

BIG BROTHERS OF SUSSEX COUNTY
(Big Brothers of Delaware)

A Project Evaluation

Submitted to the Executive Committee
of the
Delaware Agency to Reduce Crime

by
Pat Robinson
Division of Evaluation -- DARC

December, 1976

38944

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	iii
PROJECT INFORMATION.....	vii
Section	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. PERFORMANCE.....	3
Background.....	3
Goals, Objectives and Accomplishments.....	4
III. IMPACT.....	7
Effect on Clients.....	8
Impact on the Problem.....	10
Subjective Impressions.....	10
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	11
Conclusions.....	11
Recommendations.....	13
APPENDIX A.....	15
APPENDIX B.....	18
APPENDIX C.....	20

ABSTRACT

Beginning in 1973 DARC had awarded a total of \$41,975 through three subgrants (FA-82-73, 74-024 and 75-076) for the implementation and operation of the Big Brothers of Sussex County. The majority of funds were used for the salaries of a Big Brothers field representative and a part time secretary located in Georgetown. The purpose of this project was to prevent delinquency among fatherless boys in Sussex County through association with a volunteer Big Brother who would provide supportive friendship to the youth. In the final year of operation the project was expanded to include a Big Sisters component. The purpose of this report was to examine the implementation, operation and impact of the project.

The evaluation found that the project had been implemented successfully. Although the precise number of proposed individuals to be served was unclear, the project did match a total of 69 youth with volunteer Big Brothers/Big Sisters (BB/BS). Some projects which have relied on outside sources for referrals have not received the number of referrals projected, but the Big Brothers project did not experience this problem. Indeed, 35 more youth were referred to the project than were matched with volunteers due to the unavailability of BB/BS. The reason for an insufficient number of BB/BS appeared to be geographic -- there were no available volunteers in the immediate vicinity of the youth. Youth not assigned a BB/BS were sometimes included in group outings

and received direct counseling from the Big Brother professional staff.

The impact of the project was examined in three ways: effect on clients served, impact on the problem to be addressed, and subjective impressions concerning the project's use and effectiveness.

In relation to the clients assigned BB/BS, the project proposed to do two things: (1) prevent referral to Family Court and (2) improve the clients' attitudes, behavior and personality characteristics at home and in school. A review of Family Court records indicated that of the 69 youth assigned only two had any contact with the court either during or after assignment. In relation to the second objective, a group of 44 youth who had been in the project long enough to evaluate were examined in relation to their improvement in specific problem areas. This evaluation, based on subjective judgments of BB/BS, professional staff, parent, and sometimes school or referral sources, indicated that 98 percent of the youth had exhibited at least some improvement.

Even with this data it was difficult to measure the impact of the project on the clients served. It was impossible to determine if the lack of court contacts and apparent attitudinal improvement was due to participation in the project or other intervening variables.

Persons who had referred youth to the project were interviewed and all indicated that they were pleased with the service when a match was made, but cited a problem in that BB/BS were not always available for assignment. All indicated that they had

no specific criteria for referring and that they generally referred youth with minor problems who they "felt could be helped by a Big Brother", and who were not hard core delinquents.

The evaluation concluded that although the Big Brothers project may well be considered a delinquency prevention project (as could almost any project related to youth and their families), and it basically accomplished what it proposed, it had very little direct relationship to the juvenile justice system. There was no referral criteria relating to the criminal justice system, and there were very few direct referrals from police, Family Court, or juvenile corrections.

In addition to the lack of relationship to the criminal justice system, the evaluation found that the Big Brothers project had a cost per client served (matched with a BB/BS) of approximately \$687 compared to approximately \$310 for the Peer Delinquency Prevention Project (a DARC funded delinquency prevention project based on remedial education) and approximately \$129 for the Turnabout Counseling Center (a DARC funded delinquency prevention project based on counseling).

Based on these findings, the report contained the following recommendations:

1. When funding a project involving the use of volunteers DARC should require that records be kept documenting the hours and types of service contributed by each volunteer.

2. When funding a delinquency prevention project, DARC should require the applicant to specify how the project will directly relate to the juvenile justice system, i.e., how many

clients will have had prior contact with the system and how will these clients be obtained (referred from police, courts, corrections?).

3. When funding projects which propose to change clients in some way such as improve attitudes or increase knowledge, DARC should require that the clients be given pre and post tests so that the actual change may be measured and documented.

4. Since almost any project which deals with youth or their families could be considered a delinquency prevention project, and considering the scarcity of funds, DARC should consider establishing criteria (e. g., at least one-half the clients will have had some prior contact with the system) for distinguishing what makes such projects eligible or appropriate for DARC delinquency prevention funds.

PROJECT INFORMATION

GENERAL:

Grant Numbers: FA-82-73, 74-024, 75-076

Grant Title: Big Brothers of Sussex County
Delinquency Prevention Project

Implementing Agency: Big Brothers of Delaware

Project Director: William Webb

Grant Period: July 1, 1973 to July 31, 1976

Budget:

Item	FA-82-73		74-024		75-076		Total
	Federal	Match	Federal	Match	Federal	Match	
Personnel and Benefits							
One field representative							
and one part-time secretary	11,700*	1,880	12,183	969	12,718	1,069	40,519
Travel	0	0	0	576	0	720	1,296
Supplies	0	0	450	0	660	0	1,110
Operating Expenses	0	0	1,520	34	1,944	40	3,538
Other	0	0	300	150	500	0	950
Total	11,700	1,880	14,453	1,729	15,822	1,829	47,413

Total Federal Allocation \$41,975

Total Match 5,438

*Of this amount \$2,442 was not expended and returned to DARC due to project vacancies.

Organization:

Executive Director, Big Brothers of Delaware
(Project Director, located in Wilmington)
William Webb

Field Representative
(Located in Georgetown)
Roy Short

Part time Secretary
(Located in Georgetown)
Cathy Short

I. INTRODUCTION

Two approaches to preventing crime are attacking the problem and eliminating the cause. Programs in the first category attempt to prevent crimes from occurring. Projects such as block-watching, target hardening and crime prevention lectures may be included in this category. The second approach involves crime prevention through eliminating whatever it is that makes a potential criminal commit a crime. This approach may include remedial education, employment and counseling projects.

One project funded by DARC which attempted to address the cause of crime was Big Brothers of Sussex County. This project was based on the premise that the absence of a father in the household is a significant factor contributing to juvenile delinquency.¹ Hence, providing a father substitute (i. e., a Big Brother) will prevent delinquency.

¹It was not within the scope of this investigation to discuss or determine the validity of the premise upon which the Big Brothers project was based. Superficially this premise appeared to be supported by existing data -- in Sussex County a fatherless boy is five times as likely to be referred to Family Court as a boy with a father in the home. There is some controversy, however as to whether or not broken homes do in fact lead to delinquency.

Official police and court records are known to be biased in a number of ways. Take for example, the historical debate regarding broken homes and delinquency. Many of the early studies were based on samples of incarcerated offenders. Later studies showed two weaknesses in them: (1) incarcerated offenders were not representative of all offenders, and (2) coming from a broken home increased the likelihood of incarceration, not involvement in delinquent acts. (Maynard Erickson, "Group Violations and Official Delinquent Acts", Criminology, Vol. II, August 1972, p. 156).

The purpose of this evaluation was to examine the performance and impact of the Big Brothers of Sussex County project.

The evaluation consisted of the following major steps:

1. Reviewing applications to ascertain the project purposes;
2. Obtaining objective data pertaining to project activities;
3. Obtaining data from the Family Court of Sussex County pertaining to project impact;
4. Distributing a questionnaire² to all Big Brothers and Big Sisters who were or had been active in the project; and
5. Interviewing persons who had had some contact with the project to obtain subjective impressions concerning its effectiveness.

The performance of the project was discussed in terms of accomplishment of stated goals and objectives, with some necessary background information. Impact was discussed in terms of effect on clients served, impact on the problem the project proposed to address, and subjective judgments of persons involved with the project. Finally, conclusions and recommendations were made based on an analysis of the project's performance and impact.

The author would like to thank the project director for his cooperation in the conduct of this evaluation. He supplied data which would have otherwise been unobtainable and which was of considerable value to the report.

²The return rate of the questionnaire was too low (25 percent) to give the results validity for the group. For a summary of those returned, see Appendix A, page 15.

II. PERFORMANCE

Background

Beginning in July 1973, DARC awarded a total of \$41,975 (federal funds) through three subgrants (FA-82-73, 74-024 and 75-076) to Big Brothers of Delaware for the implementation and operation of the Big Brothers of Sussex County project. The majority of those funds, \$36,601, was allocated for the salary of a Big Brother field representative and a part-time secretary located in Georgetown. The field representative was responsible for the day-to-day operation of the project, and reported to the Executive Director of Big Brothers of Delaware, who was the designated project director. DARC funding for the project terminated July 31, 1976.³

The Big Brothers of Sussex County is affiliated with the Big Brothers of America, a nationally known organization which attempts to match big brother volunteers with fatherless boys. A brief description of how the project operated -- excerpted from the 1975 application -- is as follows:

Big Brothers utilizes a professionally-supervised one-to-one relationship in which a stable, mature adult male volunteer accepts the responsibility of providing supportive friendship to a fatherless boy. The effectiveness of Big Brother's service lies in our ability to counter the negative consequences that "fatherlessness" has for some boys by providing some of the consistent, supportive, male influence that has been lacking in the boy's life.

The agency's program consists of careful screening, assigning and ongoing supervision of boys who are eligible on a one-to-one basis for a Big Brother and of men who want to become Big Brother volunteers.

³Big Brothers of Sussex County is currently operating with funds from the Sussex County United Way. Funding after November 1976 is uncertain.

Those men and boys who "pass" the screening are matched by professional staff on the basis of complementary personality characteristics, geographic proximity, compatible interests, hobbies, etc. Once an assignment is made, the professional staff keeps in weekly contact with both the Big Brother and the Little Brother and his mother to assist the development of the relationship. After it is determined that a fairly stable relationship is developing, the professional staff person continues to maintain monthly contact to monitor progress.⁴

A person desiring to become a Big Brother or Sister was required to complete an application and provide three character references. These references were checked and then two interviews, one in the home and one in the Big Brother office were conducted. Upon acceptance into the program, volunteers were involved in training which consisted primarily of discussions centered around; (1) the roles, expectations and responsibilities of the Big Brother/Big Sister and (2) single parent family life, personality and sex role development, and developing trust and friendship in a relationship. Also a film supplied by Big Brothers of America was shown and discussed.⁵

Goals, Objectives and Accomplishments

The overall goal of the Big Brothers project was to prevent delinquency among fatherless boys in Sussex County. This goal had two distinct components; (1) to prevent fatherless boys from being referred to Family Court on delinquency charges, and (2) to prevent the further development of negative behavior patterns in fatherless boys that could, over time, lead to delinquency. The following are objectives related to this goal gleaned from the subgrant applications, and discussion of their accomplishment based on DARC files and interviews with project personnel.

⁴"Big Brothers of Sussex County", Subgrant Application submitted to DARC, May 1975, p. 6.

⁵There may have been some misunderstanding as to what constituted training. Eight of the 25 respondents to the questionnaire indicated that they had received no training.

1. To assess the feasibility of initiating a Big Sisters program in Sussex County. During the second year of the project the feasibility of a Big Sisters program was examined. It was decided that such a program was feasible, and one was implemented in the summer of 1975 with the matching of three Big and Little Sisters.

2. To assign fatherless boys/motherless girls to volunteer Big Brothers/Big Sisters.⁶ A total of 104 youth were referred to the project. Of these, 69 were matched with a Big Brother/Big Sister (BB/BS) and 35 were not.⁷ The majority of youth not assigned a BB/BS were included in group activities such as picnics, and received direct counseling or referral services from the Big Brother professional staff.

Ninety percent of the youth assigned a BB/BS were considered to be multi-problem youth in terms of their problems in personality development, family relationships, behavior/motivation in school and police/court contact. Eighteen (26 percent) of the 69 youth had had some police or court contact prior to involvement with the program. A profile of the youth active from March 1, 1975 through March 1, 1976 revealed the following sources of referral:⁸

⁶It was impossible to determine the precise number of individuals to be served: the first application proposed to match 80 clients; the second 50, and the third 60. However, it was not clear whether the 50 youth to be served in the second year and 60 in the third were to be new clients or whether they were to include youth carried over from previous years.

⁷According to the field representative, the major reason for not matching all clients with a BB/BS was geographic. There were no BB/BS in the area near the youth and none who wished to drive a substantial distance to see their LB/LS. The profile of youth not matched was similar to those matched.

⁸The relationship between this project and the criminal justice system is unclear. Although 26 percent of the clients served had had some contact with the system, such clients were not actively recruited. There was no referral criteria for acceptance into the project that directly related a youth to the criminal justice system, and during the final two years of the project, there were only two referrals from police, one from juvenile corrections and none from Family Court.

<u>Source of Referral</u>	<u>Number of Referrals</u>	<u>Percentage of Referrals</u>
Relative	19	38
School	14	28
Mental Hygiene	8	16
Police	2	4
Health Unit	2	4
Dover Big Brothers	2	4
Youth Outreach Unit	1	2
Friend	1	2
<u>Catholic Social Services</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
Total	50	100

A total of 71 BB/BS participated in the project.⁹ At the end of the first year there were only 27 active Big Brothers, while at the end of the third year there were 44 active BB/BS. This increase would indicate a growing community awareness and support.

Big Brothers/Big Sisters were expected to remain in the program for one year and devote at least one hour per week to their little brother or sister. According to the field representative, most BB/BS stayed in the program longer than one year and spent between three and four hours per week with their LB/LS.¹⁰

3. To develop additional evaluation techniques. During the final year of the project additional data collection forms were developed. In August 1975 a questionnaire was sent to all mothers of LB/LS active in the program to aid in program evaluation. The results of the questionnaire showed that all but one mother was satisfied with the service of the project.

⁹Sometimes a BB/BS would not remain with the program until the termination of the assignment with the LB/LS, resulting in the LB/LS being assigned another BB/BS. Hence, there were 71 BB/BS and only 69 LB/LS.

¹⁰Results of the questionnaire returned by BB/BS indicated that most were active in the program for 18 months and spent between four and five hours per week with their LB/LS.

4. To create an Advisory Board. In the summer of 1974 an initial Advisory Board meeting was held. Originally there were four members of the Board; it is now composed of eight members.¹¹ The Board generally met **every six** weeks and discussed issues such as volunteer recruitment, future funding, and community support.

5. To organize group activities for assigned and unassigned LB/LS. During the final year of the project, two group outings were held in which 56 assigned and 27 unassigned youth participated.

6. To circulate a periodic newsletter to volunteers. The Bridge, the Big Brothers of Delaware newsletter was distributed to volunteers approximately every six weeks beginning in October 1974.

III. IMPACT

Three measures of a project's impact are its effect on the clients it serves, its impact on the problems it purports to address, and subjective impressions concerning its effectiveness. Big Brothers of Sussex County will be discussed in relation to each of these.

¹¹Current members of the Advisory Board are Richard Carter, Robert Hardy, Debby Hitchens, Dan Myers, Marion Pepper, Richard Slatcher, Madeline Stango and Pauline Stewart.

Effect On Clients

In relation to its clients, the Big Brothers project proposed to do two things: (1) prevent assigned youth from committing delinquent acts and being referred to the police or courts; and (2) improve the attitudes, behavior and personality of assigned youth in the home and at school. In relation to the first objective, a review of Family Court records indicated that only two of the 69 assigned youth had had contact with the court either during or after their assignment. The youth not matched with a BB/BS exhibited the same referral rate -- only one out of the 35 had further contact with the court. In the final two years of the project's operation, not one youth assigned had any police or court contact while matched with a BB/BS.

In relation to the second objective, the project director reported the following for the period March 1, 1975 through March 1, 1976:

Of the 44 youth who were assigned long enough during the project year to evaluate, staff evaluations (based on direct observations, and on observations by parent, volunteer, and in some cases by school or referral source) showed the following:

<u>Degree of Improvement</u>	<u>Number of Youth</u>	<u>Percentage of Youth</u>
High	13	30
Moderate	20	45
Low	10	23
None	1	2
<u>Total</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>100</u>

Progress, or lack of same are defined as follows:

<u>High:</u>	Observable, consistent and <u>marked</u> improvement in all problem areas.
<u>Moderate:</u>	Fairly steady, observable improvement in all problem areas.
<u>Low:</u>	Slight observable improvement overall, or improvement in at least one problem area.
<u>None:</u>	No observable improvement in any area. ¹²

Since 98 percent of the youth exhibited at least some improvement, it would appear that the project performed satisfactorily in relation to this objective. The reader should, however, exercise caution in relying on these evaluations since they were based on subjective judgments and no pre and post tests were administered to confirm them.

Even with this data, it was difficult to measure the impact of the project on the clients served. Without a control group it was impossible to determine if the lack of court contacts and apparent attitudinal improvement was due to participation in this project or some other factor such as participation in another program. In the case of court contacts, an unintentional control group resulted because of youth being referred to the project but not being assigned a BB/BS. This group however, was not totally acceptable as a control group because the youth had some participation in the project. Hence, the finding that the referral rate for this group was the same as for the group assigned a BB/BS could be interpreted two ways: (1) assignment of a BB/BS had no impact on clients; or (2) even minimal contact with the project had a positive effect on clients.

¹²Excerpted from Internal Assessment Form submitted by the project director to DARC on July 23, 1976.

Impact On the Problem

The problem which this project proposed to address was delinquency among fatherless boys in Sussex County. It was impossible to measure the impact of the project on this problem. One measure of impact is a comparison of pre and post conditions, but this data, i.e., referral rates to Family Court of fatherless boys in Sussex County prior to implementation of the project and when the project terminated, was not available. Even if the data were available, it would be impossible to attribute the increase or reduction of referrals to the success or failure of the Big Brothers project because of a multitude of other intervening variables which could be responsible for such a condition, i.e., other projects, or changes in population.

Subjective Impressions

In order to determine subjective impressions concerning the use and effectiveness of the project, persons who had referred clients to the Big Brothers program were interviewed.¹³ In all instances, the response was the same -- all were pleased with the service when a match was made, but all cited problems in that there was not always a BB/BS available for assignment. In one instance, the interviewee cited a case in which a social worker had felt that participation in the project had definitely prevented delinquency in a client. The interviewees indicated that they had no specific criteria for referring a youth, but generally youth with minor problems who they "felt could be helped by a Big Brother" were referred rather than "hard core" delinquents.

¹³The following persons were interviewed: Mrs. Simpler, Division of Social Services; Ms. Webb, Juvenile Correction; Mr. Riley, Delaware State Police; Ms. Howard, Family Court; Ms. Rowe, Mental Hygiene Clinic.

In no case was a referral not accepted. This lack of referral criteria was in keeping with the philosophy of the project which was that its purpose was to prevent delinquency before it ever happened rather than to prevent further delinquency among youth who had already committed crimes.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

It is difficult at best to draw any valid conclusions concerning the Big Brothers of Sussex County project as it relates to crime prevention. One approach to preventing crime is to prevent it before it ever occurs, rather than dealing with known offenders, which was what the Big Brothers project proposed to do. One problem with such an approach is that almost any youth can be classified as a pre-delinquent. Self-report studies have shown that as many as 83 percent of all youth have engaged in delinquent behavior.¹⁴ Given such a broad target population and the multitude of theories concerning what contributes to delinquency, almost any project dealing with youth from boy scouts to 4-H to recreational programs could be considered delinquency prevention projects.

Another problem with this approach is that it is difficult or impossible to evaluate the impact or success of such projects. For example, although the data indicated that with two exceptions, no youth matched with a BB/BS were referred to Family Court, it cannot be concluded that the project prevented delinquency, since (1) the data considered referrals to Family Court only and did not reflect unrecorded police contacts or delinquent acts, and (2) it was im-

¹⁴Stevens H. Clarke, "Juvenile Offender Programs and Delinquency Prevention", Crime and Delinquency Literature, Vol. 6, No. 3, September 1974, p. 395.

possible to determine whether initial or additional referrals were prevented through the efforts of the project rather than some other variable. It is possible that the same "success" rate would have occurred without the intervention of the project.

If DARC decides to take this broad approach of dealing with youth before they become delinquent, the cost factor of such projects should be examined. The cost per client of the Big Brothers project -- based on project expenditures divided by the number of youth assigned a BB/BS -- was approximately \$687.¹⁵ The cost per client exhibited by the Peer Delinquency Prevention Project (a DARC funded delinquency prevention project based on remedial education) was approximately \$310 and for the Turnabout Counseling Center (a DARC funded delinquency prevention project based on counseling) was approximately \$129.¹⁶ Therefore, it would appear that the Big Brothers project was considerably more expensive than other prevention efforts.¹⁷

The Big Brothers of Sussex County was an efficiently run project. It performed satisfactorily in relation to its stated objectives. Many projects which have relied on outside sources for clients have failed to get the referrals projected, but Big

¹⁵There was no documentation of how many hours BB/BS contributed to the project and in what capacity, so a figure such as cost per counseling hour could not be obtained.

¹⁶These figures were taken from DARC evaluation reports of these projects.

¹⁷These figures do not consider effectiveness, only cost. Hence, it would not be valid to say Turnabout Counseling Center was a better project than Big Brothers because it cost less per client as Big Brothers may have been more effective in preventing delinquency.

Brothers did not experience this problem. Indeed, there were not enough BB/BS to serve all the referrals made.. Furthermore, although it could not be unquestionably attributed to the project, the major goal -- to prevent youth assigned a BB/BS from being referred to Family Court -- was accomplished with only two exceptions out of the 69 youth assigned.

It must be emphasized that the concerns found within this report - difficulty of measuring impact or effect, questionable relationship to the criminal justice system and a high cost factor-- were not attributable to either project personnel or operation. The project was implemented and performed as had been proposed in the various applications.

Recommendations

Based on the findings previously discussed, it was recommended that:

1. When funding a project involving the use of volunteers DARC should require that records be kept documenting the hours and types of service contributed by each volunteer.
2. When funding a delinquency prevention project, DARC should require the applicant to specify how the project will directly relate to the juvenile justice system, i. e., how many clients will have had prior contact with the system, and how will these clients be obtained (referred from police, courts, corrections?).
3. When funding projects which propose to change clients in some way such as improve attitudes or increase knowledge, DARC should require that they be given pre and post tests so that the actual change may be measured and documented.

4. Since almost any project which deals with youth or their families could be considered a delinquency prevention project, and considering the scarcity of funds, DARC should consider establishing criteria (e. g., at least one-half the clients will have had some prior contact with the system) for distinguishing what makes such projects eligible or appropriate for DARC delinquency prevention funds.

APPENDIX A
Questionnaire Sent to Big Brothers and Big Sisters

May 14, 1976

Dear Big Brother/Big Sister:

I represent the Delaware Agency to Reduce Crime which has funded the Big Brother/Big Sister Program of Sussex County for the past four years. I am currently conducting an evaluation of this program and would greatly appreciate your helping me by completing the following questionnaire and returning it to me in the enclosed addressed stamped envelope. All responses will be confidential. If you have any questions, please call me.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Pat Robinson
Program Evaluation Specialist

PR/jt

Enclosure

Results of Questionnaire for Big Brothers/Big Sisters*

1. Are you presently an active Big Brother/Big Sister?

Yes 9

No 7

If yes, how long have you been active? Average (mean) 18 months

If no, how long were you active? Average (mean) 18 months

What was your reason for leaving the program?

Wife had a baby (2)

Insufficient training led to a disappointing situation

Boy moved to Texas

Fulfilled one year obligation

Took a foster son

No reason given

2. How many hours per week do (did) you spend with your little brother/little sister?

1 - 2 1
2 - 3 0

3 - 4 5
4 - 5 4

5 - 6 2
more than 6 4

In numbers three through seven, circle the number which most accurately reflects your feelings.

3. Did you feel the training you received prior to being assigned was:

1 4 5
Poor Excellent

Received no training 8

4. Did you feel the supervision you received from the Big Brother/Big Sister field representative was:

1 3.7 5
Poor Excellent

Received no supervision 2

5. Did you feel the appropriateness of your match was:

1 4 5
Poor Excellent

*In questions three through seven, the average (mean) response is indicated above the line.

6. Did you feel your little brother's/little sister's attitude toward home:

3.4

1 2 3 4 5

Worsened No Change Improved Greatly

One indicated that the little brother did not have a negative attitude toward home to begin with.

7. Did you feel your little brother's/little sister's attitude toward school:

3.7

1 2 3 4 5

Worsened No Change Improved Greatly

One unable to answer.

8. Did you feel antisocial behavior was a problem or a possible problem with your little brother/little sister?

Yes 5 No 11

9. Had your little brother/little sister ever had any contact with the police before your relationship?

Yes 2 No 8 Don't know 6

If yes, explain:

One respondent indicated his little brother had been involved in several acts of theft. Another indicated his little brother had been caught breaking windows, but that no court action was taken.

After your relationship officially terminated?

Yes 1 No 4 Don't know 6

10. What changes, if any, would you make in the Big Brothers/Big Sisters program of Sussex County?

Prepare the perspective BB/BS for things that may arise. This training could be handled through seminars with a psychologist present.

Rap sessions might be a good idea.

More training for Big Brothers prior to getting little brother.

Like to see the program expanded.

Broader appeal to potential Big Brothers is Sussex County.

More BB speakers at local events.

More contact between Big Brothers and Big Sisters.

They need money.

Would like to see Big Brothers involved more with local activities.

That the field rep meet with the Little Brothers on at least a quarterly basis.

APPENDIX B

Sussex County Little Brother Profile - July 1, 1974

AGE (yrs.)

8 (2)	13 (2)
9 (2)	14 (3)
10 (4)	15 (3)
11 (8)	16 (3)
12 (9)	

RESIDENCE

Georgetown - 5	Bridgeville - 3
Greenwood - 1	Rehoboth - 4
Seaford - 9	Lewes - 3
Milton - 7	Milford - 4
Laurel - 6	

RACE

Black - 19
White - 23

RELIGION

Baptist 17	Pentacostal 1
Methodist 13	Holiness 1
Church of God 1	Not Available 8
Catholic 1	

INCOME LEVEL

Lower - 26
Middle Lower - 13
Middle - 3

GRADE IN SCHOOL

3 (2)	7 (17)
4 (2)	8 (2)
5 (5)	9 (5)
6 (5)	10 (4)

STATUS OF FATHER

Divorced	-	13
Deceased	-	11
Deserted	-	16
Deported	-	2

BROTHERS/SISTERS

Yes: 40 No: 2

REFERRAL SOURCE

Relative	-10	B.B.'s in Dover	- 4
Mental Hygiene	-9	Y. O. U.	- 3
Div. of Juvenile Corr.	-1	Big Brother	- 1
School	-10	State Police	- 1
Health Unit	-3		

ASSIGNED: 32

UNASSIGNED: 10

LENGTH OF ASSIGNMENT (monts)

1 - (1)	12 - (3)	18 - (1)
3 - (3)	13 - (5)	19 - (1)
5 - (1)	14 - (1)	20 - (2)
6 - (1)	16 - (2)	21 - (2)
7 - (2)	17 - (1)	22 - (2)
8 - (1)		

PROBLEM AREAS:

A. Individual Adjustment	- 27	C. School Related	- 29
B. Family Related	- 19	D. Police/Court Contact	- 4

TOTAL NUMBER OF BOYS SERVED

42

APPENDIX C

Sussex County Big Brother Profile - July 1, 1974

AGE (years)

20 - 25	<u>6</u>
25 - 30	<u>15</u>
30 - 35	<u>7</u>
35 - 40	<u>3</u>
40 - 60	<u>6</u>

RACE

Caucasion	<u>26</u>
Negro	<u>10</u>
Other	<u>1</u>

RELIGION

Methodist	<u>19</u>
Protestant	<u>4</u>
Baptist	<u>5</u>
Other	<u>9</u>

EDUCATION

Did not finish High school	<u>1</u>
High School graduate	<u>13</u>
Some college	<u>10</u>
College graduate	<u>10</u>
Masters of PhD	<u>3</u>

OCCUPATIONS

painter
 receiving manager
 supervisor
 motor repairman
 group leader II
 draftsman
 supervisor
 lab technician
 custodian
 judge
 industrial engineer
 shift worker
 insurance agent
 area supervisor
 survey technician
 truck driver
 carpenter
 salesman

HOW LEARNED OF BIG BROTHERS

Friend	<u>17</u>
Newspaper or Television	<u>9</u>
Jaycees	<u>4</u>
Active Big Brother	<u>3</u>
Church	<u>2</u>
Other	<u>2</u>

RESIDENCE

Seaford	<u>7</u>
Lewes	<u>7</u>
Milton	<u>6</u>
Georgetown	<u>4</u>
Millsboro	<u>4</u>
Laurel	<u>4</u>
Milford	<u>1</u>
Delmar	<u>1</u>
Salisbury	<u>1</u>
Bridgeville	<u>1</u>
Rehoboth	<u>1</u>

general manager
 machine operator
 car dealer
 mechanical engineer
 state policeman
 electrician
 minister
 service operator
 teacher
 Big Brothers field representative
 research chemist
 engineering aide
 lift truck operator
 assistant foreman
 cook
 teacher

END