. U provide some contrast in this regard, in that Mr. U appears to be the more assertive, outspoken person - both in their relationship and in regard to the degree of initial investment in wanting to operate a home. While Mrs. U is interested in operating a group home it does not seem to be as much of an "ego investment" for her as it is for her husband. In terms of how they feel they will approach their role as group home parents, the U's seem to be more in agreement with each other (and somewhat more understanding of their partner's points of view, feelings and preferences) than in the remaining homes.

Impact On Wards

With one or two possible exceptions, none of the youngsters placed in group homes appears to have been adversely affected by the group home experiences.¹ In the majority of cases it appears that youngsters placed in a group home have benefitted in one way or another. This impact, of course, has varied in nature and degree; and, the impact of the group home experience is difficult to assess independently of the ongoing, concurrent treatment being carried out by Community Agents.

We will briefly discuss three areas of possible impact of group home experience on youngsters: initial stabilization, long-term stabilization, and apparent contribution to growth.

In the Containment Home, in which many elements were considered inappropriate, a meaningful degree of immediate and fairly long-term stabilization nevertheless did take place, in the case of several youngsters. The structure and supervision in the home was considerably more than those youngsters would have experienced in their own home or even perhaps in individual foster homes. Although figures are not yet available for accurate comparisons, it appears as if the length of stay

¹ In the Containment Home, one youngster appeared to be entering into a relationship with the group home parents that could lead to emotional growth. His subsequent reaction to the home's being moved, and to the D's refusal to readmit him to the home, was seen as a damaging experience.

previously seen in the case of Cfc and Mp youngsters in other types of out-of-home placement (principally individual foster homes). The Protective Home and the Boarding Home have also experienced success in immediate and long-term stabilization of placement with several youngsters.

It is difficult to assess, at this point, the extent to which the Protective Home has participated meaningfully in the growth process with any of the youngsters thus far placed into that home. (As mentioned in the Protective Home discussion, we hope to evaluate this area in the Protective Home more meaningfully next year).

In regard to the Boarding Home, the Community Agents feel that with two or three youngsters there has been involvement between youths and the group home parents in relationships and/or circumstances that have contributed (and/or may eventually contribute) to apparent growth in these youngsters.

In addition to the above mentioned dimensions, in only four out of a total of 45 placements have group home parents requested that a youngster be removed or not replaced (Protective Home: 1; Containment Home: 1; Boarding Home: 2). All of the group home parents have shown some degree of tenacity, or readiness to "stick it out" with some rather difficult, disturbed youths.

Feedback from wards is not always highly indicative of what impact a home is having on them. Nevertheless, it can be a meaningful indicator. The general attitude which wards have about their placement may have some bearing on the potential-for-impact of given homes. The most positive feedback has come in regard to the Boarding Home. Only one of the eleven youngsters placed there has voiced any complaints about the home or the group home parents while he has been there; and, none has asked to be removed from placement. In the Protective Home, there has been a variety of feedback from the group home youngsters. Some have spoken positively of their experience at times, while others have complained a good deal and have wanted to leave. Most of them have been able to talk about both positive and negative elements (from their point of view) in the home. Most of the negative comments have related to their reaction to, and irritation with, Mrs. H.¹

In the Containment Home, during the first seven or eight months of operation, youngsters had some minor complaints. In general, however, they seemed to be satisfied - and at times appeared to enjoy - their placement in the home. In the past year, however, feedback from youngsters has been strongly ambivalent. Most of the youngsters in the Containment Home during the last year have consistently complained both about the D's and the operation of the home. At times, these youths indicated that they wanted to leave as soon as possible. In the Temporary Care Home, there has been no negative feedback - in fact, some of the youngsters placed there have stated that they wished they could stay on permanently.

General Worth and Utility

It was not intended that all of the CTP placements needs would be met by the group homes in the present project. However, each of the group homes has been used (in fact, used as the placement of preference by Community Agents) - to such an

¹ Recently, the boys in the Protective Home were approached with the "option" of staying with the H's or staff looking for another Protective Home. They all said they wanted to stay and "work things out with the H's."

extent that it appears safe to state that each of the homes has filled a definite placement need for many CTP youngsters.¹ In intake staffings, many Agents view group home placement as having some potential for contributing to the achievement of their long-range treatment objectives for individual youngsters. In other words, with the long-term placement homes, placement has not been viewed as simply a "holding" technique (c.f., "initial stabilization").

At times, the group homes have been used by Community Agents in helping youngsters to evaluate the alternatives that are open to them, and, in a sense, to help the youngsters arrive at certain decisions without - at the same time - feeling that there is literally and/or psychologically, "no place to turn". In this way the group homes have provided a specific, readily available, alternative for youngsters in placement crisis or dilemma - a placement which (as compared with the more nebulous or unknown, possible foster home placement) the youngsters can gain a good deal of information about, both prior to, and while in the process of, arriving at decisions.

Agents who have communicated regularly with group home parents and have kept in touch with their youngsters' behavior in given homes, have found that they have been able to get better information about the youngster's attitude and behavior than has usually been available from youngsters' own parents, or from some individual foster homes. Indirectly, this has had an impact on given Agents' treatment focus and/or objectives. It has, in some cases, assisted Agents in understanding more about given youngsters.

Another example that may give some estimate of the general worth and utility of the idea of group homes relates to the change of attitudes shown by a number of Community Agents. In the early stages of the Project a number of Agents (perhaps one-third) were sceptical and/or ambivalent about the use of group homes as compared with individual foster homes - particularly in regard to the issue of coordinating a home into which more than one Agent would be placing youngsters. At present it seems that more Agents now see a good deal of potential in the use of group homes and are more generally accepting of this concept - even in cases where dissatisfactions exist in regard to the operation of given homes.

The Project's general worth and utility can be assessed from many points of view. From our contact with other agencies and general familiarity with the out-of-home placement problems faced by the Youth Authority, it appears that this Project is "breaking ground" in regard to many of the issues and concerns that are present or that will come up in any intensified effort in the future within the area of out-of-home placement. For example, the present Project is moving into relatively unexplored areas - e.g., exploring the use of differing types of out-of-home placements for differing kinds of youngsters in connection with their individual characteristics and treatment needs; and, exploring the potential that out-of-home placements can have relative to short-term stabilization and long-term growth processes for various types of youngsters. Related to the above point is, in addition, the attempt to systematically match group home parents to particular types of homes or to particular types of youth. "Matching" as a general concept,

¹ Appendices G and O describe the degree of use the group homes have received in regard to I-level and DTED's portion of all paid CTP out-of-home placements.

is perhaps no longer totally new. However, its implementation within the context of the Community Treatment Project utilizing the I-level classification system, seems to represent a very specific, systematic utilization of this approach. In addition, it is felt that the Group Home Project's experiences in assessing (albeit subjectively) the alternate ways of managing, coordinating financing, maintaining, and training the homes and the group home parents can have several meaningful implications for future program efforts.

Concluding Remarks

In general, our experiences last year have been quite varied and informative. Each of the group homes has provided us with a set of experiences - some unique, some shared, and others common to all - around which to attempt to form general hypotheses. Each, in its own way, has provided a number of challenges in regard to developing effective communications and meaningful programs. These experiences have also been revealing in regard to the conditions that have to be taken into consideration in attempting to implement and coordinate a program among staff who, at times, differ widely in terms of their backgrounds, points of view, personalities, and caseload needs.

In looking ahead to the next year we hope to be able to develop another Type II, Containment Home in order to have experience with that home which is sufficient to allow us to contrast its operation with that of the first Type II Home. In addition to the planned study of the girls group home in Stockton, it is anticipated that the Protective, Boarding, Temporary Care and Individualized Group Homes will be with the Project until its termination in September, 1969.¹ As our experience increases in quality and quantity, it is felt that we will be looking into the potential for developing professional, permanent out-of-home placement resources which will be of benefit to Community Agents and youngsters not only during the life of the present project but beyond.

The potential value of group homes for delinquents is becoming much more broadly understood and accepted. Although the present Project has only scratched the surface as to this potential, it does appear as if group homes have much potential value in relation to the treatment needs - including stabilization as well as growth - of a wide range of youths.

Few investigations of foster homes or other out-of-home placement resources have been undertaken to the extent, and in the degree of detail, that is being attempted in the present Project. While there will, of course, be difficulties in extrapolating our experiences to settings other than the Community Treatment Project, it is felt that our experiences and findings will have several important implications for the development of future programming in the Youth Authority and in the other social agencies.

¹ Prior to that time each home will be assessed with treatment staff as to whether and how they wish to continue the use of each group home when operating.

APPENDIX A

GROUP HOME MODEL TYPES

The five types of group homes described in the DTED proposal were based on the differential treatment model (I-Level) and on experience to date in the Community Treatment Project in finding appropriate out-of-home placements. The five group home environments are described below.¹

Type I - Protective Home

This type of group home is envisioned for extremely immature and dependent youngsters whose family background has involved many elements of neglect and often brutality (Asocial, passive - I₂ Ap; Conformist, Immature - I₃ Cfm). Treatment goals for this type of youngster have been formulated in the Project as those of reducing the pressure of asocial drives, development of some minimal measure of conformity by strengthening self controls, increasing ability to perceive the relationship between needs and behavior, protection from being scapegoated, and reducing the sense of isolation and rejection. Typically, an out-of-home placement is needed for this type of child since natural families have been found to be difficult or impossible to work with.

The group home required for this type of case approximates normal family living as closely as possible. The home would be operated by a married couple with the training and patience to offer intensive care and supervision to this type of child for as long as several years. The group home parents would be offered on-going training and guidance as well as intermittent vacations away from these demanding children. Initially, four children would be placed in the home.

Type II - Containment Home

This type of home is envisioned for the youngster usually labeled as a defective character or culturally conforming delinquent (Manipulator - I₃ Mp; Conformist, Cultural - I₃ Cfc). He needs structure and is capable initially only of operating on the basis of external codes of behavior with the support of social power behind them. The home would represent concrete and realistic demands by community and society toward persons within that community for conforming, productive behavior. This type of home would operate on "non-family" basis, since these children are unable or unwilling to positively respond to adults who are seen as parental images. This type of youngster frequently responds positively to firm, objective authority and control when these do not carry with them the price tags of the emotional involvement inherent in the parent-child relationship.

¹Look, L.W., and Warren, M.Q.: A Demonstration Project: Differential Treatment Environments for Delinquents, Proposal submitted to NIMH, 1965. A model developed in May, 1968, by DTED staff for a sixth type of home is also presented.

The containment group home would house a maximum of six wards and would be operated by group home parents under professional direction. Training for the group home parents would involve learning to make use of the peer group as a pressure for non-delinquent behavior and to make use of guided group interaction situations to increase the wards' social perceptiveness.¹

Type III - Boarding Home

This type of home would serve as a placement for the more interpersonally mature and internally complex wards in the Project (all I₄ level subtypes Neurotic, Acting-Out - Na; Neurotic, Anxious - Nx; Situational Emotional Reaction - Se; Cultural Identifier - Ci). These wards are beginning the process of emancipation from their homes but do not yet possess sufficient strength to live by themselves. This type of group living situation would provide the wards with a base from which to work as they continue to deal with the resolution of internal conflicts, emancipation, identity, etc. Essentially the goals and orientation of this home would appear similar to those maintained in Y.M.C.A. hotels; however, some very large demands would be placed upon the foster parents as a result of the nature of the complexities of these youngsters. Generally, this type of youngster will not be seeking additional parent figures. He may choose to remain distant and cautious in his interactions with the foster parents. He may later decide to move in to a closer relationship, trying to cast the foster parents into roles of his natural parents so that he may continue to try to resolve his conflicts with them. This type of behavior clearly spells out the demand for flexibility on the part of the foster parents. They must be able to allow the wards an atmosphere of comfort without threat, give the wards the opportunity to take the initiative in seeking a more meaningful relationship if indeed they should choose to do so. Additionally, the foster parents must be able to sense significant cues in the ward's emotional state (rather than focusing upon behavior in itself) and communicate this to the Community Agent.

The foster parents must be extremely tolerant and accepting. Typically, these wards will be placed in the home at different times and at different stages in their own development. Characteristically, they will be less cohesive as a total group, at least initially, and the wards may continue meaningful group relationships independent of group home members during their stay in the group home. Consequently, the foster parents will in very short order be exposed to many other groups interacting with their wards.

The above-described three types of group homes are aimed specifically at the treatment-control needs of the three major subgroups of the delinquent population (I₂, I₃, and I₄). These three types of placements are seen as relatively long-term or permanent arrangements for wards. In contrast, group home types IV and V are visualized as temporary placements and will, to some extent, cut across delinquent types.

¹See text discussion of Type II Home for revised model, page 35.

Type IV - Temporary Community Care Home

This type of group home would be used for wards who have a temporary placement need (all I-levels). In these cases, a custody situation is seen as inappropriate on the one hand, and the ward is too immature to handle an independent living situation on the other hand. This type of group home might merely be used as temporary housing between more permanent placements. It might also be a place to work with wards who have not adjusted in a regular placement and who require short term counseling with their Community Agent away from their regular placement. Wards might also be placed in this type of home when regular group home or foster parents require a vacation apart from their foster children. The atmosphere of the home would involve an "unlocked door" policy where support for the ward, rather than custody, would be the emphasis.

As in Type II and Type III group homes, the parents in this group home would be required to maintain a "non-parental" attitude, so that they would not interfere with the long-range treatment program for each individual ward placed temporarily in their care. Such a home would house six wards.

Type V - Short Term Restriction Home

This type of home would be used for six wards (all I-levels) needing fairly restrictive behavioral limits imposed upon them and would be used as a substitute for detention in juvenile halls or other facilities. Placement in such a setting would permit the continuation of individual treatment plans in cases where it would be necessary to know the exact whereabouts of the ward at any given moment. Residence in this setting would usually be limited to a few days, rarely exceeding one week. Generally, if the ward required limits and surveillance to this degree for more than a week, other arrangements would be made. Consequently, a ward might be removed from his own home or foster home and placed in this type of group home where he would continue to attend school or to work, perhaps even being taken to and from these locations by the group home parents and remaining within the confines of the home for the remainder of the day. School or work attendance would not be a requisite for residence, as some wards would simply be required to remain in the home except for Project-related activities. While to a large degree wards would live in this home on the "honor" system, they would understand that violation of group home rules would lead to immediate removal to the formal custody setting.

The following home was conceptualized by DTED staff utilizing experience from the Boarding Home, discussions with Agents; and familiarity with the treatment and placement issues concerning I₄ youngsters.

Type VI, Individualized Home

This home - for a maximum of six wards - will be a relatively long-term, "open-ended", placement resource for those I₄ youngsters who may benefit from having a "family-like" situation and healthy adult relationships made available to them, while resolution of conflicts with self and family takes place. A great deal of flexibility will be allowed in terms of the expectations of the youngsters relative to the home and in terms of the nature of their relationships

with the group home parents. Long-range plans for individual wards can include return to family, foster home placement, independent living or continued placement in the group home.

Home Environment and Stance: This home focuses on the placement needs of a specified (but broad) group of I₄ wards who, at present, are placed in foster homes, premature independent placement, or are allowed to live at home or with relatives not as a placement of choice, but because suitable placement alternatives do not exist. While it is designed primarily for Na's and Nx's, it also permits placement of Se's and Ci's whose needs and treatment objectives are compatible with the home design.

The home will attempt to represent an environment where a "family-like" type of interaction and relationships are made available to each youngster. There would be a prior "understanding" between the ward and his agent in which the availability of such interactions and/or relationships is emphasized. This would be in contrast to an "understanding" (explicit or implicit) to the effect that the agent's intent was, in fact, for the ward to definitely become part of a pre-existing (non-individualized) structure which existed over and beyond the existence (presence) of the family-type setting in general (i.e., an understanding in which the ward would be expected - or told - to behave or react in a given way). A ward should know prior to entering the home, that the agent does not have the expectation that the ward has to fit into a particular mold (e.g., "because that's the way the home is"). In other words, the agent will not be "saying", "This is the kind of home for you and here is what it is, and you conform to it (or, do such and such)". Instead, a wide range of possibilities will be made available, and the ward will be allowed to choose the "best" of these possibilities.

Thus, this home can allow for regressive and/or non-regressive dependency needs to be met where this is appropriate and/or allowable in terms of the short and/or long-range treatment objectives. Relationships with the group home parents would be such as to allow for a great deal of variation between and among wards: For example, relationships might involve (a) "parent-child" interactions (e.g., regressive dependency); (b) "parent-adolescent" interactions (non-regressive dependency); or, they might be largely characterized by the factor of relative impersonality or distance.

In all three instances of direction of the relationships would depend on the wards' readiness and openness for the given relationship and related modes of interaction - rather than upon the fact that "the home" is a place where one or another form of relationship is stressed, or where still other forms are discouraged on an across-the-board basis. However, from the point of view of the group home parents and staff the "starting point" in the interactions would generally focus around having the group home parents make available an "adult-adolescent" type of relationship or stance. Expectation as to a given ward's particular type of response to this stance of general availability would be very flexible, in regard to the form into which the actual relationship might develop. Thus, each ward would (primarily, but not exclusively) set the pace for, and the general direction of, the particular relationship between himself and the group home parents, and the total group home "family" as well.

Nature of Placement and Treatment Goals: Placement will be relatively long-term or open-ended with a good deal of flexibility allowed for short and long-range treatment techniques and objectives. However, three to five months minimum placement time should be intended at the time of entry into the home.

Future placement objectives can include:

- (1) Return to family.
- (2) Movement to an individual foster home.
- (3) Independent placement on a permanent or trial basis.
- (4) Continued residence in the group home.

Exclusions: The model for this home excludes from admission those wards for whom - by virtue of age, maturity, or treatment focus - the making available of a set of conditions where each youngster primarily sets the pace for and the form of the relationships he develops in the home is seen as inappropriate and/or undesirable. For example, the treatment focus for a given ward might be to press him (right away) to be relatively self-sufficient and dependent upon himself rather than others. In such a case, exposure to a situation that allows for a dependent relationship to be developed would be undesirable and/or inappropriate. Thus, this home would not be available for this ward - given that particular treatment focus, at that point in time - even though it might otherwise be preferred over other alternatives at the same, given point in time.

Cases of extreme emotional disturbance will also be excluded if the nature of the disturbance appears to be such that placement would inhibit, prohibit or markedly deter the home from its primary purpose, or would alter the perception of the home (what it is or isn't, what it can be or cannot be) in view of other wards in the home.

Youngsters who - to all intents and purposes - are being viewed as "hopeless" (in terms of treatment objectives) and who are seen as in need, essentially, of a "holding" facility only - will also be excluded from placement.

The detailed home model description for the Type VI home illustrates what we plan to do for the other model types: i.e., expanded hypothesized models resulting from our experiences with each type. Although no model was developed relative to a girls' home prior to one being developed, we hope to also be able to offer a girls' home model in a future report based on anticipated involvement with a girls' group home.

CONTRACTING

A basic state contract has been developed for group homes. This contract is used with non-Project Youth Authority group homes and is modified somewhat in the DTED Project, basically to include research and staffing obligations. The basic contract and form of payment was defined following months of complicated - often difficult - communication and discussion with CYA Administration. It appears to be settled and resolved to a mutually satisfactory degree, for the remainder of the DTED Project. Some minor changes in the contracts (effective 7/1/68) have recently been made by DTED staff for purposes of increasing the overall degree of flexibility.

At the time the group home proposal was written, speculations were made as to the differential cost of operating the five group homes.¹ Estimated total ward rate costs were in all cases higher than what Youth Authority normally budgeted for group home subsidy (\$149 per ward per month). NIMH group home subsidy allocations were to make up the difference between the Youth Authority's normal contribution and the total budgeted rates for given homes.

The financial supports which are contained in group home contracts which are part of the Youth Authority's regular group home program are written on the basic assumption that - since these homes are operated exclusively for the Youth Authority - some retainer or minimum guarantee should be paid to cover: (1) constant costs that occur irrespective of the number of youngsters placed in the home (for example, costs of equipping and making available a home plus a given number of beds); and (2) increased costs which are a function of the total number of youngsters in the home.

In the Youth Authority generally, the present \$149 rate has been broken down into a usual maximum of \$200 per month retainer, plus \$94 per ward per month subsidy.² As a result of this form of payment, when four youngsters are in a home for a full month, the overall per-ward rate closely approximates the \$149 budgeted rate per youngster. This same "average of four" principle is used in determining DTED group home contracts. The total amount of retainer is calculated first in terms of an evaluation of the financial needs of the particular home, and also with respect to what seems to be appropriate and/or reasonable in a more abstract sense. The ward's subsidy is calculated from

¹The total budgeted rates per ward per month were established (and have remained) as follows (shown by type of home): Types I, II, IV: \$240 (YA \$149, NIMH \$91); Type III: \$180 (YA \$149, NIMH \$31); Type V: \$300 (YA \$149, NIMH \$151). Type VI, which was not specifically outlined in the original proposal, has its contract based on the \$240 per month rate.

²\$94 per ward per month is the normal CYA foster home subsidy payment (the sum includes \$14 per month for clothing and incidentals).

APPENDIX B, Continued

the amount of monies which then remain.¹ Group home parents are paid with little specific instructions as to how the monies are to be spent. Generally they are advised that they are to meet the needs of operating their home the best they can within the total amount of money they receive (retainer + subsidy) in any given month. In addition, the Coordinator is available for consultation and advice concerning financial matters. Evaluation and discussion of this procedure and alternate methods will appear in future reports.

In some cases, it has taken as long as two or three months after selection of a group home for contracts to be processed and to become effective. In every home developed to date, there has been a need to place youngsters into the given home prior to the effective date of the contract. With the cooperation of the group home parents, we have been able to do this by using the regular Youth Authority Foster Home Agreement (\$94 per ward per month).

Together with other delays in routine monthly payments, the above-mentioned slow rate of processing of contracts has not created a positive image of the State in the eyes of some group home parents. DTED plans to submit in the next few months procedural recommendations that may reduce future problems.² While monetary consideration has not been apparent with DTED group home parents, the occasional (and sometimes consistent) malfunction of contracting and payment procedures has sometimes made it appear that some group home parents were overly concerned with money - when in fact they have, in our opinion, been primarily concerned with (a) the principle of the State meeting its end of the "bargain" and (2) meeting payments of expenses incurred by virtue of operating their home.

As soon as the group home parents have been officially "hired", the home is considered to be under the auspices and control of the DTED Project, and all of the procedures and mechanics of operating the home in conjunction with the CTP staff (intake staffings, training, etc.) go into effect, regardless of the effective date of the group home contract.

¹Four times the budgeted rate minus the retainer, divided by four - $(\frac{4BR-R}{4})$ equals the per ward per month subsidy. Alternate ways of contracting were presented in the First Year Report.

Specific contract amounts for the group homes during the past year have been as follows:

Type I	\$300 retainer per month, plus \$160 per ward per month subsidy (subsidy includes \$25 for clothing and incidentals);
Type II	\$500 per month retainer, plus \$110 per ward per month subsidy (subsidy includes \$14 for clothing and incidentals);
Type III	\$200 per month retainer, plus \$125 per ward per month subsidy (subsidy includes \$14 for clothing and incidentals);
Type IV (VI)	\$360 per month retainer, plus \$145 per ward per month subsidy.

Beginning July 1, 1968 - May 1, 1968, for the Type IV home - monetary amounts for clothing and incidentals will not be indicated. The group home parents will be asked to evaluate and meet legitimate needs in these areas within the total amount of money they receive in any given month. The aim of this is to give the group home parents and Agents more flexibility in meeting ward needs. The group home parents are required to keep records of expenses in order to allow for future cost analysis.

²For example, decentralizing payment control information and flexibility in contract wording to meet individual home - and ward - needs.

APPENDIX C

GROUP HOME INSTRUMENTS AND FORMS

ITEM ¹	SOURCE	FREQUENCY USED ²
1. Group Home Parent Data Sheet & Initial Screening Report	DTED	Once, pre-selection.
2. Research Screening Interview For Prospective Group Home Parents	DTED	Once, pre-selection.
3. Seventy-eight items for rating Group Home Parent's Characteristics	Selected from scale items used to rate Probation Officers in study by Ted Palmer, Ph.D., "Types of Probation Officers & Types Of Youth On Probation: Their Views and Interactions", Youth Studies Center, 1963.	After screening interviews; then every 12 months.
4. Characteristics Of Youngsters Questionnaire	Adapted from "Scale Items Used To Define 28 Core Characteristics Of Youth", used in same study as No. 3, above.	After ratings (No.3); then every 12 months.
5. Foster Parent Preference Survey	Adapted from the "Staff Preference Survey", used with group supervisors in the "Preston Typology Study", by Carl Jesness, Ph.D., at CYA's Preston School of Industry. (1964-68).	After No. 4; then every 12 months.
*6. Group Home Parents "Pre-Hiring" Staffing Guide for Group Home staff	DTED	Once, after No. 5.
7. "Hiring" Staffing Guide used with CTP staff.	DTED	Once, after No. 6.

¹Items that are in the appendices of this report are indicated. Copies of most of these items are available from the Group Home Project (DTED), 3526 Fifth Avenue, Sacramento, California, 95817.

²In some instances the frequency has been difficult to maintain which may result in the elimination of some instruments or revision of the frequency (if it appears that the information would still be meaningful).

* Indicates that the instrument or form was included in the First Year Progress Report, August, 1967.

APPENDIX C, Continued

ITEM	SOURCE	FREQUENCY USED
8. Importance Questionnaire For Group Home Parents	Adapted from interview items used in the "Family Relations Project", William Larson, Youth Studies Center.	After No. 7; then every 9 months.
*9. Ward Intake Staffing Guide	DTED	Once before entry into I, II, III, and VI type homes.
10. Initial Ward Interview Guide	DTED	After entry into a group home.
11. Importance Questionnaire For Group Home Youngsters	Adapted from interview items used in the "Family Relations Project", William Larson, Youth Studies Center.	In I, II, III, and VI type homes. After No. 10; then every 9 months.
12. Group Home Father Behavior Inventory	Adapted from the "Parent Behavior Inventory", Earl S. Schaefer, NIMH, 1964.	Three months after placement; then every 6 months. (Revised)
13. Group Home Mother Behavior Inventory	Adapted from the "Parent Behavior Inventory", Earl S. Schaefer, NIMH, 1964.	After No. 12; then every 6 months. (Revised)
14. Paternal Behavior Inventory	Adapted from the "Parent Behavior Inventory", Earl S. Schaefer, NIMH, 1964.	In I, II, III, and VI type homes. After No. 13; once.
15. Maternal Behavior Inventory	Adapted from the "Parent Behavior Inventory", Earl S. Schaefer, NIMH, 1964.	In I, II, III, and VI type homes. After No. 14; once.
*16. Management Instrument Interviews	Developed by Ted Palmer, Ph.D., Group Home Project Principal Investigator.	Every 6 months over a 3 month period of time. (May be revised)

APPENDIX C, Continued

ITEM	SOURCE	FREQUENCY USED
17. Youngster Behavior Inventory For Group Home Parents	Adapted from the "Classroom Behavior Inventory", by Earl S. Schaefer, May Aaronson, and Betty Burgoon, NIMH, 1965.	Every 2 months after entry into Type I, II, III, or VI homes.
18. Youngster Behavior Inventory For Parole (Community) Agents	Adapted from the "Classroom Behavior Inventory", by Earl S. Schaefer, May Aaronson, and Betty Burgoon, NIMH, 1965.	Every 2 months after entry into Type I, II, III or VI homes.
19. Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI)	Adapted from "Development Of a Parental Attitude Research Instrument", by Earl S. Schaefer and Richard Q. Bell, NIMH: CHILD DEVELOPMENT, Vol. 29, No. 3, (Sept., 1958).	Every 12 months.
20. Daily Attendance Pattern	DTED	Monthly.
21. Accounting	DTED	Daily: Monthly totals.
22. Group Home Register	DTED	By Community Agent at time of ward's entry into a home.
23. Group Home Youngster Follow-up Interview	DTED	Every 4 to 5 months. (Type I, II, III, and VI homes.)
24. Community Agent Follow-up Interview	DTED	Every 6 months.
25. Follow-up Group Home Parent Interview Schedule (open-ended)	DTED	After 18 months.

APPENDIX C, Concluded

ITEM	SOURCE	FREQUENCY USED
26. Comparative Rank Order Ratings	DTED	Type I, II and III Homes. August 1968.
27. Family Problems Scale (1968 Edition)	Jane Loevinger, Claire B. Ennhart and Blanche Sweet.	Once after 15 months.
28. Type IV Temporary Care Home Data	DTED	At time of entry and departure on each placement.
29. Placement by Subtype	DTED	Survey of each Agent's caseload on the first of the month.

APPENDIX D

Definitions and Explanatory Remarks Relative To
Tables 2, 3, 4, and 5; Appendices E and K

Item

- A. No. of Wards Placed: Total number of different wards placed.
- B. No. of Placements: May be greater than "number of wards placed" if a ward left a home (usually under conditions that appeared to preclude replacement) for more than 8 weeks and was later placed back into that same home. Except for Race, and I-level, all data on the tables which follow will be presented in terms of numbers of placements.
- C. Age: In months and years at the time of each placement. Average age shown is rounded to nearest month.
- D. Race: Cauc = Caucasian; Mex/Am = Mexican-American; "Other" includes Chinese, Japanese, Fillapino, and other national origins.
- E. I-level: Official CTP classification of wards at the time of entry into a given group home. Exceptions will be noted in footnotes.
- F. Months on Parole Prior to Placement: The number of placements within each category are shown - e.g., $\frac{0}{5}$ = five placements in the group home occurred at time of release to parole; $\frac{1-6}{2}$ = two placements in which the wards had been released to parole within one to six months prior to group home placement; and so on.
- G. Number of Breaks in Placement: Refers only to the number of temporary breaks (e.g., AWOL, temporary detention, etc.) in each continuous placement. Most of these breaks were for two weeks or less; a few were for as long as four weeks (e.g., $\frac{0}{5}$ = five placements had no breaks and so on). Includes only those breaks in placement for which a ward's Agent submitted a stop payment order (Agents have the option of submitting or not submitting this order if a ward is out of a home for three days or less, however, breaks in placement where a stop order was not submitted are estimated to be 10% or less of the total number of breaks). Breaks in placements are not calculated for the Type IV Homes due to the temporary nature of all placements in that home.
- H. Days in Placement: The number of placements in each time-category as shown includes wards still in the homes on 6/30/68 (i.e., not just those wards who have left a given home). E.g., $\frac{0-30}{2}$ = two placements have existed for one to 30 days. Breaks in each continuous placement are not deducted from the total number of days. Average number of days shown are rounded to nearest day.
- I. Wards in Home: The number of wards in a home on the dates shown (6/30/67 and 6/30/68). Includes wards who were temporarily out and those particular dates.
- J. Placements: Number of placements made through 6/30/67; and during the period 7/1/67 through 6/30/68.

APPENDIX E

GROUP HOMES/CTP: POPULATION DATA SUMMARIES
(Long-Term Placement Homes: Protective, Containment, and Boarding)¹

A		B		C Age*				D Race			
Number of Wards Placed		Number of Placements		15-5 and under	15-6 to 17-5	17-6 and over	Average Age	Cauc	Mex/Am	Negro	Other
26*		31*		N 1	N 20	N 10	N 17-2	N 9	N 6	N 10	N 1
				% 3%	% 65%	% 32%		% 35%	% 23%	% 38%	% 4%

*One ward placed in Types II & III homes count as one ward and two placements.
*CTP ages at time of commitment.

Number of Wards		C Age*				D Race			
CTP 287		N 83	N 153	N 51	N 16-1	N 156	N 61	N 54	N 16
		% 29%	% 53%	% 18%		% 54%	% 21%	% 19%	% 6%

		E I-level*								
		Aa	Ap	Cfm	Cfc	Mp	Na	Nx	Se	Ci
Group Homes	N	0	0	3	5	4	5	7	0	2
	%	-	-	12%	19%	15%	19%	27%	-	8%
CTP	N	0	12	33	30	30	62	97	8	15
	%	-	4%	12%	11%	11%	21%	33%	3%	5%

*CTP classifications at time of commitment; DTED classifications at time of group home placement includes as a Mp only one ward who later changed to I₄ U (undifferentiated as to subtype).

		F Months on Parole Prior to Placement				
		0	1-6	7-12	13-18	19 & over
Group Homes	N	13	4	7	5	2
	%	42%	13%	23%	16%	6%

		G Number of Breaks in Placement						
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6 & over
Group Homes	N	15	8	4	1	2	0	1
	%	48%	26%	13%	3%	6%	-	3%

		H Days in Placement													
		0-30	31-60	61-90	91-120	121-150	151-180	181-210	211-240	241-270	271-300	301-330	331-360	361 & over	Ave.
Group Homes	N	6	5	-	3	3	2	3	1	2	2	1	1	2	156
	%	20%	17%	-	10%	10%	6%	10%	3%	6%	6%	3%	3%	6%	

I Wards in Homes	
on 6/30/67	on 6/30/68
9	10

J Placements	
through 6/30/67	7/1/67 - 6/30/68
16	15

¹ See Appendix D for explanation of each item. CTP figures represent the total (cumulative) as of 3/31/68 for boys only. Group Home figures are cumulative through 6/30/68 for Types I, II, and III Homes only (excludes first Type I Home - 1/1/67 - 3/17/68). Percentages on Items D and E (Race and I-level) respectively are in relation to total number of wards placed (26) for other items, percentages are given in relation to the total number of placements (31).

APPENDIX C

PERCENTAGE OF WARDS BY I-LEVEL
PLACED IN THE TYPE I, II, AND III HOMES

Type I, Protective Home (Stockton)
5/1/67 - 6/30/68

I-level	Number in Unit ¹	Number Placed in Group Home	% Placed in Group Home
I ₂ Ap	1	0	0%
Cfm	5	3	60%
Totals	6	3	50%
I ₄ Na, Nx	60 (41 Nx)	2 (Nx)	3% (5% Nx)

*Does not include one Cfm placed by error for one week, and one I₄ Ci ward erroneously classified Cfm when placed. Later reclassified as I₄ Ci.

Type II, Containment Home (Sacramento)
11/1/66 - 6/30/68

I-level	Number in Unit ¹	Number Placed in Group Home	% Placed in Group Home
Cfc	11	5	45%
Mp	8	4	50%
Totals	19	9*	47%

*Does not include one Cfc ward later termed to be a Na when in the home

Type III, Boarding Home (Sacramento)
3/1/67 - 6/30/68

I-level	Number in Unit ¹	Number Placed in Group Home	% Placed in Group Home
Na	28	4	14%
Nx	40	5	13%
Se	4	0	0%
Ci	8	1	13%
I ₄ U*	3	1	33%
Totals	83	11	13%

*Undifferentiated as to subtype

¹The number of wards in a given CTP unit are the total number of wards of each I-level (current classification) that were on parole during the time that a given home was in operation (through 6/30/68).

APPENDIX H

Type I Protective Home Rules
H GROUP HOME

Welcome to the H Group Home. We hope you will like it here and that you will stay. The boys who live here like the idea of having some written rules so you will know what you can do and what is expected of you. The following rules will help you get along at home and at the CTP Office.

YOU WILL BE EXPECTED TO:

1. ARISE AT 6:30 A.M. WEEKDAYS. YOU CAN SLEEP UNTIL 8:00 A.M. ON SATURDAY AND SUNDAY.
2. BE READY FOR BREAKFAST AT 7:00 A.M. WEEKDAYS. WEEKENDS AT 8:30 A.M.
3. BE HOME FOR EVENING MEAL AT 6:00 P.M. BE READY TO EAT AT 6:30 P.M.
4. BE READY TO LEAVE FOR WORK, CTP CENTER OR SCHOOL AT 7:30 A.M. TRANSPORTATION
5. BE IN BED AT 11:00 P.M. WEEKDAYS WITH LIGHTS OUT. FRIDAY AND SATURDAY YOU MAY STAY UP UNTIL 1:00 A.M. WITH PERMISSION.
6. PLEASE KEEP MATCHES AND LIGHTER OUT OF THE CHILDRENS' REACH.
7. TELL US WHERE YOU ARE GOING AND WHEN YOU WILL BE HOME.
8. CALL HOME IF YOU ARE GOING TO BE LATE OR NEED TRANSPORTATION.
9. CHANGE BEDDING AND IRON YOUR CLOTHES ON SATURDAY MORNINGS.
10. CLEAN YOUR ROOM BEFORE BREAKFAST AND KEEP IT NEAT. CLEAN BATHROOM AFTER USE. KEEP CLOTHES NEAT AND CLEAN.
11. KEEP PHONOGRAPH, RADIO, T.V., AND YOUR VOICES TONED DOWN AFTER 9:00 P.M.
12. HELP KEEP HOUSE AND YARD CLEANED UP. EVERYONE DOES CHORES.
13. GET APPROVAL FOR VISITORS: NO VISITORS UNLESS WE ARE HOME.
14. CONTROL YOUR TEMPER, SMOKING, AND PERSONAL HABITS.
15. NO BORROWING FROM ANYONE: CLOTHES, PERSONAL ITEMS, ETC.
16. TELEPHONE RULES:
 - A. NO CALLS BEFORE OR AFTER 9:00 A.M. AND P.M.
 - B. DO NOT USE PHONE FROM 4:15 TO 4:45 P.M.
 - C. TEN MINUTE LIMITS WITH FIFTEEN MINUTE INTERVALS
 - D. NO GIRLS CALLING IN.
17. YOU MAY SNACK BETWEEN MEALS BUT WITHIN REASON.

You may attend church if you wish. If you need to know anything not listed, ask the H's

APPENDIX K

TYPE IV TEMPORARY CARE HOME - POPULATION DATA¹
 Mr. and Mrs. N, 3/17/67 - 6/30/67 (3.5 months)

A		B		C Age				D Race			
Number of Wards Placed	Number of Placements	15-5 and under	15-6 to 17-5	17-6 and over	Average Age	Cauc	Mex/Am	Negro	Other		
7	7	N 1 % 14%	N 4 % 57%	N 2 % 29%	16-9	N 5 % 71%	N 2 % 29%	-	-		

E
I-level

	Aa	Ap	Cfm	Cfc	Mp	Na	Nx	Se	Ci
N	-	-	-	-	1	3	3*	-	-
%	-	-	-	-	14%	43%	43%	-	-

*Includes one I₅ Nx

F
Months on Parole Prior to Placement

	0	1-6	7-12	13-18	19 & Over
N	2	-	-	3	2
%	29%	-	-	42%	29%

H
Days in Placement

	0-15	16-30	31-45	46-60	61 & Over	Ave.
N	1	4	2	-	-	25
%	14%	57%	29%	-	-	

I Wards in Home		J Placements	
on 6/30/67	on 6/30/68	through 6/30/67	7/1/67 - 6/30/68
2	-	7	1

*Home was cancelled 7/1/67.

¹See Appendix D for explanations of these items.

APPENDIX M

Type IV Temporary Case Home Rules

F Group Home

1. Bedrooms must be kept clean at all times (vacuumed and dusted).
2. Please keep clothes and personal belongings in your room.
3. Bed Time: 10:00 PM weekdays
12:00 PM weekends
4. Please be on time for meals.
5. If you are going to be late coming home or if you change your place of activity, please telephone.
6. No "horseplay" in any part of the house, please. Okay in back yard.

Thank You

Marie & "Ernie" F.

4/68

APPENDIX N

GROUP HOME PROJECT

GUIDELINES FOR PAROLE AGENTS AND GROUP HOME MANAGERS¹

The Guidelines For Parole Agents And Group Home Managers which are presented here are for the purpose of creating and maintaining effective means of communicating our concerns and meeting our needs as they arise in our attempts to develop particular treatment environments in group homes for delinquent boys. The information is presented with the awareness that it will not provide ready answers to all questions, but will answer basic questions which may arise in the early development and use of a given home. The expressed concerns and requests for information from parole agents, group home managers, and Group Home Project staff accentuated the need for standardization of some procedures and license for creativity and flexibility with regard to others. The following guidelines are proposed to help meet these needs.

¹ These guidelines are a part of a loose-leaf notebook which is supplied to each group home. In addition to the guidelines the notebook contains the following forms which are filled out by the group home parents; Group Home Daily Attendance Report, (2) Group Home Accounting (Home Costs and Ward Expenses); (3) Group Home Register (filled out by a youngster's Agent at time of placement).

APPENDIX N, Continued
GUIDELINES FOR PAROLE AGENTS

Pre-Placement

If you are considering placement of a ward in a group home, contact the Group Home Coordinator to make arrangements for a staffing time. Wards will not be placed in the Type I, II, III or VI homes prior to a placement staffing. The purpose of the case staffing is to determine the appropriateness of the placement with regard to the present status and overall design of the home. In order to maintain our research design for a given home, approval will not be given to mix I-levels to solve emergency placement needs (i.e., I₄ boys in I₃ homes), or for "temporary" placement in "long-term" homes (i.e., Type IV home boys in Type III home, etc.). After a placement is considered appropriate, you may proceed with placement plans by contacting the group home managers regarding ward history and placement details. At this time you may wish to begin to develop the treatment attitude regarding your boy with the group home managers. The boy should be structured for placement in the home. Placement arrangements and Board reports should be made in accordance with routine Community Treatment Project procedures.

Arrangements for placement in the Type IV and V homes may be made by contacting the Group Home Coordinator or your supervising parole agent. A pre-placement staffing is not required.

Placement

The Foster Home Agreement is to be completed by you. The agency code for Group Home Project homes in Stockton is 2282; in Sacramento, 2281.

You will retain responsibility for treatment and case management of your wards in placement. Necessary initial clothing purchases should be made and you should communicate to the group home managers what clothing the ward has and the extent of normal replacement which may be anticipated in the near future. Medical cards should be left with the group home managers (except in homes IV and V) with signed medical consent forms. A Group Home Register form should be completed and left with the managers. The Group Home Coordinator should be provided a copy of the Clinic Summary, Board reports, and dates of Start and Stop Orders. Agents using a home may be requested to attend management staffings (agents, group home managers, Group Home Coordinator, Research) twice monthly, and maintenance staffings (agents, supervising parole agent, Coordinator, Research) once monthly. Participation in these staffings contributes to the training of the group home managers and keeps the parole agents and Group Home staff apprised of the status of each ward in the home. Routine individual contracts by you with the managers will enhance direct communication concerning specific ward treatment.

Keep group home managers and the Coordinator informed of significant modifications in treatment plans and ward status and indicate any major issues regarding the treatment stance and technique so that these issues may be discussed at appropriate staffings. Communicating concerns regarding a home with Group Home Staff will facilitate handling of possible problems before major issues develop. Special staffings will be scheduled at the request of any staffing participant.

LVED 9/57 (revised 5/68)

APPENDIX N, Continued

You are requested to support the group home managers in whatever manner seems appropriate, to listen to them, to evaluate their perceptions, and to act upon the information in whatever way is appropriate after making an evaluation with them.

Termination Of Placement

Upon termination of the placement, submit a Stop Order and advise the Group Home Coordinator of the removal date and reason for removal. If you do not anticipate the return of the ward to the home within a reasonable length of time, collect the Medical card and dispose of it in accordance with county welfare department instructions. Collect the Group Home Register from the group home managers, complete the last three lines and return the form to the Group Home Coordinator. Collect the medical consent form and hold it in the field folder. The termination of the placement should be discussed with the group home managers to evaluate the experience from their perception and from your perception relative to the ward's stay, the group home managers' feelings about their participation with the ward, and relative to your feelings about the placement.

Miscellaneous

From time to time you will be requested to complete and return questionnaires and inquiries to Group Home staff. The information elicited may be helpful to you at some future time although it may not seem so at the time of the request. Research will also call upon agents periodically in collection of data pertinent to research goals.

Home Types

- I - Protective (N's, Cfm's, Maximum 4)
- II - Containment (Cfc's, Mp's, Maximum 6)
- III - Boarding (All I₄'s, Maximum 6)
- IV - Temporary Community Care (All subtypes, Maximum 5)
- V - Short Term Restriction (All subtypes, Maximum 3)
- VI - Individualized (I₄'s - primarily Na's and Nx's, Maximum 6)

APPENDIX N, Continued

GUIDELINES FOR GROUP HOME MANAGERS

Group Home Project: What Is It?

The Group Home Project is a demonstration research project in the Department of the Youth Authority, Division of Parole. It is sponsored jointly by the Youth Authority and the National Institute of Mental Health (a Federal agency). Its purpose is to develop study homes for delinquent boys who are on parole to the California Youth Authority in the cities of Stockton, Sacramento and Modesto. It is anticipated that there will be three homes in Stockton, two in Sacramento, and possibly one in Modesto. Each home will be developed to meet the particular needs of the boys who are placed there.

What Is A Group Home?

A group home is a home which is large enough to accommodate several boys in addition to family members already in the home. Boys who are most alike in their degree of maturity and ways of getting along with others will be placed together. The group home provides a setting in which care, supervision, and guidance can be given to each boy in addition to shelter and food, clothing and personal needs.

Who Are Group Home Managers?

Group home managers are usually a husband and wife team who want to help us rehabilitate delinquent boys. They must be stable in their family relationships. They should not have emotional stress or worries which might prevent them from developing positive, helpful relationships with our boys. They must be willing and able to work closely with our staff (Parole and Research). They must have a home large enough to house our boys with their family. Their income should be sufficient to care for their own family so that monies provided for the care of our boys can be used for the purposes indicated in the group home contract. Group home managers are requested to apply for a foster home license in accordance with regulations established by the State Department of Social Welfare. Licenses should be applied for through the local county welfare departments.

How Are Group Home Managers Paid?

The amount of monthly rent (or retainer) indicated in the contract will be mailed automatically on the first workday of each month. Monthly rent is paid in advance; i.e., rental allowance issued on the first of a given month is for the maintenance of the home throughout that month. Ward subsidy payments usually will be mailed by noon on the fifth day of the month. However, if the fifth day is on a weekend, the checks are mailed on the first workday following the weekend. Ward subsidy is paid in arrears; i.e., the check you receive this month is for ward maintenance last month, and is computed on the basis of the number of days each boy was in the home during the month. You will verify attendance each month on a form provided by our accounting office. This form should be signed and returned immediately to avoid delay in payment. The parole agent will initiate ward subsidy payments for each boy he places in your home in accordance with the amount indicated in your contract. He will terminate payments when the boy is removed.

DTED 5/68

APPENDIX N, Continued

The monthly rental allowance will normally be used to develop, equip, furnish and maintain your home for the number of boys indicated in your contract, and for your participating closely with parole and research staff and wards in developing and researching a treatment environment appropriate for the "type" of home you have been selected to develop. Ward subsidy payments will normally provide food, shelter care and personal needs (laundry, dry cleaning, shoe repair, hair cuts, etc.). Clothing, recreation and incidental allowances should not be used for personal needs items. Arrangements regarding the issuance of cash to boys should be made directly with the parole agent.

Care Of Boys

Medical and dental care may be arranged for each boy by contacting the parole agent directly. Meals should be regularly scheduled, nourishing, and pleasant. The home should be maintained in a neat, clean, orderly manner. Each boy should be directly involved in the care and maintenance of the home by way of chores and responsibility for his own room and clothing care. Home activities and outings should be planned to include all of the boys when possible. You should work with the parole agent initially in developing appropriate kinds of activities and trips.

Discipline

Follow the parole agent's instructions and directions. Use common sense judgment when in doubt or when the parole agent is not available to help you resolve particular difficulties. Specific discipline and ward management should be developed with the parole agent.

Home Management

From time to time you will be requested to provide specific, detailed information concerning the management of your home. You will be asked to document all expenditures relative to each ward specifically and the home generally; therefore, accurate, current records should be kept. We request that you maintain a monthly attendance report on forms provided. Questions regarding budgeting, contracts, meetings, and general policy should be directed to the Group Home Coordinator directly.

Staffings

You will be requested to meet regularly with staff (parole agents, Group Home Coordinator, Researcher) to discuss and evaluate home development and ward progress. Contact with the Researcher and others on individual bases will be frequent to insure sharing of information, the development of particular treatment techniques for the boys in your home, and to evaluate various aspects of treatment stances deemed appropriate for the care and treatment of the boys in your home. Scheduled meetings with staff will be conducted in the Community Treatment Project offices or in the Group Home Project office in Sacramento. At

APPENDIX N, Concluded

other times, the Group Home Coordinator, the parole agents, the Researcher, or the supervising parole agent may visit with you and the boys in your home. From time to time we will ask you to participate with us in sharing our group home experiences with others interested in similar programs by way of bringing visitors into your home to talk with you directly and to look at the home environment you have been able to create for the boys.

Because we are a research project, we will be asking you to share with us much detailed information concerning yourselves, the boys in your home, your perceptions of us, and so on. We hope that the foregoing guidelines will be helpful to you in our working together to develop the kinds of treatment environments which we feel are appropriate for the particular home type for which you have been selected.

APPENDIX O

CTP/DTED PAID OUT-OF-HOME PLACEMENTS¹
8/1/67 - 7/1/68

		1967					1968							
		Aug 1	Sep 1	Oct 1	Nov 1	Dec 1	Jan 1	Feb 1	Mar 1	Apr 1	May 1	Jun 1	Jul 1	AVE.
Stockton	CTP ²	4	5	6	3	5	5	4	8	9	10	9	11	6.6
	Type I: (8/67-7/68)													
	DTED	3	2	2	1	2	3	4	4	3	5	5	5	3.3
	Type IV: (4/68-7/68)													
Group Homes		43%	29%	25%	25%	29%	38%	50%	33%	25%	33%	36%	31%	33%
Sacramento	CTP	9	5	7	7	7	7	7	12	14	13	14	11	8.4
	Type II: (8/67-6/68) ³													
	DTED	5	4	7	7	7	6	9	7	6	7	7	3	6.3
	Type III: (8/67-7/68)													
Group Homes		36%	44%	50%	50%	50%	46%	56%	37%	30%	35%	33%	21%	40%
Totals	CTP	13	10	13	10	12	12	11	20	23	23	23	22	16
	DTED	8	6	9	8	9	9	13	11	9	12	12	8	9.5
	% in Group Homes	38%	38%	41%	44%	43%	43%	54%	35%	28%	34%	34%	27%	37%

-135-

¹These figures are from a survey done of each Agent's caseload on the first day of each month.

²CTP out-of-home placements include: Foster Home, paid relative, subsidized independent placement. DTED figures include only youngsters in group homes (unless in temporary detention, AWOL, etc.).

³7/1/68 Sacramento figures do not include three youngsters in the Type II home on 6/30/68 since the Type II home was cancelled effective on 7/1/68.

END