 <b>U. S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE</b> <b>LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION</b>		<b>FINAL</b> DISCRETIONARY GRANT <b>PROGRESS REPORT</b>	
GRANTEE County of Douglas	LEAA GRANT NO. 73 DF 07 0002A	DATE OF REPORT 4/15/76	REPORT NO.
IMPLEMENTING SUBGRANTEE Eastern Ne. Human Services Agency Office of Mental Health	TYPE OF REPORT <input type="checkbox"/> REGULAR QUARTERLY <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL REQUEST <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FINAL REPORT		
SHORT TITLE OF PROJECT Project for Adjudicated Youth	GRANT AMOUNT \$205,234.00		
REPORT IS SUBMITTED FOR THE PERIOD 9/1/75	THROUGH 6/30/75		
SIGNATURE OF PROJECT DIRECTOR <i>Ray Christensen</i>	TYPED NAME & TITLE OF PROJECT DIRECTOR Ray Christiansen Executive Director - ENHSA		
COMMENCE REPORT/HERE (Add continuation pages as required.)  <div style="text-align: center;"> <p>Report attached</p> <p>NCJRS</p> <p>OCT 19 1976</p> <p>ACQUISITIONS</p> </div>			
<div style="position: relative; height: 200px;"> <div style="position: absolute; left: 0; top: 50%; transform: rotate(-90deg); font-size: 48px; font-weight: bold;">369999</div> <div style="position: absolute; left: 10%; top: 60%; font-size: 24px; font-weight: bold;">6:12</div> <div style="position: absolute; right: 0; top: 20%; text-align: right;"> <p>LOAN DOCUMENT</p> <p>RETURN TO:</p> <p>NCJRS</p> <p>P.O. BOX 24036 S.W. POST OFFICE</p> <p>WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024</p> </div> <div style="position: absolute; left: 15%; bottom: 20%; text-align: center;"> <p>RECEIVED</p> <p>AUG 11 1976</p> <p>NEBRASKA COMMISSION ON LAW ENFORCEMENT AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE</p> </div> <div style="position: absolute; right: 10%; bottom: 10%; text-align: right;"> <p>LOG 915</p> <p>8/16/76</p> <p>km</p> </div> </div>			
RECEIVED BY GRANTEE STATE PLANNING AGENCY (Official) <i>Donald C. [Signature]</i>		DATE 8-12-76	

ADOLESCENT GROUP HOMES:  
AN EVALUATION RESEARCH STUDY

A study of the Adolescent Group Home Program operated by the  
Eastern Nebraska Human Service Agency under a grant from the  
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (Grant #73-DF-07-0002A)

by

John F. Else  
*Project Director*

George W. Barger

A. Mark Hutcherson

Project Staff for

HUMAN RESOURCES ASSOCIATES

2440 Fontenelle Boulevard  
Omaha, Nebraska 68104  
(402) 551-0855

February 1976

RECEIVED

AUG 11 1976

NEBRASKA COMMISSION ON  
LAW ENFORCEMENT AND  
CRIMINAL JUSTICE

36999-22

# TABLE OF CONTENTS


I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. RESEARCH/EVALUATION DESIGN AND PROCESS	
A. History and Goals	1
B. Research Design	3
1. Program Administration/Operation	3
2. Benefits to Youth Participants	4
a. Profile of Youth Served	4
b. Behavior Changes	4
c. Attitude Changes	6
d. Control/Comparison Groups	8
3. Benefits to the Community	8
4. Program Finances	9
C. Research/Evaluation Problems and Limitations	9
III. RESEARCH/EVALUATION FINDINGS	
A. Program Administration/Operation	10
1. Administrative Leadership	10
2. Program Design	13
3. Staff	15
4. Program Operation	16
a. Selection Process	16
b. Physical Environment	16
c. Social Environment	17
d. Behavioral Change Program	17
e. Communications	18
f. Social and Educational Service Linkages	18
B. Benefits to Youth Participants	19
1. Profile of Youth Served	19
2. Behavior Changes	20
a. Length of Stay	21
b. Performance of Youths	21
c. Status When Youths Left Program	22
d. Post-program Situation/Performance	22
3. Attitude Changes	23
C. Benefits to the Community	26
1. Evaluation of Program by School Staff	26
2. Evaluation of Program by Court, Agencies, Parents, Youth, and Program Staff	27
a. Evaluation by Juvenile Court Personnel	28
b. Evaluation by Personnel from Other Agencies	29
c. Evaluation by Parents	30
d. Evaluation by Youths	31
e. Evaluation by Staff	32
D. Program Finances	33
1. Longitudinal Analysis of Expenditures	33
2. Analysis of Per Unit Cost of Service	34
3. Analysis of Financial Processes and Planning	37
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
A. Interpretation of Findings	38
B. Recommendations	39

JOHN F. ELSE, M.A., is assistant professor in the School of Social Work, University of Nebraska at Omaha.

GEORGE W. BARGER, PH.D., is professor and chairperson of the Sociology Department, University of Nebraska at Omaha.

A. MARK HUTCHERSON, B.A., is a graduate student in the School of Social Work, University of Nebraska at Omaha.

HUMAN RESOURCES ASSOCIATES is a non-profit corporation consisting of social scientists and human service professionals who share concern for improving the quality of human service programs and the quality of life in our society. HRA provides planning, program development, education, training, management consultation, research, evaluation, and other technical assistance and consultation services to various human service agencies and to other organizations.



## APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Measures of Attitude Change	44
A-1: Instructions for Administration of Scales	44
A-2: Internal-External Scale	46
A-3: Machiavellian Scale	48
A-4: Achievement-Orientatation Scale	49
A-5: Self-Concept Scale	50
APPENDIX B: Community Questionnaires	
B-1: Questionnaire for School	51
B-2: Questionnaire for Court, Agencies, Parents, Youths, and Staff	54
APPENDIX C: Length of Residence of Youth Placed in Group Homes	56

## INDEX OF TABLES

1 - Tenure of Program Directors	11
2 - Shifts in Administrative Structure	12
3 - Tenure of Teaching Parents	15
4 - Profile of Youths Served	19
5 - Cross-Tabulation of Most Serious Offenses and Sex	20
6 - Length of Stay	21
7 - Performance of Youths	22
8 - Scores of Subjects on Various Attitude Measures by Test Series	24
9 - Evaluation of Program by School Staff	27
10 - Distribution of Responses to Questionnaire B-2	28
11 - Evaluation of Program by Juvenile Court Personnel	28
12 - Evaluation of Program by Personnel from Other Social Agencies	29
13 - Evaluation of Program by Parents	30
14 - Evaluation of Program by Youths	31
15 - Evaluation of Program by Staff	32
16 - Longitudinal Analysis of Expenditure Rates	34
17 - Youth Days of Residency and Per Diem Costs by Month	35
18 - Youth Days of Residency and Annual Costs by Major Time Periods	36

## I. INTRODUCTION

The need for additional placement resources for adjudicated youth has long been recognized by the Douglas County Juvenile Court and by the social service agencies of the area. In late 1972 and for the first eight months of 1973, Douglas County Social Service (DCSS) and the Juvenile Court worked on a proposal for group homes for adjudicated youth. The work was done in cooperation with the University of Nebraska at Omaha's (UNO) Pilot Cities project and its Center for Applied Urban Research (CAUR). In about August, 1973, the proposal was submitted to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) for funding. On November 28, 1973, the project was officially approved and funded for a sixteen-month period (November 28, 1973 through March 31, 1975) for a total of \$228,038 of which \$205,234 was federal money and \$22,804 was County funds. The grant period was later extended to June 30, 1975, at which time LEAA funding ceased and Douglas County assumed the full financial responsibility.

During the grant application period the Douglas County Office of Human Services was being created and it later became the Eastern Nebraska Human Service Agency (ENHSA). It was an umbrella agency which included four major components--aging, mental health, mental retardation, and youth services. When funding was official, the program implementation responsibilities were shifted from DCSS to ENHSA.

## II. RESEARCH/EVALUATION DESIGN AND PROCESS

### A. HISTORY AND GOALS

The research/evaluation component of the group home project was first given to another party, who failed to perform. Over twelve months after the grant was funded and more than five months after the first placement had been made (only 3 1/2 months before the original termination date for the grant), Human Resources Associates (HRA) was contacted and asked to undertake the research/evaluation. HRA's contract took effect on December 16, 1974.

The primary objective of the Adolescent Group Home Program was to test the transferability of the Achievement Place (AP) model from the environment in which it had been created and developed to the Omaha community. The second goal of the project was simply to provide a service, i.e., to create an alternative for adjudicated youth which was intermediate between institutionalization on the one hand and returning the youth to an untenable home situation on the other; the research/evaluation goal related to this second program objective was to determine the effectiveness of the program.

By the time the HRA research/evaluation came onto the scene, it was clear that the primary objective of the project had been scrapped

and that research on that objective was therefore impossible. As will be discussed in the findings section of this report, there was little commitment to the Achievement Place (AP) model and little effort to train people in the model or to provide support for implementing the model. The focus of the project then became directed towards providing a service and forming positive treatment relationships with the youths. However, some aspects of the AP model, particularly the point system, were retained during most of the project period; therefore, the point system was used in the research design as one form of measuring the behavioral development of the youths. In fact, the research design retained many parallels to the original design, but there was less focus on comparison with the norms of the AP research.

The goal of the research/evaluation, then, became to evaluate the effectiveness of the program. Our concerns were four-fold:

1. How effective is the administration and operation of the program?
2. How effective is the program in developing new behavior patterns, new attitudes and new directions in the youth it serves?
3. How effective is the program from the viewpoint of the Juvenile Court, cooperating agencies, schools, parents and youth participants?
4. What are the program costs and how do they compare with alternative programs?

The first quarter (January-March, 1975) of the research/evaluation project was spent in getting the research design specified and beginning to gather research data. But more important was the consultation function that the HRA team played during this time. The team interviewed program staff, ENHSA administrators, and Juvenile Court judges and staff in order to compile an accurate picture of the history of the program, its current status, and the issues and problems involved in its operation. This resulted in a First Quarterly Report which summarized the history, described the achievements of the program, identified what seemed to be the central problems, and made a series of recommendations aimed at resolving key problems. On the basis of commitments from the ENHSA administration to implement the eleven recommendations contained in that report, the Regional Office of LEAA agreed to extend the funding for three months.

A second Quarterly Report was submitted at the end of June, 1975. It reported the significant changes which had been made during the quarter, especially in clarification of objectives, changes in staffing patterns, improvement in supportive service linkages and inter-agency communication and improvement in administrative staffing pattern. The gathering of data for the research aspect of the project also continued.

Effective July 1, 1975, Douglas County assumed financial responsibility for the group homes and the two homes were able to continue operation

after the grant period ended. HRA agreed to extend the period of its research/evaluation for three months, so as to include a longer period of time under the new administration and staff arrangement. Thus, data covered in this study extends through September 30, 1975.

## B. RESEARCH DESIGN

The research/evaluation project was designed to provide information on the effectiveness of the group home project in four areas:

1. Administration and Operation of the Program
2. Benefits to Youth Participants
  - Profile of youth served--personal and family characteristics
  - Behavior change
  - Attitude change
3. Benefit to the Community
  - Evaluation of the effectiveness of the program based on the perceptions of Juvenile Court judges and staff, schools, cooperating agencies, parents, and participants
4. Program Costs

### 1. Program Administration/Operation

The HRA staff believes in a philosophy of evaluation which maintains that program evaluation should normally include a "process evaluation" and that feedback should be at intervals which allow the program to make adjustments and improvements during the course of the program's life-span rather than simply receive a report on its performance at the conclusion of the program. This philosophy of evaluation was shared by the program staff and the ENHSA administration. As part of this philosophy, the evaluation staff occasionally is called upon to serve a consulting function as part of its evaluation function. This is always a delicate mixing of roles and the HRA staff was very conscious of the need to separate those roles. One HRA staff person served the consulting role wherever that was appropriate and the other professional staff person consistently avoided functioning in that role.

The evaluation of the administration and operation of the program was clearly a major aspect of the study. It was important in evaluating the effectiveness of a program to evaluate the leadership, the staff structure, the personnel, the training, the selection of youths, the operational processes, the communication structure and processes, the facilities, and the various aspects of the developmental program provided for the youths. This necessitated a fairly open-ended type of evaluation procedure. There were interviews with program staff and administrators, with ENHSA administrators, and with Juvenile Court judges and staff. One staff meeting at each group home was observed. The actual operation of the program was compared with the original design. All the data from interviews, observations, and records was analyzed and a profile of the history, the performance, and the key issues and problems of the program



was developed. Feedback on these findings was then sought and recommendations were proposed for alleviating some of the perceived dilemmas and problems.

## 2. Benefits to Youth Participants

Benefits to youth participants were measured in several ways:

- a. First, the plan called for a profile of the youth served in the program. The following demographic categories were agreed upon and the information was compiled from program records and Juvenile Court records:

Personal characteristics - sex  
- age  
- racial/ethnic group  
- number of offenses  
- most serious offenses

Family characteristics - parental status  
- number of siblings  
- family income  
- primary source of family income  
- residential location

Cross-analysis of various categories was done in order to determine whether correlations between categories revealed particular patterns which might be of importance.

- b. Behavior changes were determined by several measuring techniques. The original plan was to calculate changes in the number of police and court contacts, improvements in school grades and attendance, and decrease in runaway activity. We also planned to use the point system which was part of the AP model to measure changes in specific forms of adverse behavior as it was observed by the house parents as well as by other persons associated with the program. This elaborate plan was discarded early in favor of some more gross measures of behavior change. There were several factors indicating the need for this shift. Given the lack of training of the staff in using the point system, the work required to get all parties to agree to try to change certain behavior and to observe that behavior change, and the fact that the process had not begun early in the program, detailed observation of behavior change was not feasible. Detailed grade and attendance records had not been obtained on several former participants who had already left the program; also the research staff failed to ask the program to take responsibility for obtaining this information on all participants.

The research team finally agreed on four measures of behavior change:

(1) Length of stay in the program: successful completion of the program was projected to require 9-12 months of residence. Some youths would run away or be terminated prior to this time. Thus a short stay should indicate little behavior change--either because the program was unable to work effectively with the youth or because the youth was unwilling to make use of the opportunity provided by the program.

(2) Performance of youths: In order to complete the program successfully, it was necessary for the youths to progress through the point system. Earning points earned personal privileges and other rewards. One of the rewards was moving from daily to weekly point calculations and then off the point system altogether. On the other hand, adverse behavior resulted in point "fines." When fines totaling a set amount were compiled, the participant went onto a "sub-system" in which his/her behavior was more closely monitored and many personal privileges were revoked until the person earned enough points to move out of the sub-system. Thus point fines and reversion to a sub-system were indicators of lack of progress in positive behavior change.

While the youths were in the program it was hoped that they would not have additional offenses. To have additional offenses would be a sign of a lack of behavior change.

Thus three categories were developed to represent gross measurements of levels of performance while in the program:

--Excellent performance meant the person had fines totaling 300,000 or fewer points, was placed in sub-systems 0-2 times, and had no additional offenses.

--Average performance meant the person had fines totaling 300,001-600,000 points, was placed in sub-systems 3-4 times, and had one or two additional offenses.

--Poor performance meant the youth had fines totaling over 600,000 points, was placed in sub-systems five or more times, and had three or more additional offenses.

In addition to these three categories, it was necessary to create a fourth category, which we labeled "inadequate information" for youths whose point system records were too poor to allow placement into one of the three categories.

(3) Status when youth left program: these were simply categories which express the program staff's judgment of the reason for the youth leaving the program.

--Successful completion indicated that the youth remained in the program until the program staff felt s/he had successfully completed the program.

--Termination before completion indicated that the youth left without having completed the program. The youth may have run away or failed in some major way to comply with the rules of the program or the program staff may not have felt able to deal with the youth.

(4) Post-program situation/performance: If the youths successfully completed the program, they may have gone home or to a foster home; they may have been adjudicated again or they may have stayed out of trouble. Thus at the close of the research period, the youths who successfully completed the program may have been at home, in a foster home, or incarcerated.

Similarly those youths who had been terminated before completion of the program may have been sent to an institution or sent home. Thus the purpose of this set of categories was to determine, at the time the data collection ceased, the circumstances of the youths who had left the program.

Finally, cross analysis of the four measures of behavior change was done to determine whether any particularly critical insights could be obtained.

c. Attitude change measures were sought in the evaluation process by administering a series of paper and pencil tests (see Appendix A) to the participants in the group homes. These measures include assessments of four dimensions:

(1) internal-external scale, which measures a person's sense of control over his/her life chances;

(2) Machiavellian scale, which measures a person's orientation towards interpersonal relationships;

(3) achievement-orientation scale, which measures a person's achievement drive; and

(4) self-concept scale, which measures a person's perceptions of her/himself.

The measures were administered at approximately three month intervals.

These measures were adopted primarily because they had previously been reported in use in the Achievement Place homes which had been a partial model for the plan in Omaha. (Cf. D.S. Eitzen, "The Effects of Behavior Modification on the Attitudes of Delinquents," unpublished paper, Lawrence, Kansas, no date.)

It was felt that the findings reported from Lawrence, Kansas could serve as a kind of base for comparison with the data collected during evaluation of the Omaha project. In addition,

further bases for comparison were planned: identical measures were administered to two groups of students at a local Catholic school serving youths who for various reasons could not function in the public school setting and to youth residents of a group home similar, but not identical to, the homes which constituted a focus for this evaluation.

A further description of the measures is appropriate at this point. Previous research has indicated that lower socio-economic class persons and delinquents tend to view the world as something that happens to them, something over which they have virtually no determinant control. They are "externals" in the jargon of the research. One would expect that under suitable conditions, for example, one in which rewards for behaviors were closely connected with those behaviors both positively and negatively, some movement towards greater sense of control over one's destiny (i.e., towards "internal" control) should be observed. A measure of such "internal/external" locus of control was included as a part of the assessment, the Nowicki-Strickland measure. (S. Nowicki and B. Strickland, "A Locus of Control Scale for Children," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1973.)

Interpersonal relationships are quite important in all life's stages. They are often seen as peculiarly relevant to the teenager, whose associations with peers and others loom large in his/her developing a sense of social coping. A measure of Machiavellianism, that is, of a tendency to be manipulative and exploitative in relating to others, was included in the evaluation measures. (R. Christie, Studies in Machiavellianism, 1970.) It is conceivable that association with the consistent reward structures of group home staff provided in the group home could modify whatever Machiavellian tendencies were initially present in the young person's coping patterns.

It often is presumed that delinquent persons are low on motivation for achievement. While social motivation is complex both in origins and maintenance, the stable role models provided by house parents in the group home environment could have some measurable effect on the strength of the motive. An eight-item achievement orientation scale was included in the assessment process. (F. Strodbeck, "Family Interaction, Values, and Achievement" in D.C. McClelland, ed., Talent and Society, 1958.)

Finally, a series of measures intended to assess the young person's sense of personal identity were included. Most of our actions are anchored in a context of how we see ourselves, and how we imagine others see us. If these self-perceptions are positive, our behaviors generally reflect this orientation. The measures utilized offer some objective insight into this question.

- d. Control/comparison groups: The original research design inherited by HRA included comparison of the Adolescent Group Home Program with the effectiveness of Nebraska youth correctional institutions. This design assumed the cooperation of the Nebraska Department of Correctional Services, but no agreement for such cooperation had ever been obtained. The HRA staff did not think it was feasible to negotiate such an agreement at the late date on which it received the research/evaluation contract, so the comparison with State youth correctional institutions was dropped.

The HRA staff did hope to use other control groups for at least some aspects of the study. Four groups were considered: adolescents placed in foster homes; adolescents in other group homes; adolescents who were in status offender programs but who were not living in any kind of residential or institutional setting; and adolescents enrolled in regular school programs. The short time remaining in the grant period created problems in obtaining control groups. Furthermore, it was clear that the small number of youths involved in the Adolescent Group Home Program would not make statistical tests appropriate, so control and comparison groups would not be particularly useful anyway.

Nonetheless, we arranged for three comparison groups for the attitudes tests. One comparison group was comprised of youths who resided in Mary House, a girl's group home operated by Eastern Nebraska Community Office of Mental Health (ENCOMH). The second comparison group was formed by youths who were enrolled in an alternative education program operated by a local Catholic school and funded by ENHSA as one component of its status-offender program. The third comparison group was made up of youths enrolled in the regular school program of a local Catholic school. This third group was utilized solely to establish a local comparison base, so it was tested only once. All comparison groups were similar in age; the second was roughly similar in socio-economic status. In addition to these three comparison groups, the staff intended to make comparisons with the norms established in the research on the AP model which had been done at the University of Kansas.

### 3. Benefits to the Community

In order to determine community impressions of the Adolescent Group Home Program and its benefit to the youths served and to the community, two different questionnaires were used. One questionnaire (see Appendix B-1) was sent to school teachers, counselors, and administrators. It asked about the quality of communication, cooperation/assistance, and responsiveness between the school and the program, and about the progress of the student in school while s/he was living in the group home.

A second questionnaire (see Appendix B-2) was sent to the Juvenile Court judges, probation officers and staff, to social agencies/programs

that worked cooperatively with the group homes (most of these were other programs within the ENHSA umbrella), to parents of youth who had been placed in the group homes, and to youths who had been in the group homes. This questionnaire asked for an evaluation of the administration of the program, the facilities and the program provided by the group homes.

The questionnaires were mailed after the research period had concluded in order to assure that the assessments would reflect the total research period. A follow-up request was sent to all persons who had not responded within two weeks.

#### 4. Program Finances

The program finances were analyzed in three different ways:

- a. A longitudinal analysis of expenditure rates: This was simply an analysis of the expenditures by month and a comparison with the expected expenditure (determined by pro-rating the total grant funds over the proposed period of the grant). This analysis reflected the pace of program development and the level of on-going operation.
- b. Analysis of per unit cost of service: In this case, the analysis was done in terms of the per diem cost per youth and then this cost was also annualized. In other words, the total costs were divided by the sum of the days of residency of all youths served by the program; this per day cost figure was annualized by multiplying it by 365 days. These costs were then compared with the per diem and annual costs in state youth institutions and foster homes.

Since the group homes were being developed and since the developmental period of a residential program always has unusually high costs, the per diem rate was calculated for the last few months of the program's operation as well as for the total grant period. The calculation for the last few months should more accurately reflect the projected cost of continuing to operate the program.

- c. Analysis of the financial administration of the program: This is an analysis of the fiscal processes and fiscal planning. It involves looking into the budgeting processes, expenditure processes, and such issues as accountability, flexibility, and communication as they relate to financial aspects of the program.

#### C. RESEARCH/EVALUATION PROBLEMS AND LIMITATIONS

Several problems related to the group home project created limitations on what could be reported in the findings and discussed in the interpretation. Four specific problems should be noted:

1. As stated earlier, the original concept of the group home project intended to mirror the Achievement Place model pioneered by the Bureau of Child Research, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas. (Cf. E.L. Phillips et al., The Teaching Family Handbook, revised edition, Lawrence, Kansas: Bureau of Child Research, 1974.) The evaluation design employed in this report was adopted because it was compatible with the data format used by that Bureau in its reporting. Several administrative decisions altered in substantial ways the application of this model in Omaha as the evaluation period proceeded. Consequently the anticipated data base did not materialize fully and the context for interpretation of findings is not as clear as strict procedure would dictate. While this is not an unusual situation in evaluative research, especially with developing programs, it does serve to restrict the conclusions which will be stated. (Cf. Carol Weiss, "Between the Cup and the Lip," Evaluation, Vol. 1, No. 2, 1973.)

2. Simply the fact that there was not a consistent, established program design during the evaluation period means that whatever positive or negative finding emerges cannot be attributed to any particular program design.

3. There are gaps in the data. Some of this is due to inadequate records being maintained by program staff, some is due to the late start on the research and some is due to failure by the research staff to specify sufficiently far in advance some of the data that it would need.

4. It was difficult to conduct a valid longitudinal study because (a) the population was not as large as the proposal had projected since only two of the three proposed homes were developed and even they did not operate at full capacity until late in the research period; and (b) the retention rate was poor and the turnover great among those youths who did participate in the program, so long-term analysis of most participants was not possible.

### III. RESEARCH/EVALUATION FINDINGS

#### A. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION/OPERATION

##### 1. Administrative Leadership

The administrative leadership and structure of the program was characterized by discontinuity and instability during the 19 months of funding (November 28, 1973 through June 30, 1975) plus 3 additional months that research was conducted. During that 22-month period there were six directors of the Group Home Program. Three were interim directors who had major responsibilities in other programs. The other three who had primary responsibility for the program, served an average of 6 months as directors.

The administrative structure of the program and its placement within

the ENHSA superstructure also changed several times. The program was first an independent unit of ENHSA; then it was placed with the Youth Service Agency (YSA) of ENHSA; and finally it was shifted into the administrative structure of Eastern Nebraska Community Office of Mental Health (ENCOMH), a division of ENHSA. These shifts were due in large part to the fact that ENHSA itself was just coming into existence and developing divisions, administrative structure, and assigning and re-assigning personnel. It also seems clear, however, that until April, 1975 insufficient attention was given to solving problems related to the program, whether because of preoccupation with the development of ENHSA or for other reasons.

The changes in administrative structure (and placement) and in leadership are summarized in Tables 1 and 2 below.

---

TABLE 1: Tenure of Program Directors

<u>Name</u>	<u>Length</u>	<u>Dates</u>	<u>Duties Unrelated to LEAA Adolescent Group Home Program</u>
*Brian Lensink	3 mo	11-28-73 to 2-2-74	ENHSA Exec. Dir.
Len Fralick	8 mo	3-1-74 to 10-25-74 (sick leave to 12-31-74)	none
*Mary Gabriel	1 mo	10-25-74 to 11-30-74	Dir., YSA
Dick Matland	4.5 mo	12-1-74 to 4-15-75	Coordinator, Adolescent & Pre- Adolescent Group Homes, ENCOMH
*Tom DiCostanzo	0.5 mo	4-15-75 to 4-23-75	Dir., Residential Alternatives, ENCOMH
Mike Durr	5 mo	5-5-75 to 9-30-75**	Coordinator, Adolescent Group Homes, ENCOMH
Ann Kopinski		4-23-75 to 9-30-75**	none

\* Interim Directors

\*\* September 30, 1975 was the termination of data gathering for the research/evaluation project. Durr & Kopinski continued in these capacities after that date.

---



TABLE 2: Shifts in Administrative Structure

<u>Administrative Unit</u>	<u>Length of Existence</u>	<u>Dates</u>
1. Independent unit of ENHSA	7 mo	11-28-73 to about 6-30-
2. Independent unit of YSA (ENHSA)	5 mo	about 7-1-74 to 11-30-7
3. One aspect of Adolescent/Pre-adolescent Group Home Unit of ENCOMH (ENHSA)	4.5 mo	12-1-74 to 4-15-75
4. Independent component of Adolescent Group Home Unit, Division of Residential Alternatives, ENCOMH (ENHSA)	5.5 mo	4-16-75 to 9-30-75

When ENHSA accepted the LEAA grant, Brian Lensink, former Executive Director of ENHSA, was officially designated as program director. There was no one, however, specifically assigned the responsibilities of program director for three months following funding.

On March 1, 1974, Len Fralick became director of the Adolescent Group Home Program and Mary Gabriel assumed his former duties as the Director of YSA. At this point the work program of the grant was rewritten, but apparently not submitted to LEAA for approval. (The evaluation/research team has the revised proposal, but has never seen the original.) Mr. Fralick reported directly to Mr. Lensink for a period of time, but later was asked to report to Sr. Gabriel. On October 25, 1974 Mr. Fralick took sick leave and later resigned his position.

Sr. Gabriel served as interim program director. On December 1, 1974, those responsibilities shifted to Dick Matland, who became Coordinator of Group Homes for Eastern Nebraska Community Office of Mental Health (ENCOMH). In addition to supervising the LEAA group homes, Mr. Matland was responsible for four other group homes and a short-term evaluation and diagnosis center. Matland was paid from mental health funds and did not fill the position of Coordinator of the LEAA group homes for which grant funds were designated. Matland resigned his position on April 15, 1975.

Tom DiCostanzo, who had been appointed director of Residential Alternatives for ENCOMH, served as interim director for about two weeks. Matland's position was subsequently split into two separate positions: Coordinator of Adolescent Group Homes and Coordinator of Pre-adolescent Group Homes. On May 5, 1975, Mike Durr, who had been working as the residential supervisor of the Children's Group Home Program, became the Coordinator of Adolescent Group Homes, which includes the two LEAA group homes plus Mary House, Walden I and Walden II. As part of the process

of strengthening the administration of the two LEAA group homes, Ann Marie Kopinski was hired as resident supervisor for the two homes. Ann Kopinski assumed her position on April 23, 1975.

April, 1975 was thus a turning point in the administrative leadership of the program. At this point, in the seventeenth month of the funding period, the program was for the first time given the attention required to develop a stable program operating at full capacity. Kopinski, Durr, and DiCostanzo all contributed significantly to this process, each providing appropriate initiatives and support at his/her administrative level.

## 2. Program Design

The program was designed to provide a developmental experience for 18-24 youths ages 13-16 and for their families. The goal was to have the youths return to their homes after modifications in their self-images and behaviors; development of social interaction skills; and a strengthening of the homes. The objective was to provide an alternative between returning youths to untenable home situations and sending them to state youth correctional institutions.

The Achievement Place (AP) model was to be used in the operation of the program. The AP model was developed by the Bureau of Child Research of the University of Kansas. It involves the use of behavior modification (point system) techniques in the early stages of a youth's stay in the homes as a means of providing

"maximum instruction and feedback to the youths when they first enter the program, and then, as the youths develop skills and self-control, the structured elements of the program are reduced and replaced by a more natural set of feedback conditions. As the youths accomplish the behavioral goals of the program, they and their natural parents are prepared for the youths' return to the natural home." Elery Phillips et al., The Teaching-Family Handbook (Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas, 1972).

The Achievement Place model was chosen because of the success it had demonstrated. The program design included two-stage training by AP staff from Lawrence, plus on-going consultation and evaluation by the AP staff.

Since the research/evaluation team was not hired until after Len Fralick's departure, we cannot assess Mr. Fralick's commitment to the concept of the project. We do know that the first two teaching parent couples attended the AP training program in Lawrence, Kansas, but no follow-up was arranged.

Dick Matland was open in his philosophical disagreement with the Achievement Place model, especially with the behavior modification aspects of it. He asked Russell Miller of Regional LEAA during his visit in February 1975 whether continual operation on the basis of the AP model was essential and reported that Mr. Miller indicated that

retention of the AP model was not crucial. Under the guidance of Mr. Matland, the AP model was phased out and an eclectic process or design was initiated. The eclectic design or process was never formally outlined for the evaluators nor for the benefit of the group home staff.

Under the guidance of Ann Kopinski, there was an attempt to retain certain aspects of the Achievement Place model, but no systematized procedures were incorporated into the daily operation of the group homes. Thus the group homes did not operate on a "model"--i.e., there was not a well-developed concept of systematic, interlocking elements which were taught and utilized.

Originally each group home used a "teaching parent"; that is, each group home had a married couple who lived in the home and served as the "teaching parents". In addition there was a residential aide who relieved the teaching parents approximately forty hours per week; there are indications, however, that teaching parents did not make adequate use of residential aides for relief. The first couple to serve as teaching parents was hired in May, 1974. The teaching parent model was retained for ten months. Then in March, 1975, the teaching parent pattern was dropped and a 24-hour staffing pattern was adopted; this involved each group home having five unrelated persons serving as resident counselors, each working 36-40 hours per week.

The LEAA grant narrative stipulated and allocated funds for the development of three group homes (two for boys; one for girls). Two group homes (Myott House for boys; Hartman House for girls) were organized; however, the second group home for boys was never developed. Problems with finding a suitable location for the group homes plagued the project and contributed to the failure of developing a second group home for boys.

The program was designed to include work with the families of the adolescents and linking the youth with educational and social service resources. It was April, 1975, before any effective working linkages were developed by the program. The way in which the program was administered until then left the teaching parent with the major burden of responsibility for the development of useful educational and social service resources. It was important to have these linkages, and this was only feasible if the teaching parents received assistance in making the appropriate linkages. The teaching parents were not experts in social services, alternative educational programs, family counseling, or public relations. As a result of the lack of administrative support and the teaching parents' lack of familiarity with community agencies, linkages to families of program participants and community resources were practically non-existent until April, 1975.

This situation changed dramatically when Mike Durr and Ann Kopinski began administering the program. The mental health clinics assigned one counselor to each group home. Those counselors had regular individual and group sessions with the youths, attempted to have individual or group sessions with the parents, participated regularly in staff meetings and were available for consultation with the staff.

In addition, Durr and Kopinski were regularly available to consult with the staff about kinds of services and programs that would be most useful to the youths, to assist in identifying the resources which might be available, and to participate in the process of obtaining the resources.

### 3. Staff

There was much turnover in personnel operating the group homes. As has been noted previously, there was a change in March, 1975, from the "teaching-parent" pattern to a "24-hour staffing" pattern. Thus the analysis of staff turnover must be divided into two sections. Four couples were hired as teaching parents. Omitting the one couple who were on the pay-roll for one month but never actually served as teaching-parents, the average stay of the couples was less than five months. Table 3 summarizes the tenure of teaching parents.

---

TABLE 3: Tenure of Teaching Parents

	<u>Starting Date</u>	<u>Termination Date</u>	<u>Tenure</u>
Carters	5-1-74	11-30-74	7 mo
Cahills	7-22-74	8-15-74	1 mo
Brigmans	10-1-74	1-31-75*	4 mo
Atwoods	1-1-75	3-31-75*	3 mo

\*Represents date on which one spouse ceased to be employed and thus the group home no longer had a teaching-parent couple.

---

The "24-hour staffing" pattern using residential counselors had approximately the same tenure record. The pattern had only been operating for six months when the research period ended, but in that period eight of the eleven residential counselors resigned or were terminated. The average tenure was just over five months.

The staff turnover can be explained by several factors. The teaching-parent pattern obviously places a great burden on a couple. To supervise five or six adolescents is no easy matter under the best of circumstances. When the adolescents have emotional and behavioral problems before they arrive, the difficulty multiplies geometrically. Add to that a developing program with innumerable hassles of getting facilities, furniture and equipment, procedures, etc. Combine that with a lack of training in the model which is supposed to be implemented, ambiguity about commitment to the model, and thus lack of support in developing and implementing the model or any alternative systematic approach. And finally mix it with an isolation from supportive services or persons who could provide such linkages and inadequate use of relief personnel. The result has to be frustration and failure.

The failure was attributed to the teaching-parent pattern, so a shift was made to the "24-hour staffing" pattern. Indeed, there may be fatal flaws in the concept that "teaching-parents" can handle a group home, or it may be that it requires a particular kind of couple with unusual skills and personalities and with adequate supportive and relief personnel. On the other hand, the Achievement Place model had

demonstrated that a teaching-parent pattern was feasible, so perhaps the problem was in the failure to provide an effective support system and to implement all of the elements of the model systematically.

The teaching parents were paid well. Each spouse received \$600-650 per month plus free housing and food. In contrast, residential counselors hired under the 24-hour staffing pattern received approximately \$525 per month with food only for the hours they were on duty. These low-level salaries may be necessary in order to keep the costs reasonable, but they limit the recruitment options. In effect the salaries virtually guaranteed that the staff would consist of relatively young people with minimal education and experience who would leave as soon as they had enough time and experience to obtain a better job in the human service field.

We hasten to add that nothing in the above analysis is intended to reflect on the commitment of the staff. We consistently found the staff to be concerned for the well-being of the youths and willing to give of themselves in whatever ways they knew how.

#### 4. Program Operation

- a. Selection Process: Youths were referred to the group homes by the Juvenile Court. A representative from the group homes reviewed the records and interviewed each youth. Then a decision was made regarding whether to accept the youth into the program. If the youth was accepted, the Court transferred custody of the youth to the group home program and set a date for review of the case. Subsequently the Residential Supervisor served as liaison between the Court, the youth, and the program.

The Juvenile Court was very unhappy about the slowness of the development of the program and the fact that the third group home was never established. Also, the Court was anxious to place youths and felt that the process of acceptance was usually slower than they would have liked. The process improved during the last five months of the research period.

- b. Physical Environment: This program was developing during a time of increasing neighborhood opposition to group homes. Consequently there were many problems in acquiring adequate facilities. It must be noted, however, that other programs did acquire good facilities during this time and thus there is an indication of lack of diligence directed to this problem. Ultimately one home was established at 4026 Hartman Street in a duplex which was purchased and remodeled by Douglas County. The other home was established in Myott Park, an apartment complex built with HUD 236 funds. Originally two apartments were leased with the intention of connecting them, but the connection never occurred and finally the lease on one was dropped.

The remodeling of Hartman House was never fully completed

and there were long delays on making repairs. The Myott House facility was small and cramped, and the boys caused much damage to the apartment which went unrepaired for long periods.

The Juvenile Court officials expressed concern several times about lack of recreational supplies and equipment in the homes. The program was slow in obtaining equipment, though it did give increasing attention to providing cards and games. The telephone also served as a major "social facility."

- c. Social Environment: Generally the atmosphere of the homes was pleasant. Several Juvenile Court staff noted the concern, patience, and flexibility of the staff; they felt that the small size of the homes provided the kind of interpersonal involvement and attention that the youth needed. On the other hand, there were numerous comments and observations about the apparent inability of the staff to keep control, to maintain discipline, or to handle crises which arose when one or more of the youths began to act out.

Of the questionnaires returned by youths, most said that the environment was generally pleasant but half expressed strong concern about safety. Some of this was attributed to hostile neighbors, but some was attributed to fear of staff or other residents.

Providing recreational activities outside the home was problematic in several respects. A fiscal process for providing weekly allowances for the youths was never arranged, so there was no regular mechanism for giving youths pocket money for recreation. Also the program did not have a vehicle which would permit transporting the entire group on outings. Both of these factors severely limited activities that could provide recreational outlets and which would have developed more group cohesiveness.

Furthermore, until late in the program (July, 1975) there was not regular staff coverage for weekend responsibilities, which is often a critical period for providing activities and developing close personal relationships. Since there was not regular staff coverage for weekends, the general practice was to arrange for each youth to go home or to a friend or relative's home for weekends.

- d. Behavioral Change Program: The point system was retained as a basic tool for encouraging behavioral change. It was the mechanism for giving rewards (privileges) and punishment (withdrawal of privileges). Use of a point system requires extensive training to assure understanding of the philosophical principles on which the system is based, knowledge of techniques of application, and awareness of the problems of application of the system. Training was not provided and, as previously observed, the staff was generally young and inexperienced.

Consequently the researchers found vast disparities in the application of the point system which created serious questions about how appropriately it was used as a mechanism for encouraging behavioral change.

- e. Communications: There were many problems with communication early in the program. The frequent change in administrators and in the administrative structure contributed to the communication problems. The administrative structure was finally stabilized in mid-April, 1975. Shortly thereafter the present administrative team was hired and communication has, for the most part, been good since that time. The communication seems fairly good in the three major relationships: between youth and staff, between staff and administration, and between the program and the Juvenile Court and other supportive services. Three exceptions should be noted. First, many persons, including the evaluators, observed repeatedly how difficult it was to locate the program administrators. Despite repeated written and verbal comments about this, the administrators never arranged a simple process of checking in at a designated office where messages could be left and information obtained regarding the time they expected to return. Second, school officials noted problems in reaching group home staff during day-time hours and also expressed interest in knowing more about the program and about the youths attending their schools. Third, relations were not good between the accounting office and the program. This was in large part because the administrators prior to May, 1975 did not attend to administrative details. For example, the original budget did not provide for many of the kinds of expenditures which were essential to the operation of the project, so the accounting office was continually rejecting payment vouchers and requesting that grant modifications be made so as to legitimize such expenditures. It was September 1974 before a revised budget was submitted to LEAA for approval. Also, personnel action forms were often submitted late and required making retroactive payments.

The First Quarterly Evaluation Report (March 1975) called attention to the fact that implementation of the Advisory Committee which had been proposed in the program design would assist in improving communications. The Advisory Board was not developed during the remaining six months of the research period.

- e. Social and Educational Service Linkages: Good linkages with supportive services were not accomplished until the present administrative team assumed leadership in May, 1975. An arrangement was then made for an ENCOMH Clinic Social Worker to be assigned to each house. They provide individual and group therapy for youths and their families, participate in group home staff meetings and treatment planning meetings, consult individually with the staff, and provide some in-service

training for staff. Other ENCOMI staff and consultants were also used to provide in-service training on specific topics.

Linkages with the Omaha Public Schools were problematic. Many of the youths were only allowed to attend the Independent Study Center and were only in school 2-3 hours per day. This placed an extra burden on the group home for day-time staffing and programming. The researchers did not do thorough investigation of this facet of the program, but simply note it here as an area of concern.

## B. BENEFITS TO YOUTH PARTICIPANTS

### 1. Profile of Youths Served

The program received funds for 19 months (November 28, 1973 to June 30, 1975). During this time it served 15 youths.\* The following table describes several important characteristics of the persons served.

---

TABLE 4: Profile of Youths Served

#### Personal Characteristics

Sex: 9 males and 6 females  
Age: Range was 12-17 years old, 2/3 of whom were 14 or 15 years old  
Racial/ethnic group: 6 Black; 1 Native American; 8 white  
Number of offenses: 2 had only one offense  
6 had 2-4 offenses  
7 had 5 or more offenses  
Most serious offenses: 3 status offenses (runaway, truancy, incorrigible)  
9 property offenses (2 theft, 4 robbery,  
3 vandalism, arson, etc.)  
3 assault

#### Family Characteristics

Parental status: 14 of the 15 had only one natural parent in the home  
Siblings: 7 had 3 or fewer brothers and sisters  
8 had 4 or more brothers and sisters  
Family income: 4 came from families with less than \$6,000/yr. income  
4 came from families with \$6,000-9,000/yr. income  
7 came from families with more than \$9,000/yr. income  
Primary source of family income: 10 families' income was mainly from  
parental employment  
5 families' income was mainly from  
public assistance  
Residential location (geographic): When the city was divided into  
quarters, using 50th Street and Dodge Street as dividing lines:  
9 lived in northeast Omaha  
4 lived in southeast Omaha  
2 lived in northwest Omaha  
0 lived in southwest Omaha

---

\*Two youths who entered the program during the last month of the research period (September, 1975) were excluded from the study.



As seen in Table 4, Most of the youths served were 14-15 years of age, about 50% were racial/ethnic minorities, and 60% were males. Nearly half of the youths had five or more offenses, but in 80% of the cases the most serious offense was either a status offense (20%) or a property offense (60%).

This data was analyzed further via cross-tabulations of various categories, which produced additional information about the 15 youths served. For example, the most serious offense of the females tended to be at one extreme or the other. All of the status offenders were females and two of the three assaults were females. The most serious offense of males was usually a property offense. Table 5 illustrates the groupings.

---

TABLE 5: Cross-Tabulation of Most Serious Offense and Sex

---

	<u>Status</u>	<u>Most Serious Offense</u>		<u>Total</u>
		<u>Property</u>	<u>Assault</u>	
Female	3	1	2	6
Male	0	8	1	9
Total	3	9	3	15

---

The family characteristics portrayed in Table 4 indicate that almost all the youths came from families with only one natural parent in the home. Some of these were single-parent homes and others were homes with a step-parent. Separation of families is an increasingly common phenomenon in our society, but it is worthy of note that this was the most nearly universal characteristic among the youths served. Of the 14 youths living with only one natural parent, in four cases one parent was deceased and in seven cases the whereabouts of one parent was unknown. Program staff noted that the death of a parent, a desertion or a separation from a parent often resulted in a basic orientation of non-investment in interpersonal relationships; i.e., youths often seemed to be hesitant to invest themselves in a relationship with another person, especially with an adult for fear of the loss of that relationship.

Over half of the youths came from families with four or more siblings. For two-thirds of the families, the primary source of income was employment. Family income ranged widely, but nearly half had income over \$9,000 per year. Finally, 60% of the families lived in the northeast sector of the city and another 33% lived in the southeast sector of the city.

## 2. Behavior Changes

Four measures of the effect of the program on youths were used: length of stay, performance of youth, status when youth left the program, and post-program situation/performance. By the end of the research period (September 30, 1975), only eight youths had entered and left the

program. Discussion of the effect of the program on the youths served is limited primarily to these eight youths, though occasional comments may be included regarding the seven youths still in the homes at the termination of the research period.

- a. Length of stay: This was used because it reflects the program's ability to serve the youths it accepts. Some youths ran away from the group homes. Others were terminated early because of behavioral problems which the program was unable to resolve. Others completed what the staff considered as the full program of the homes and were released. Successful completion of the developmental program was projected to require 9-12 months of residency.

Appendix C provides a detailed portrayal of the length of stay of the 15 youths served by the program. The average length of stay was 150 days, or just under five months. The average stay for females was 145 days and for males 154 days. Of the eight who had left the program when the research was completed, five were in the homes three months or less, two remained 4-6 months, and one remained seven or more months. Of the seven who were in the homes at the end of the research period, five had been in the group homes 4-6 months and two for seven or more months. Table 6 portrays these figures. The changes in the operation of the program may increase the length of stay of those still in the program.

---

TABLE 6: Length of Stay

	<u>0-3 mo</u>	<u>4-6 mo</u>	<u>7 or more mo</u>	<u>Total</u>
Youths who left program by 9-30-75	5	2	1	8
Youths still in program on 9-30-75	0	5	2	7
Totals	5	7	3	15

---

- b. Performance of youths: This is a measure of the youths' behavior both inside the home and outside the home. The researchers developed four categories of performance:

- (1) Excellent performance was indicated by 300,000 or less points in fines, being placed in sub-systems two or fewer times, and having no additional juvenile offenses;
- (2) Average performance was defined as fines of 300,001-600,000 points, being placed in sub-systems 3 or 4 times, and having one or two additional juvenile offenses;
- (3) Poor performance was fines of 600,001 or more points, being placed in sub-systems 5 or more times, and having three or more additional juvenile offenses; and

(4) Inadequate information was a category which indicated that the point system records were too poor to be able to collect enough data to make a judgment about performance.

Of the eight youths who had left the program, there were inadequate data on five. Of the three on which there were adequate data, one had Average and two had Poor performances.

Of the seven youths still in the program, the performances were: 3 Excellent, 2 Average, and 2 Poor. Table 7 summarizes the performance data.

TABLE 7: Performance of Youths

<u>Status on 9-30-75</u>	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Inadequate Information</u>	<u>Total</u>
Youths who left program	0	1	2	5	8
Youths still in program	3	2	2	0	7
Totals	3	3	4	5	15

- c. Status when youths left program: Some youths successfully completed the developmental program and others were terminated for various reasons before they completed the program. This data was only relevant for the eight youths who had left the program by 9-30-75. Of these eight, two successfully completed the program and six were terminated before completing the program. In short, only 25% of those who left the program had successfully completed the program.
- d. Post-program situation/performance: This category was concerned with the present status of the youths. That is, where were the youths who left the program? As of September 30, 1975, five of the eight were in Youth Development Centers, one was in the Douglas County Youth Center, and two were at home. Thus 75% of those who had left the program were in public custody.

CROSS-ANALYSIS: Since there was inadequate data on youth performance for 5 of the 8 youths who had left the program, cross-analysis could not include that category. Length of stay correlated highly with program success. Post-program situation of being at home did not necessarily mean the person had successfully completed the program. One youth who successfully completed the program was at home; the other was in a Youth Development Center, having committed another major offense after leaving the group home. One of the youths who was at home was there because the group home had terminated him due to conflict with the staff and behavioral problems; since the Court did not have an appropriate alternative placement, the youth remained at home.

### 3. Attitude Change

The four attitude tests administered were described in the research design section of this report. Several factors severely limited the findings from the attitude tests.

The first limitation was the small number of youths (12) who were assessed and the even smaller number of youths (5) who were tested more than once. Since the research design required that the tests be administered at least twice (at approximately three month intervals) in order to determine the amount of change over time, adequate data was obtained on only the five youths--four females and one male. The testing was limited to the 12 youths who were residents between March 1, 1975 and September 30, 1975. The first administration of the tests was on March 12, 1975 and the last administration was on September 15, 1975. Some of those who were in the original group tested left the program before the second testing time, and others joined the project too late to allow for a second administration of the tests before the research period ended.

Similar problems arose with the comparison group which consisted of residents of another ENHSA group home. The turnover of residents was so great that only one of four residents could be tested twice.

The second comparison group--youths enrolled in an alternative education program in a local Catholic school--were tested in the Spring and Fall of 1975. Thirteen youths were tested in the Spring and seven of those were retested in the Fall. However, the seven youths retested were only given the first three tests.

The third comparison group--youths enrolled in the regular school program in a local Catholic school--was tested only once (in the Spring, 1975) since it was intended only to provide a local comparison base. Nineteen youths were included in this comparison group.

In summary, there are three serious limitations on the findings and any interpretation of them: (a) the small number of young people involved in the group homes during the time span of the research; (b) the even smaller number of multiple assessments that were possible; and (c) problems in obtaining data on the comparison groups. Table 8 (on next page) summarizes the computed scores for individuals in the group homes, and group data for the matching groups included in the study. Some comments will call attention to relevant factors.

Because of the small total number of persons in the repeated measures of the data, no statistics of significance were computed. They simply would be too unstable for any sort of confidence. Instead, individual and group means were used for comparisons.

Scoring of the internal/external scale was in the direction of externality. Thus, the higher the score, the more the respondent tends to view external forces as controlling him/her; i.e., the more the respondent tends to view the world as something happening to him/her and over which s/he exercises little active influence.

TABLE 8: Scores of Subjects on Various Attitude Measures by Test Series

## INDIVIDUAL SCORES OF EXPERIMENTAL AND ONE COMPARISON GROUP

TEST SERIES	INTERNAL/EXTERNAL <sup>1</sup>			MACHIAVELLIAN <sup>2</sup>			ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTATION <sup>3</sup>			SELF-CONCEPT I AM <sup>4</sup>			SELF-CONCEPT FRIENDS <sup>4</sup>			SELF-CONCEPT TEACHER <sup>4</sup>			SELF-CONCEPT MOTHER <sup>4</sup>		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Subject																					
1	4	9	3	2.15	2.50	2.20	3.75	3.75	4.10	2.90	3.90	2.70	2.40	2.00	3.30	3.00	3.40	3.30	3.90	4.30	3.80
2	5	8		2.55	2.40		4.25	4.37		3.30	3.00		2.90	2.40		3.70	3.60		4.20	2.80	
3	7	3		2.75	2.20		2.75	3.50		3.60	2.40		3.00	2.80		3.80	2.50		3.30	1.60	
4	1	6		2.55	1.95		2.37	2.25		4.32	3.20		3.20	3.60		3.10	3.10		2.90*	4.50*	

HARTMAN HOUSE

MYOTT HOUSE

MARY HOUSE

1	5	Term	5	3.45			4.39			1.90			1.20			3.40			4.60		
2	15	Term		2.75			3.37			1.40			1.20			1.60			2.40		
3	11	Ref.	6	2.50	Ref.		2.87	Ref.		4.40	Ref.		2.90	Ref.		4.80	Ref.		5.70	Ref.	
4	15	Term		2.60			3.25			3.60			3.30			3.10			3.10		
5	13	11		2.65	3.15		2.87	3.00		3.80	1.30		4.00	1.00		3.10	2.00		4.00	2.00	
6	5	Term		2.20			3.86			N.S.			Ref.			Ref.			N.S.		
7	15			2.45			2.10			2.10			4.10			2.30			4.00		
8	15			4.25			3.80			3.50			4.70			5.80			4.00		

1	5	Term		3.15			4.25			2.40			2.30			1.80			6.10		
2	13	Term		2.95			4.00			3.60			3.20			3.70			2.20**		
3	4	Term		2.35			3.87			4.10			1.70			1.70			6.50		
4	11	4		2.30	2.10		4.37	3.50		3.20	2.90		2.70	2.60		2.00	2.50		4.30	3.20	

## MEAN SCORES OF EXPERIMENTAL &amp; COMPARISON GROUPS

KANSAS NORMS	8.53	6.5		6.19	5.81		4.47	4.63													
HARTMAN HOUSE	4.2	6.5		2.50	2.33		3.28	3.45		3.53	3.12		2.88	2.70		3.40	3.10		3.60	3.30	
MYOTT HOUSE	11.7			2.85			3.31			2.95			3.05			3.44			4.11		
HARTMAN + MYOTT	9.2			2.74			3.30			3.15			2.99			3.43			3.94		
MARY HOUSE	11.2			2.69			4.25			3.32			2.47			2.30			4.78		
CATHOLIC REGULAR	11.6			2.86			3.40			2.95			2.90			3.36			3.21		
CATHOLIC ALTERNATIVE ED	7.9			2.81			3.14			2.69			2.79			2.85			2.87		
Single Test	9.0			2.78			2.93														
Two Test	7.0	228		2.83	3.05		3.32	3.41													

<sup>1</sup>Internal/External Scale -- The higher the score the more the respondent tends to view external forces as controlling him/her. The lower the score the more the respondent feels that s/he controls what is happening to her/him.

<sup>2</sup>Machiavellian Scale -- Higher scores indicate greater tendency to relate to others in exploitative and manipulative ways.

<sup>3</sup>Achievement Orientation Scale -- The higher the score the greater the orientation toward achievement.

<sup>4</sup>Self-Concept Scale -- The lower the score the more positive the self-concept.

<sup>5</sup>Term. - Terminated

<sup>6</sup>Ref. - Refused

<sup>7</sup>N.S. - Not Scoreable

\*Guardian (Aunt)

\*\*Foster Mother

The females assigned to group homes in this evaluation differed in internal/external scores. Their mean on both first and second measurements (4.2; 6.5) was far lower than that of the males (11.7); it also was lower than that of either of the comparison groups. Finally, it was lower than the first mean reported in the Lawrence, Kansas study cited above, and exactly the same as their second reported mean (8.5; 6.5). Since the measure was scored in the direction of "externality" (the world is seen as imposing itself upon the person), the indication is that the females in the group homes began the program with a more positive view of possibilities for self-direction; they became less internally oriented while in the program, but even this movement in a negative direction (which may be a factor of population size) left them with a second score which was equal to the Kansas norms for second score.

The Machiavellian scale was scored so that the higher score indicated greater tendency to relate to others in exploitative and manipulative ways. Again, the females scored lower than either of the other groups (the Kansas Achievement Place data were not reported in comparable form), and they continued to do so in the second administration of the instrument. As a matter of fact, the female mean was even lower on the second administration of the test. One could conclude from this that, not only are youth assigned to the group homes no more manipulative than their peers; over time, the consistent milieu which the homes tend to provide fosters a lowering of manipulative tendencies during the period of assignment to the home.

The achievement-orientation measure was scored so that the higher score indicated greater orientation to achieve; i.e., a greater likelihood that the respondent would persist toward some standard of excellence, even in the face of obstacles. Both males and females assigned to the group homes were lower in achievement orientation than were the youths in the Kansas study and in the local comparison groups, with the exception of the students in the alternative education program in the local Catholic school. The females, the only group for which measurement over time was possible, increased in achievement orientation.

Presumably delinquents are poorly motivated for achievement, as a result of their lack of success in academic work, their lower social standing, and the like. A kind of "what's the use" feeling may develop, and the young person simply ceases making serious effort. A possible outcome of the environment provided by group homes is that this tendency could be reversed.

Finally, the self-concept measure was scored so that a lower score would indicate a more positive self-concept. In this study, the young persons were asked to rate themselves, their view of how their friends, their teachers and their mothers see them, on a series of ten dichotomous adjective scales. The youths in both group homes had somewhat less positive self-concepts (their mean scores were higher) than the comparison groups, a not surprising finding in that one would probably not expect persons adjudged delinquent to have high self-esteem. On the other hand, the environment of the group home may reasonably be expected to initiate

\*some recovery of this sense of worth. Examination of the data of Table 8 supports this conclusion. The mean scores for the females declined on all four self-concept scales, which indicates an improvement in self-concept.

Conclusion of this section: It seems clear that straight-forward interpretation of the foregoing data is precluded because of the small sample size, and especially because of the failure to be able to include time data for all participants. What comparisons are possible indicate: (1) the group home youths do not differ from the comparison groups in major ways (except for the female participants in internal/external) at the beginning of the program. During their participation in the program, apparently they (i.e., the females) begin to move in directions of more positive self-concepts and behaviors except in the area of sense of self-direction. (2) A possible explanation of this is that the structure provided by the group home context--that is, stability, firmness and concern--may be accounting for some of this movement.

### C. BENEFITS TO THE COMMUNITY

#### 1. Evaluation of Program by School Staff

A questionnaire (see Appendix B-1) was sent to the Omaha Public School (OPS) staff who had some degree of contact with youths residing in the group homes. The names were provided by the group home staff. Questionnaires were mailed to 33 OPS staff: 22 teachers, 7 counselors, and 4 principals. Of the 33 questionnaires mailed, 11 (33%) returned completed questionnaires and another 8 wrote to say that their contact with the group home program had been too limited to be able to make an evaluation. Of the 11 who responded, there were 6 teachers, 4 counselors, and 1 principal.

The school staff was asked to evaluate the program in four respects: (1) communication; (2) cooperation and assistance; (3) effectiveness in resolving school-related problems; and (4) the progress of students in terms of attitudes, behavior, and academic performance. They were asked to rate each item on a 7-category scale ranging from "completely satisfied" to "completely dissatisfied." The presentation of findings collapses the categories into three: satisfied, dissatisfied, and neither satisfied or dissatisfied.

As indicated in Table 9, the preponderance of those who responded expressed satisfaction with the program. Several strengths of the program were noted in the narrative comments: the point system and periodic reports provide good motivation; there is good support, guidance, and concern for the youths; and it provides a stable environment for the youths. The weaknesses identified in the narrative comments centered around problems with lack of spending money and transportation and with inadequate communication. School staff noted that the youths did not have pocket money available for supplies and extra-curricular events and that there did not seem to be transportation available to allow the youths to participate in extra-curricular events.

There were both positive and negative comments about communication; but there were specific criticisms about: (1) lack of knowledge by teachers, counselors, and principals of the program and how they could relate to it most effectively; (2) difficulty in reaching anyone to handle day-time emergencies; and (3) the problem of having to communicate with too many different people on relatively simple matters. Two persons suggested that there be a formal presentation about the program to school personnel. Two persons urged that the school be given more information on the youths.

TABLE 9: Evaluation of Program by School Staff

	<u>Satisfied</u>	<u>Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied</u>	<u>Dissatisfied</u>
1. Communication	5	3	1
2. Cooperation/Assistance	8	2	1
3. Responsiveness in Correcting Problems	6	2	2
4. Student Progress			
Attitudes	6	1	1
Behavior	8	0	0
Academic	7	0	1

2. Evaluation of the Program by Court, Agencies, Parents, Youths, and the Program Staff

A second questionnaire (see Appendix B-2) was sent to Juvenile Court judges and staff, agencies, parents, youths, and the program staff. This questionnaire asked for evaluation of the administration of the program, the cooperativeness of administrators, quality of facilities (attractiveness, cleanliness, safety and pleasantness), the developmental program (educational, social/recreational, personal development, and family development) and the staff. Like the other questionnaire, the responses were made on a 7-category scale which, for purposes of simplicity in presentation, were collapsed into three categories for this report: satisfied, dissatisfied, and neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

As shown in Table 10, fifty-nine questionnaires were mailed, 32 (54%) completed forms were returned and 3 blank forms were returned. Two completed forms provided neither a name nor any indication of which group the respondent was in, so they could not be included in the group data.



TABLE 10: Distribution of Responses to Questionnaire B-2

	<u>Number Mailed</u>	<u>Number of Completed Forms Returned</u>	<u>Number of Blank Forms Returned</u>
A. Juvenile Court	10	6 (60%)	1
B. Agencies	12	7 (58%)	1
C. Parents	15	4 (27%)	0
D. Youth	15	8 (53%)	1
E. Program Staff	7	5 (71%)	0
F. Unsigned	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>
	59	32 (54%)	3

a. Evaluation by Juvenile Court Personnel

Table 11 shows the distribution of responses from 6 Juvenile Court personnel who responded. In six of the eleven questions, only half or fewer of the respondents expressed satisfaction. There was a high level of satisfaction with the administrators, with the cooperation received, and with the safety and pleasantness of the homes.

TABLE 11: Evaluation of Program by Juvenile Court Personnel

	<u>Satisfied</u>	<u>Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied</u>	<u>Dissatisfied</u>
1. Administration	5	0	1
2. Cooperation	5	1	0
3. Facilities			
Attractive	3	0	2
Clean	3	1	2
Safe	5	0	1
Pleasant	5	0	1
4. Program			
Education	4	1	1
Social/Recreation	3	2	1
Personal Development	3	1	2
Family Development	2	1	3
5. Staff	3	2	1

The narrative comments included positive remarks about the location, food, and cooperation. Special note was made of the stability and excellent quality of Hartman House, the girls' group home. One person said that the program was the best alternative the Court has. Other comments noted the amount of

individual attention, the supervision, the patience and the flexibility exhibited by the staff.

The weaknesses noted in the narrative comments included concern about the slowness of the process of getting youths accepted into the homes and the difficulty of reaching the administrators. Regarding the internal operation of the homes, comments were made about "lack of controls" which created insecurity in youths, lack of enforcement of attendance at school and work, and "partiality" shown in the distribution of "fines" in the point system. Special note was made of the difficulties with Myott House, the boys' group home.

Recommendations included: stability in upper management positions; institution of a mechanism for contacting administrators; tighter discipline in homes; and more work with parents.

b. Evaluation by Personnel from Other Agencies

Most of the social programs which worked cooperatively with the group homes were other sub-units of the Eastern Nebraska Human Service Agency, e.g., the neighborhood mental health clinics, the foster care program, and the accounting office. Table 12 shows the distribution of the responses of the six persons who completed the questionnaire. Generally the responses were favorable. The high number of "neither satisfied nor dissatisfied" simply indicates lack of exposure to those aspects of the program. The areas in which there were indications of dissatisfaction were administration, cooperation of administrators, and the family development program. Some rather strong negative comments about these areas were made in the narrative comments.

TABLE 12: Evaluation of Program by Personnel from Other Social Agencies

	<u>Satisfied</u>	<u>Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied</u>	<u>Dissatisfied</u>
1. Administration	2	2	2
2. Cooperation	4	1	1
3. Facilities			
Attractive	4	2	0
Clean	4	2	0
Safe	4	2	0
Pleasant	4	2	0
4. Program			
Education	4	2	0
Social/Recreation	4	2	0
Personal Development	4	2	0
Family Development	2	3	1
5. Staff Relate to Youth			
Effectively	4	2	0

Narrative comments noted the following strengths: staff and immediate supervisors; staff involvement with youth; the point system as a developmental technique; the community settings of the homes; and the financial reporting. Comments on program weaknesses can be divided into references to administration, staff, and program. There were criticisms of program administration in regard to staff selection and supervision and attention to programmatic and financial reports and details. A question was also raised about lack of clarity in the division of decision-making responsibilities. Comments were made about difficulties related to the staff being too near the same age as the youth residents, and to the low level of skills among the staff. Finally, weaknesses were observed in programmatic aspects such as inadequate family counseling, inadequate planning for departure of youths, and lack of spending money for youths to use for recreation and personal needs.

Recommendations included: clarification of job descriptions and division of responsibilities; a more systematic plan and developmental program for youths who are accepted into the homes; more staff training; more counseling for youths and families; petty cash fund for allowances; and a stable funding base.

c. Evaluation of Program by Parents

Only four of the fifteen parents responded to the questionnaire. This was by far the poorest response group. Three of the four responses came from girls' parents. As can be seen in Table 13, the responses generally expressed satisfaction with the program.

---

TABLE 13: Evaluation of Program by Parents

	<u>Satisfied</u>	<u>Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied</u>	<u>Dissatisfied</u>
1. Administration	3	0	1
2. Cooperation	3	0	1
3. Facilities			
Attractive	4	0	0
Clean	4	0	0
Safe	4	0	0
Pleasant	4	0	0
4. Program			
Education	4	0	0
Social/Recreation	4	0	0
Personal Development	3	0	1
Family Development	3	0	1
5. Staff Relate to Youth			
Effectively	3	1	0

---

The narrative comments referred to the following strengths: concern of staff for youths; communication between staff and parents; improvement in youths. Weaknesses listed included: leniency of discipline; no change in attitudes of youths; not enough "morals" taught, and some poor staff.

Recommendations included: Limiting program to first offenders; staff training; more structure; a moral training/development program; and making the group homes less like a "vacation."

d. Evaluation of Program by Youths

Eight of the 15 youths who had participated in the program responded to the questionnaire, four females and four males. Table 14 shows the distribution of the responses, including a breakdown by male and female respondents. The totals show that there were more expressions of satisfaction (57%) than dissatisfaction (34%) and "neithers" (9%), and that the ratio of satisfaction/dissatisfaction/neither was the same for males and females. One can note, however, areas of differences in the male/female responses, and these become more evident in the narrative comments.

TABLE 14: Evaluation of the Program by Youths

	Satisfied		Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied	
	<u>M</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>F</u>
1. Administration	1	2	2	1	1	1
2. Cooperation	4	3	0	0	0	1
3. Facilities						
Attractive	2	3	0	0	2	1
Clean	2	2	1	0	1	2
Safe	2	1	0	1	2	2
Pleasant	2	3	0	0	2	1
4. Program						
Education	3	4	0	0	1	0
Recreation	1	1	0	1	3	2
Personal Development	3	2	0	0	1	2
Family Development	3	2	0	1	1	1
5. Staff Relate to Youth						
Effectively	2	2	1	0	1	2
	<u>25</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>15</u>

Favorable comments indicated: that staff really wanted to help, were fair and "hip"; that staff helped with school work; that good behavior was rewarded; and that there were good recreational opportunities. Criticisms included: no allowances; lack of recreation and recreational equipment; lack of freedom; maintenance

of homes; other boys unruly and staff could not handle them; lack of individual attention; and hostility of neighbors.

Recommendations were: allowances; clothes; maintenance of homes; change of neighborhoods; staff spend more time with youths.

e. Evaluation of Program by Staff

We felt program staff should also have a chance to evaluate the program. Questionnaires were only sent to staff who were still with the program in October, 1975. Including three administrative staff persons, there were only seven staff, and five of them responded. As shown in Table 15, the predominant response was favorable.

TABLE 15: Evaluation of Program by Staff

	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied
1. Administration	4	0	1
2. Cooperation	5	0	0
3. Facilities			
Attractive	4	0	1
Clean	5	0	0
Safe	4	0	1
Pleasant	5	0	0
4. Program			
Education	3	1	1
Social/Recreation	4	0	1
Personal Development	5	0	0
Family Development	5	0	0
5. Staff Relate Effectively to Youth	5	0	0

Strengths noted in the narrative comments included: homes provide an alternative to Youth Development Centers; good relations with Juvenile Court, clients, staff, and administrators; the attitudes and commitment of the staff; and the quality of consulting, counseling and medical services.

The most frequently mentioned problems with the program were: not having a petty cash fund (for allowances and recreational activities); and the inadequate orientation and training of staff. Other observations about areas of weakness were: inadequate transportation; lack of cooperation from Omaha Public Schools and the fact that only a half-day program at school was allowed; maintenance of the homes; size of Myott House; inadequate intake evaluation system; inadequate data collection system;

budgeting; and neighbors.

Recommendations for program improvement included: more work with families; increased coordination with courts and Omaha Public Schools; better staff orientation/training, especially in court procedures; petty cash fund; overnight resident counselors; more staff input in decisions about intake and termination; more utilization of outside resources; and more one-to-one contact with primary clients.

#### D. PROGRAM FINANCES

The first year of operation of this type of program would normally have very high costs. There is a period prior to the time when services can be provided when there are administrative costs related to: the search, selection and acquisition of facilities; the search for and selection of staff; the furnishing of a facility; and the referral and selection of youth residents. Also, it is common to have a low number of residents in the early stages of the program. However, this program had an unusually slow start and one of the three homes proposed was never developed. The program was funded for \$228,038.00 (\$205,234.00 by LEAA and \$22,804.00 by Douglas County) to operate for a sixteen-month period. Only \$10,148.70 were expended in the first seven months (November 28, 1973 to June 30, 1974) when projected expenditures called for expending \$99,766.59. Even though the funding period was extended for 3 months (to June 30, 1975) the program only expended 45% of the allocated funds. During the nineteen months of funding (November 28, 1973 to June 30, 1975), \$103,068.53 of the \$228,038.00 was expended.

##### 1. Longitudinal Analysis of Expenditures

Table 16 is a financial analysis of program expenditures on a monthly basis, broken into four categories: administrative; Myott House; Hartman House; and total program costs. The expenditures for November 28, 1973 to June 30, 1974 were consolidated since expenditures were so low during that time. The Table shows a division between the nineteen months of the grant period (November 28, 1973 to June 30, 1975) and the three months of the post-grant period (July 1, 1975 to September 30, 1975) in order to clearly distinguish those periods.

Ann Kopinski, the resident supervisor for the two homes and the only administrator paid from grant funds after January, 1975, was paid from the cost center for Hartman House, which accounts for the low expenditures in the administrative cost category. This also distorts the Hartman House expenditures. Mike Durr, coordinator of Adolescent Group Homes, receives no salary from any of the cost center categories.

It should be noted that the high administrative costs in March, 1975 included the large initial payment for the evaluation/research component of the program (\$3600). Also the administrative costs of June (\$2,540.00) and July (\$1,716.00) are entirely attributable to the costs of the evaluation/research component of the program.

TABLE 16: Longitudinal Analysis of Expenditure Rates  
(November 28, 1973 - September 30, 1975)

	<u>Admin.</u>	<u>Myott</u>	<u>Hartman</u>	<u>Total</u>
Nov. 28, 1973 - June 30, 1974	\$ 7,305.40	\$ 2,843.30	-0-	\$ 10,148.70
July, 1974	1,732.11	1,950.91	\$ 105.28	3,788.30
Aug., 1974	1,865.29	2,402.71	1,188.40	5,456.40
Sept., 1974	1,789.90	5,770.52	103.67	7,664.09
Oct., 1974	1,804.29	6,482.01	1,782.79	10,069.09
Nov., 1974	1,624.07	5,341.60	3,203.92	10,169.59
Dec., 1974	815.34	4,761.49	1,416.27	6,993.10
Jan., 1975	1,051.41	3,935.16	2,290.89	7,277.46
Feb., 1975	43.39	4,169.92	1,750.36	5,963.67
March, 1975	3,619.09	2,586.24	1,316.27	7,521.60
April, 1975	211.82	3,644.99	1,438.09	5,294.90
May, 1975	9.88	2,033.52	2,181.87	4,225.27
June, 1975	2,540.00	6,885.95	6,267.95	15,693.90
SUBTOTALS (Grant Period)	\$24,411.99	\$52,808.32	\$23,045.76	\$100,266.07*
July, 1975	1,716.00	4,026.38	4,308.55	10,050.93
Aug., 1975	-0-	3,439.56	4,220.71	7,660.27
Sept., 1975	-0-	2,548.67	3,823.44	6,372.11
TOTAL (Grant and Post-Grant Period)	\$26,127.99	\$62,822.93	\$35,378.46	\$124,349.38

\*Due to expenditures during July which were chargeable to the grant, the actual total expenditures charged to the grant were \$103,068.53. However, the totals listed above were used in calculations in the following tables.

## 2. Analysis of Per Unit Cost of Service

The summary of the number of youth days of occupancy per month and of the per diem costs for each month is shown in Table 17. The absence of any "youth-days of residency" until July indicates that the program did not become operational until seven months after funding.

The per diem costs were highest in September, 1974, three months after the first admission of a youth into the group home. The per diem costs after that time basically followed a downward trend. There were two major changes in the per diem costs: a \$47.31 drop in cost per day between the months of November and December, 1974 and a \$31.27 drop in cost per day between April and May, 1975. Both decreases in costs coincided with the arrival of new administrative personnel and with increases in the number of youth-days of residency.

TABLE 17: Youth Days of Residency and Per Diem Costs by Month

<u>Grant Period</u>	<u>Youth Days of Residency</u>	<u>Per Diem Costs</u>
Nov. 1973 - June 1974	0	(10,148.70)*
July, 1974	51	74.28
Aug., 1974	62	88.01
Sept., 1974	64	119.75
Oct., 1974	93	108.27
Nov., 1974	101	100.69
Dec., 1974	131	53.38
Jan., 1975	174	41.82
Feb., 1975	143	41.70
March, 1975	135	55.71
April, 1975	91	58.18
May, 1975	157	26.91
June, 1975	269	58.34
SUBTOTAL	1471	68.16
<u>Post-Grant Period</u>		
July, 1975	279	36.02
Aug., 1975	263	29.13
**Sept., 1975	(286**) 240	(22.28**) 26.55
SUBTOTAL	782	30.79
TOTAL	2253	55.19

\*Shows expenditures prior to any youth-days of residency, so not a "per-diem" rate.

\*\*There were two youths who entered the program in September who were excluded from all aspects of this research study. Consequently the number of youth-days of residency was actually higher (and the per diem rate lower) in September than indicated here.

The most significant change in the number of youth-days of residency occurred between May and June of 1975 when there was an increase of 126 youth-days. However, the per diem cost increased between May and June. This can be explained by observing that June, 1975 was the last month of LEAA funding and there are indications that the program made an effort to take advantage of the federal funds before they were no longer available. The total cost (\$15,693.90) for that month included several large expenditures for each group home. Major expenses at Hartman House in June included \$333.60 for medical services, \$636.85 for land and building equipment, \$295.71 for kitchen supplies, and \$664.67 for raw food. At Myott House, major expenses for the month of June included \$1,174.63 for raw food (\$416.08 of this amount was applicable to the previous month), \$308.86 for telephone services, and \$940.60 for



furniture. In addition, the \$2,540.00 listed in administrative costs is attributable to the research/evaluation component of the program.

The total number of youth-days during the three-month post-grant period (782 youth-days) is over one-half the total number of youth days during the nineteen months of the grant period (1471 youth-days). The three-month post-grant period plus the preceding month (June) represent the first period of months that the program operated at a stable, full occupancy level. This reflects favorably upon the current administration and demonstrates more realistically the actual costs of operating this kind of program.

When the total number of youth-days of occupancy (782) is divided into the total expenditures for the last three months of evaluation (post-grant period), the resulting cost per day of youth occupancy is \$30.79, which would calculate to \$11,238.35 per year per youth. This cost compares favorably with the rates in the state institutions of about \$30.00 per day (or about \$11,000.00 per year per youth). However, when either one of these rates is compared to the cost per youth per year in the foster care program (\$4,000.00 to \$4,400.00 per year), the amount of money spent in group homes and state institutions is considerably greater.

Table 18 summarizes the number of youth-days of residency and program costs on a per diem and annual rate for various time periods.

---

TABLE 18: Youth Days, Per Diem Costs Per Youth and  
Annual Costs Per Youth by Major Time Periods

	<u>Youth Days</u>	<u>Per Diem Costs</u>	<u>Annual Costs</u>
A. Grant Period (Nov. 28, 1973-June 30, 1975)	1471	\$68.16	\$24,878.40
B. Post-Grant Period (July 1, 1975-Sept. 30, 1975)	782	30.79	11,238.35
C. Grant Period & Post-grant Period (Nov. 28, 1973 - Sept. 30, 1975)	2253	55.19	20,144.85
D. Research/Evaluation Period (Jan. 1, 1975-Sept. 30, 1975)	1797	38.98	14,227.70

---

The table shows significant differences between the grant period and the post-grant period. The per diem costs of the grant period (\$68.16) reflects the high cost of starting the program, the instability of the administration of the program, and the low occupancy rate. The per diem costs of the post-grant period (\$30.79) reflects the optimal level of operation, the stability of the administration, and a high occupancy rate.

In addition to the three periods just described, Table 18 gives cost data on a fourth period, namely the nine-month period during which the research was being conducted. The research/evaluation period includes the last six months of the grant-period plus the three-month post-grant period. This nine-month period thus excludes the most problematic (and costly) time during the grant period but includes months when the program was not operating at its optimal level. Thus this fourth period (January 1, 1975 to September 30, 1975) reflects the costs of the program from the time that it should have been fully operational until the end of the research/evaluation period.

### 3. Analysis of Financial Processes and Planning

For a major part of the program, the financial processes and planning were a primary area of neglect. The lack of foresight and responsiveness on the part of the administrators of the program allowed major financial problems to develop.

At the beginning of the program there were antagonisms between the ENHSA accounting office and this program. The original program budget did not provide for many of the kinds of expenditures which were essential to the operation of the project, so the accounting office continually rejected payment vouchers and requested that grant modifications be made in order to legitimize such expenditures. It was September, 1974 before a revised budget was submitted; LEAA approved the revisions on January 31, 1975 and relations with the accounting office have since improved.

Some frictions continued, however. For example, personnel action forms continued to be submitted late and required retroactive pay charges.

Another source of friction was the veto by the accounting department of any plan to create a petty cash fund. It is understandable that the accounting department would be concerned foremost with fiscal controls and therefore oppose the establishment of any petty cash fund; Douglas County fiscal authorities have been especially sensitive to this issue because of the criminal indictments issued against administrators of the Douglas County Hospital related to the alleged abuse of a petty cash fund. On the other hand, the importance of a petty cash fund for allowances and recreational expenditures is obvious in a group home program. Not having such a fund places tremendous financial burdens on staff who receive relatively low salaries and are responsible for providing social and recreational outlets for the youths. It means that the staff must use their personal funds for allowances and recreation and then wait for the 30-90 days usually required for reimbursement.

Finally, there were some abuses of funds by program staff. In some instances staff purchased personal items on program accounts and in other instances there were excessive expenditures in some home budget categories. Appropriate actions were taken against staff who misused program accounts, and new procedures were instituted to avoid any repetition of these abuses.

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

##### A. INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS

It is clear that this program was not given adequate administrative attention until the last few months of the grant period. (The grant period was November 28, 1973 to June 30, 1975) As a result, the program performance must be judged as poor when the total grant period is considered. There was not a clear understanding of and commitment to the concepts and philosophy included in the proposal. The program never reached its proposed objectives; that is, the treatment approach was never systematically implemented nor was the third of three proposed homes ever opened. The administrative structure and the program's placement within the ENHSA super-structure kept shifting. There was high turnover in administrative leadership, program staff and youth participants. There was poor relationships or absence of relationships with the Juvenile Court, schools, social agencies and neighborhood until late in the grant period.

Taking the entire grant period into consideration, the program management and operation must be judged as extremely unsatisfactory. While the data on the management and operation of the program is easily available and assessable and clear conclusions can be drawn, the poor management made it less feasible to collect, assess, and evaluate the affect of the program on the participants. On the one hand, only 25% of the eight youths who left the program prior to September, 1975, had successfully completed the program and 75% were incarcerated (see III, B, 2, c-d above).

On the other hand, there is evidence in the research data to suggest that the record of successful completions was improving in the later stages of the research period and that there were positive attitudinal and behavioral changes occurring in the homes. Thus there are hints of significant positive potential for the group home program, but the smallness of the population and the inadequacy of the data which could be collected makes it impossible to draw definite conclusions about the effectiveness of the program in achieving positive changes in youths.

In fact, perhaps the most apparent conclusion that can be made in reference to the effectiveness of the program is that the program really was not given an opportunity to be tested and to prove its worth or lack of worth. In essence the program as proposed was never implemented; furthermore a stable, fully developed alternative to the proposed program was not accomplished until the last two months of the grant period. Thus the program which was to be evaluated had barely been developed when the research period ended.

Since the concept of adolescent group homes has not really had a chance to be tested and since there are indications that the current program is relatively stable and has a fairly systematic program, it seems appropriate to point to several positive aspects of the program that make it worthwhile to continue efforts to develop and test a quality program:

1. There is general agreement that institutions have more adverse than positive effects on most persons who pass through them. There is also general agreement that there needs to be a variety of alternatives to institutional placement of youths on the one hand and to returning youths to untenable home situations on the other. Group homes provide one alternative; they provide a developmental program within the context of a home-like environment in a community setting.
2. Financially, the group home program has demonstrated in the last three months of the research period (which was the post-grant period, July-September, 1975) that it could operate at costs comparable to that of the state youth development centers, or approximately \$30 per youth per day.
3. Since the administrative change in April, 1975, there have been major improvements in the communications and interagency linkages, in staff training opportunities, in consultation and supportive services, in supervision and program management, and in the developmental program in the homes. Many problems remain, especially in the boys' group home, but a multitude of problems have been resolved during this period.

### 4. RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE FUTURE OF THE GROUP HOME PROGRAM

Douglas County has assumed funding of the two group homes since the termination of the LEAA grant on June 30, 1975. Since the decision to continue the program has already been made, it is appropriate that several recommendations be made regarding specific aspects of the program which have been identified as problem areas as well as one or two general recommendations:

1. That a specific detailed plan for the developmental program within the group homes be developed.

As stated in the findings, no systematic pattern or model for the developmental program exists. The administration and staff need to struggle with specifying and putting into written form the assumptions, principles, patterns of action, and expectations which are only vaguely stated at present in phrases such as "forming relationships with the youths." If we are to learn from successes and failures, social service programs must specify much more clearly what they are doing and how they are doing it--both for clarity and consistency within the staff and so that variables that contribute to successes or failures can be identified.

2. That a specific, detailed plan for supportive services and interagency linkages be developed.

The program has developed a fairly good system of linkages, especially with the resources of the community mental health clinics. If the resources of those cooperating programs shrink because of financial cutbacks, it may be more difficult for them to retain their commitment of time and resources to programs such as the group homes. Yet the success of the group homes depends on these supportive services; if the supportive services are not present, it is more likely that the financial investment in the group homes will be wasted. It is crucial,

therefore, that the supportive services be retained.

3. That a Community Advisory Committee be established immediately.

This was an element in the original proposal that was never implemented. It was also a recommendation in the first quarterly report of the evaluation team in April, 1975. The program needs better communication with the neighborhoods and with various social service agencies; it needs to be accountable to some group that reviews its progress and performance; and it needs a constituency to advocate in its behalf if it is in fact performing well.

4. That greater attention be given to staff selection, orientation, supervision and training.

As stated in the findings, the low salary virtually guarantees that the staff will have minimal education and experience and makes it likely that there will be high turnover. In order to compensate for the lack of experience and training, it is doubly important to make a careful selection to assure maturity and potential for development. Then it is crucial to provide the best possible orientation, supervision, and training, both to develop skills and to develop staff morale, comradery, and commitment that will create the unique spirit that plays such an important part in the success of small group endeavors. This will probably necessitate a good system of either paid or volunteer substitutes who can free the staff for frequent group sessions.

5. That a volunteer program be developed.

Not enough attention has been given to the use of volunteers. A group home program is sufficiently small and specific that there is much potential for connecting with a specific religious or civic group which would adopt the group homes as the focus for their volunteer efforts. Volunteers could provide relief personnel for staff training time, could help provide transportation for group recreational activities, could form personal ties with individual youths in the program, and could connect the program with a variety of community resources as specific needs arose.

6. That there be high-level negotiations with the Omaha Public Schools with a goal of having OPS provide more full-day programs for problem youths.

Such negotiations might be initiated by the ENHSA Board, but should involve representatives of the Juvenile Court and various youth-serving agencies. At present, many of the youths attend school only two hours a day, which places extra personnel and financial burdens on the group home program, to say nothing of the limited educational development provided for the youths.

7. That the perpetual problem of providing weekly allowances be resolved.

The least we can ask of group homes is that they provide those minimal benefits which are common to normal home situations. One of those is a weekly allowance, which provides some degree of independence and choice.

While there are fiscal constraints that must be taken into consideration, it seems unbelievable that there is not some way to achieve the desired objective within the framework of the fiscal constraints. If adequate attention and creativity were focused on the problem, some solution could surely be found. Allowances seem like a minor issue and consequently perhaps the issue has not received adequate attention. It cannot be overemphasized that for a group home program, it is a major issue which can significantly affect the morale of the program.

If no solution can be found within the context of the public fiscal mechanism, some combination of private and public financial resources needs to be explored. For example, perhaps a civic or religious organization could make no-interest private loans to program staff so that the staff would have the "seed money" to expend and then await reimbursement from the county treasurer.

8. That the problem of transportation to extracurricular school activities and other group social/recreational activities be resolved.

This may require purchase of a van or station wagon for each group home or it may be resolvable in other ways such as via the use of volunteers or the use of staff cars. This latter may be feasible since there are usually two staff persons on duty during late afternoon and evening hours. At any rate, transportation problems can severely hamper social/recreational opportunities and thus have significant effect on the morale and on the developmental program, so the issue is important.

9. That a system be established to facilitate contact with the program administrators.

As noted in the findings (see III, A, 4, 8), there has been a persistent problem with trying to locate the program administrators. The persons responsible for supervision of these administrators need to insist on a check-in procedure whereby a designated office either knows where to locate the administrator or can take messages and assure callers that the administrator will call for messages by a specified time.

10. That a systematic record-keeping system be developed and implemented.

A check-list should be devised as a cover sheet for each participant. The check-list should specify all base-line data that must be gathered on each new participant (e.g., demographic data, police records, court contacts, academic and attendance records from the

schools, medical records) and the data to be gathered periodically (e.g., administration of attitude tests, school grades and attendance records, point cards, narrative logs). There should be clear designation of responsibilities for obtaining and maintaining the various kinds of data. There should be monthly conferences between the residential supervisor and each resident counselor to review the records to assure that everything is current and complete. There should be a "tickler file" system developed to serve as a reminder of when tests should be administered or other types of follow-up should be done.

11. That some kind of intermittent external evaluation be conducted.

It is important to assess the progress of the program in implementing goals and plans to which it commits itself and to evaluate the effectiveness of the program in achieving positive changes in youths. There is evidence that one of the major factors in getting administrative attention focused on the Adolescent Group Home Program was the implementation of the evaluation component and the quarterly reports which it produced. Thus evaluation serves not only to assess program effectiveness and specific areas of strength and weakness; but also to remind busy administrators of the existence of a program and their responsibility to give attention to the resolution of its problems.

12. That serious attention and study be given to the relative benefits to different youths as well as to the comparative costs of foster care and group homes.

Foster care is obviously a less expensive form of care than group homes or institutions. Even if foster care payments were increased significantly to make such involvement more attractive to a broader range of people, the costs of foster care would be comparatively low. The problem is that we do not know the relative effectiveness of foster care as compared with group homes, and we do not know which youths would likely to benefit most by which kinds of care. These are just two of a multitude of uncertainties which need to be studied systematically via demonstration programs which are carefully structured and researched. In a period of shrinking funds for human services, an approach which costs less and which may in many cases be a preferred option in terms of the development of the adolescent certainly deserves our attention.

## APPENDICES



## APPENDIX A: MEASURES OF ATTITUDE CHANGE

### Appendix A-1: Instructions for Administration of the Scales

My name is \_\_\_\_\_ and, as your house parents have probably already told you, I am here to obtain some information about you so I can find out what happens to people who are in the program. To obtain this information, I have brought along four different questionnaires which I would like for you to fill out. Actually, you'll be filling out seven questionnaires because you'll be filling out one questionnaire four times. I will give you instructions for completing each questionnaire before you begin filling it out. Before we begin, I'd like for you to remember that this is not a test--there are no right or wrong answers. We simply want to find out how you feel about yourself and the world around you. Also, in completing these questionnaires, please do not think about your feelings before marking your answer, just mark your immediate feeling, the way you feel after hearing the statement read. Before we begin, I want you to write your name at the top of each questionnaire.

Are there any questions?

Okay, then we're ready to begin.

- (1) Here's the first questionnaire. This questionnaire is made up of 40 different statements which I will read to you. You'll probably find that you agree with some and disagree with others. If you agree with a statement, place a checkmark in the space provided at the left of the statement. If you disagree, make no mark and wait for me to read the next statement. Remember, do not think about your feelings, mark your gut reaction.
- (2) Here is the second questionnaire. It contains 20 statements which I will read to you. You will find that you agree with some of the statements and disagree with others. Notice that there are five symbols to the right of each statement. You are to circle the symbol that represents the way you feel. The symbols stand for "strongly agree," "agree," "undecided," "disagree," and "strongly disagree." If you agree with a statement but don't feel strongly about it, circle the "A." If you are undecided, circle the "U" and so on.
- (3) Here is the third questionnaire. It contains 8 statements which I will read to you. You will find that you agree with some statements and disagree with others. Once again, there are 5 symbols to the right of each statement and they stand for "strongly agree," "agree," "undecided," "disagree," and "strongly agree." You are to circle the symbol that represents your feelings.
- (4) This is the fourth questionnaire. You will fill it out four times. This questionnaire consists of ten pairs of words with opposite meanings and seven answer spaces between each pair. Each pair of words describes a different view of yourself. We want you to place a checkmark between each pair. The closer you place a checkmark to

APPENDIX A: MEASURES OF ATTITUDE CHANGE (continued)

Appendix A-1: Instructions for Administration of the Scales (continued)

one word of a pair, the better you are saying that word describes you. For example, using the words, "good" and "bad," a checkmark in space #1, which is the closest space to "good," means you think of yourself as being very good. If you were to place a checkmark in space #3, you would still be indicating that "good" describes you better than "bad" but you don't believe you are so good that you could place a checkmark in either of the first two spaces. If you place a checkmark in the fourth space, which is the middle space, then you are saying both words describe you equally well.

- (a) This first time, I want you to write the sentence, "I am" under your name. Now fill the questionnaire out according to the way you see yourself.
- (b) This time, write the sentence, "My teachers think I am" under your name. Now fill the questionnaire out the ways you think your teachers see you.
- (c) Okay. This time, write the sentence, "My friends think I am" under your name. Now fill the questionnaire out the way you think your friends see you.
- (d) This is the last questionnaire. Write the sentence, "My mother thinks I am" under your name and fill the questionnaire out the way your mother sees you.

Thank you for your cooperation. As I said before, this information will be used to determine what happens to people who are in this program.

So that we will know how you are doing, we'll be back every three or four months for the next year to have you fill out these same types of questionnaires. If you want to know, I can also give you the results of these questionnaires.

APPENDIX A: MEASURES OF ATTITUDE CHANGE (continued)

Appendix A-2: Internal-External Scale

The following scale is reported in Stephen Nowicki, Jr. and Bonnie R. Strickland, "A Locus of Control Scale for Children," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology (Vol. 40, No. 1, 1973), pp. 148-154.

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Do you believe that most problems will solve themselves if you just don't fool with them?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Do you believe that you can stop yourself from catching a cold?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Are some kids just born lucky?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Most of the time do you feel that getting good grades means a great deal to you?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Are you often blamed for things that just aren't your fault?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. Do you believe that if somebody studies hard enough he or she can pass any subject?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. Do you feel that most of the time it doesn't pay to try hard because things never turn out right anyway?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8. Do you feel that if things start out well in the morning that it's going to be a good day no matter what you do?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 9. Do you feel that most of the time parents listen to what their children have to say?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10. Do you believe that wishing can make good things happen?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 11. When you get punished does it usually seem its for no good reason at all?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 12. Most of the time do you find it hard to change a friend's (mind) opinion?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 13. Do you think that cheering more than luck helps a team to win?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 14. Do you feel that it's nearly impossible to change your parent's mind about anything?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 15. Do you believe that your parents should allow you to make most of your own decisions?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 16. Do you feel that when you do something wrong there's very little you can do to make it right?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 17. Do you believe that most kids are just born good at sports?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 18. Are most of the other kids your age stronger than you are?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 19. Do you feel that one of the best ways to handle most problems is just not to think about them?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 20. Do you feel that you have a lot of choice in deciding who your friends are?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 21. If you find a four-leaf clover do you believe that it might bring you good luck?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 22. Do you often feel that whether you do your homework has much to do with what kind of grades you get?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 23. Do you feel that when a kid your age decides to hit you, there's little you can do to stop him or her?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 24. Have you ever had a good-luck charm?

APPENDIX A: MEASURES OF ATTITUDE CHANGE (continued)

Appendix A-2: Internal-External Scale

- \_\_\_\_\_ 25. Do you believe that whether or not people like you depends on how you act?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 26. Will your parents usually help you if you ask them to?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 27. Have you felt that when people were mean to you it was usually for no reason at all?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 28. Most of the time, do you feel that you can change what might happen tomorrow by what you do today?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 29. Do you believe that when bad things are going to happen they just are going to happen no matter what you try to do to stop them?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 30. Do you think that kids can get their own way if they just keep trying?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 31. Most of the time do you find it useless to try to get your own way at home?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 32. Do you feel that when good things happen they happen because of hard work?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 33. Do you feel that when somebody your age wants to be your enemy there's little you can do to change matters?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 34. Do you feel that it's easy to get friends to do what you want them to?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 35. Do you usually feel that you have little to say about what you get to eat at home?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 36. Do you feel that when someone doesn't like you there's little you can do about it?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 37. Do you usually feel that it's almost useless to try in school because most other children are just plain smarter than you are?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 38. Are you the kind of person who believes that planning ahead makes things turn out better?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 39. Most of the time, do you feel that you have little to say about what your family decides to do?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 40. Do you think it's better to be smart than to be lucky?

APPENDIX A: MEASURES OF ATTITUDE CHANGE (continued)

Appendix A-3: Machiavellian Scale

The following scale is reported in Richard Christie and Florence L. Geis, Studies in Machiavellianism (New York: Academic Press, 1970), p. 372.

+	1.	Never tell anyone why you did something unless it will help you.	SA	A	U	D	SD
-	2.	Most people are good and kind.	SA	A	U	D	SD
+	3.	The best way to get along with people is to tell them things that make them happy.	SA	A	U	D	SD
-	4.	You should do something only when you are sure it is right.	SA	A	U	D	SD
+	5.	It is smartest to believe that all people will be mean if they have a chance.	SA	A	U	D	SD
-	6.	You should always be honest, no matter what.	SA	A	U	D	SD
+	7.	Sometimes you have to hurt other people to get what you want.	SA	A	U	D	SD
+	8.	Most people won't work hard unless you make them do it.	SA	A	U	D	SD
-	9.	It is better to be ordinary and honest than famous and dishonest.	SA	A	U	D	SD
-	10.	It's better to tell someone why you want him to help you than to make up a good story to get him to do it.	SA	A	U	D	SD
-	11.	Successful people are mostly honest and good.	SA	A	U	D	SD
+	12.	Anyone who completely trusts anyone else is asking for trouble.	SA	A	U	D	SD
+	13.	A criminal is just like other people except that he is stupid enough to get caught.	SA	A	U	D	SD
-	14.	Most people are brave.	SA	A	U	D	SD
+	15.	It is smart to be nice to important people even if you don't really like them.	SA	A	U	D	SD
-	16.	It is possible to be good in every way.	SA	A	U	D	SD
-	17.	Most people cannot be easily fooled.	SA	A	U	D	SD
+	18.	Sometimes you have to cheat a little to get what you want.	SA	A	U	D	SD
-	19.	It is never right to tell a lie.	SA	A	U	D	SD
+	20.	It hurts more to lose money than to lose a friend.	SA	A	U	D	SD

APPENDIX A: MEASURES OF ATTITUDE CHANGE (continued)

Appendix A-4: Achievement-Orientation Scale

The following scale is reported in Fred L. Strodbeck, "Family Interaction, Values, and Achievement," in David C. McClelland, et al. (ed), Talent and Society (Princeton, N.J.: Van Nos Reinhold, 1958), pp. 135-194.

- |  |    |   |   |   |    |
|--|----|---|---|---|----|
| 1. Planning only makes a person unhappy since your plans hardly every work out anyhow.   | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 2. When a man is born, the success he's going to have is already in the cards, so he might as well accept it and not fight against it.       | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 3. Nowadays, with world conditions the way they are, the wise person lives for today and lets tomorrow take care of itself.                  | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 4. Even when teen-agers get married, their main loyalty still belongs to their fathers and mothers.  | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 5. When the time comes for a boy to take a job, he should stay near his parents, even if it means giving up a good job opportunity.          | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 6. Nothing in life is worth the sacrifice of moving away from your parents.  | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 7. The best kind of job to have is one where you are a part of an organization all working together even if you don't get individual credit. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 8. It's silly for a teen'ager to put money into a car when the money could be used to get started in business or for an education.           | SA | A | U | D | SD |

## APPENDIX A: MEASURES OF ATTITUDE CHANGE (continued)

Appendix A-5: Self-Concept Scale

The following scale is a modification of the Semantic Differential Scale, which is reported in Charles E. Osgood, et al., The Measurement of Meaning (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957).

[illegible]

# APPENDIX B: COMMUNITY QUESTIONNAIRES

The following questionnaires are modifications of the questionnaires reported in Elery L. Phillips et al., The Teaching-Family Handbook (Lawrence, Kansas: Bureau of Child Research, University of Kansas, 1972, revised 1974), pp. 241-247.

## Appendix B-1: Questionnaire for Schools

1. Are you satisfied that the administrators of the program are doing an effective job of administering the program; e.g., budgeting; selecting, training, and supervising staff; developing program linkages; etc.?

- ☐ Completely satisfied
- ☐ Satisfied
- ☐ Slightly satisfied
- ☐ Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- ☐ Slightly dissatisfied
- ☐ Dissatisfied
- ☐ Completely dissatisfied

COMMENTS: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

2. Are you satisfied with the degree of cooperation you have received from the administrators of the program?

- ☐ Completely satisfied
- ☐ Satisfied
- ☐ Slightly satisfied
- ☐ Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- ☐ Slightly dissatisfied
- ☐ Dissatisfied
- ☐ Completely dissatisfied

COMMENTS: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

3. Are you satisfied that the program is providing the youths with an attractive, clean, safe, and pleasant living environment?

Attractive	Clean	Safe	Pleasant
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Completely satisfied  
Satisfied  
Slightly satisfied  
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied  
Slightly dissatisfied  
Dissatisfied  
Completely dissatisfied



APPENDIX B: COMMUNITY QUESTIONNAIRES (continued)

Appendix B-1: Questionnaire for Schools (continued)

4. Are you satisfied that the program provides adequate services to the youths in the areas of education, social/recreation, personal development, and family development?

Education	Social/ Recreation	Personal Development	Family Devel.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Completely satisfied
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfied
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Slightly satisfied
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither satisf. nor dissatisf.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Slightly dissatisfied
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Dissatisfied
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Completely dissatisfied

5. Are you satisfied that the staff in the homes are doing an effective job of relating to the youths in a way that contributes to the development of the youths in the program?

☐ Completely satisfied  
☐ Satisfied  
☐ Slightly satisfied  
☐ Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied  
☐ Slightly dissatisfied  
☐ Dissatisfied  
☐ Completely dissatisfied

COMMENTS: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

6. Please make specific comments on your perceptions of the strengths of the program: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Problems of the program: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

7. Please make specific suggestions or recommendations; \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX B: COMMUNITY QUESTIONNAIRES (continued)

Appendix B-1: Questionnaire for Schools (continued)

8. Please indicate the length of time you have been associated with this program. From \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_.
9. Please indicate how you want us to use the above information.

☐ I have no objection to having my evaluation quoted or identified with me.

☐ I do not want my evaluation to be quoted or identified with me.

Signed \_\_\_\_\_

Position \_\_\_\_\_

Agency \_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX B: COMMUNITY QUESTIONNAIRES (continued)

Appendix B-2: Questionnaire for Court, Agencies, Parents, Youths and Staff

According to our records you teach, supervise, or come into contact with the following student(s) who are living in the above named program:

NAME OF STUDENT(S)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

1. Are you satisfied with the amount and quality of communication between the school and the staff?

- ☐ Completely satisfied  
☐ Satisfied  
☐ Slightly satisfied  
☐ Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied  
☐ Slightly dissatisfied  
☐ Dissatisfied  
☐ Completely dissatisfied

COMMENTS: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

2. Are you satisfied with the amount and quality of cooperation and assistance you have received from the staff in working with the above-named student(s)?

- ☐ Completely satisfied  
☐ Satisfied  
☐ Slightly satisfied  
☐ Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied  
☐ Slightly dissatisfied  
☐ Dissatisfied  
☐ Completely dissatisfied

COMMENTS: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

3. Are you satisfied that the staff is doing an effective job in quickly responding and correcting the recognized school-related problems of the student(s) placed in their custody?

- ☐ Completely satisfied  
☐ Satisfied  
☐ Slightly satisfied  
☐ Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied  
☐ Slightly dissatisfied  
☐ Dissatisfied  
☐ Completely dissatisfied

COMMENTS: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

4. Are you satisfied with the progress of the students in the areas of attitudes, behavior, and academic performance?

Attitudes Behavior Academic Performance

☐  
☐  
☐  
☐  
☐  
☐  
☐  
☐  
☐  
☐

☐  
☐  
☐  
☐  
☐  
☐  
☐  
☐  
☐  
☐

☐  
☐  
☐  
☐  
☐  
☐  
☐  
☐  
☐  
☐

Completely satisfied  
Satisfied  
Slightly satisfied  
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied  
Slightly dissatisfied  
Dissatisfied  
Completely dissatisfied

APPENDIX B: COMMUNITY QUESTIONNAIRES (continued)

Appendix B-2: Questionnaire for Court, Agencies, Parents, Youths and Staff (continued)

5. Please make specific comments on your perceptions of the strengths of the program in working with the school: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Problems of the program in working with the school: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

6. Please make specific suggestions or recommendations in improving the program/school service to the youth. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

7. Please indicate the length of time you have been associated with this program.  
From \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_.

8. Please indicate how you want us to use the above information.

- ☐ I have no objection to having my evaluation quoted or identified with me.  
☐ I do not want my evaluation to be quoted or identified with me.

Signed \_\_\_\_\_  
Position \_\_\_\_\_  
School \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix C

## LENGTH OF RESIDENCE OF YOUTH PLACED IN GROUP HOME

	1973		1974					1975															
Myott	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	
1-A								5						30									210 Days
1-B								8										13					310
1-C									27						11								166
1-D													17			1							75
1-E																		12					142
1-F																		12		15			96
1-G																		19					135
1-H																		26					128
1-I																			2				121
Hartman																							1,383 days (boys)
2-A													14										11 days
2-B													2		3								64
2-C													24										281
2-D														27									247
2-E																			14				140
2-F																			27				127
																							870 days (girls)
Total								51	62	64	93	101	131	174	143	135	91	157	269	279	263	286	2,253 days

NOTE: Two residents who entered the program (Myott House) in the last month of the research period were excluded from the study. If they had been included, there would have been an additional 46 days of residency in September.

**END**

7/10/55/1000