

NCJR

MAR 1 9 1980

ACQUISITIONS

State of California

EDMUND G. BROWN JR. Governor

Health and Welfare Agency

MARIO OBLEDO Secretary



Department of the

Youth Authority

KEITH S. GRIFFITHS, Chief of Research

ELAINE DUXBURY, Research Manager III

JOACHIM P. SECKEL, Principal Investigator

JAMES K. TURNER, Research Analyst II PEARL S. WEST, Director

CHARLES A. KUHL, CHIEF DEPUTY DIRECTOR

> JAMES C. BARNETT, DEPUTY DIRECTOR PREVENTION AND COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS BRANCH

CHON GUTIERREZ Deputy Director MANAGEMENT SERVICES BRANCH

RUTH E. KRANOVICH, Deputy Director PAROLE SERVICES BRANCH

FREDERICK F. MILLS, Deputy Director PLANNING, RESEARCH, EVALUATION AND DEVELOPMENT BRANCH

GEORGE R. ROBERTS, Deputy Director INSTITUTIONS AND CAMPS BRANCH

: P

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project evaluation could not have been carried out without the steady cooperation of the Fir Lodge and Evergreen Lodge staff. With their patient assistance, a reliable and timely data collection system was established and maintained during the 30-month study period. The investigators want to express special appreciation for the many helpful suggestions and strong support given to research by William R. Wells who served as project director and treatment team supervisor, and by Harleen Altieri and Don Matulich, who provided casework supervision for the project living units.

The evaluation of the Institutional Violence Reduction Project was conducted by the Youth Authority Research Division. The project was supported by Grant Number 2175-3-78 awarded by the Office of Criminal Justice Planning, U. S. Department of Justice, under Section 301 (b) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended by PL-91-644. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|--|
| SUMMARY | 1 |
| BACKGROUND | 3 |
| METHODOLOGY | 5 |
| Role of Project Research Staff Research Design Objectives Data Collection | 5 5 8 9 |
| FINDINGS | 12 |
| Movement Statistics Violence History Indicators of Living Unit Tension Transfers Disciplinary Incidents Time Adds and Time Cuts Bed Space and Cost Savings Staff Sick Leave | 12 14 17 20 25 30 32 34 37 37 41 44 46 46 46 |
| DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS | 52 |
| Grant Objectives Evaluation Objectives | 52 53 |

LIST OF CHARTS

.

Chart Number

•

.

*

•

| I | SUMMARY OF PROJECT RESEARCH DESIGN | 6 |
|----|---|----|
| II | MEAN DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PHASE I AND PHASE II POST- | |
| | TEST SCORES ON CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION ENVIRONMENT | |
| | SCALES FOR WARDS OF EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS | 38 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Number | | Page |
|-------|--------|--|------|
| | 1 | MONTHLY MOVEMENT STATISTICS FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, BY STUDY PERIOD | 13 |
| | 2 | VIOLENCE HISTORY OF WARDS PRIOR TO ADMISSION EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR PHASES I AND II | 15 |
| | 3 | DEPARTURES STATISTICS FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR BASELINE PERIOD, PHASE I, AND PHASE II | 18 |
| | 4 | RATES OF WARD INVOLVEMENT IN LEVEL B DISCIPLINARY INCIDENTS, BY TYPE, FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR BASELINE PERIOD, PHASE I, AND PHASE II | 22 |
| | 5 | RATES OF WARD INVOLVEMENT IN LEVEL B DISCIPLINARY INCIDENTS WITH SERIOUS VIOLENT ACTS, BY LIVING UNIT SIZE | 24 |
| | 6 | RATES OF TIME ADDS FOR WARDS IN EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR BASELINE PERIOD, PHASE I, AND PHASE II | 26 |
| | 7 | RATES OF TIME CUTS FOR WARDS IN EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR BASELINE PERIOD, PHASE I, AND PHASE II | 28 |
| | 8 | RATIO OF TIME CUTS TO TIME ADDS, BY LARGE VERSUS SMALL LIVING UNIT SIZE | 29 |
| | 9 | ANNUAL NET TIME ADDS, BY LARGE VERSUS SMALL LIVING UNIT SIZE | 30 |
| : | 10 | SAVINGS IN NET TIME ADDS AND BED SPACE IN CHANGE FROM 47-BED TO 38-BED UNIT | 31 |
| : | 11 | SICK LEAVE STATISTICS FOR STAFF OF EVERGREEN AND FIR LIV- ING UNITS, FOR BASELINE PERIOD, PHASE I, AND PHASE II. | 33 |
| : | 12 | STAFF DEPARTURE STATISTICS FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIV- ING UNITS, BY REASON,1972-1973 | 34 |
| : | 13 | STAFF DEPARTURE STATISTICS FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, BY REASON, JANUARY 1976 - SEPTEMBER 1978 | 35 |
| : | 14 | STAFF DEPARTURE STATISTICS FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, BY REASON,OCTOBER 1978-SEPTEMBER 1979. | 36 |
| : | 15 | WARD PERCEPTIONS OF STAFF RELATIONSHIPS WITH WARDS, FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR PHASES I AND II | 42 |

LIST OF TABLES (Con't)

| Table Number | | Page |
|--------------|--|------|
| 16 | WARD PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF, FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNIT, FOR PHASES I AND II | 43 |
| 17 | WARD PERCEPTIONS OF PROGRAM, FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR PHASES I AND II | 45 |
| 18 | MONTHLY RATINGS OF DEGREE OF TENSION IN EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR PHASES I AND II | 47 |
| 19 | KEY RESULTS OF PROJECT EVALUATION FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR BASELINE PERIOD, PHASE I, AND PHASE II | 54 |

APPENDICES

Table Number

• • •

.•

-

| A | MOVEMENT STATISTICS FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR BASELINE PERIOD | 57 |
|---|---|----|
| B | MONTHLY MOVEMENT STATISTICS FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR PHASE I | 58 |
| с | MONTHLY MOVEMENT STATISTICS FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR TRANSITION PERIOD AND PHASE II | 59 |
| D | DEPARTURES STATISTICS FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR BASELINE PERIOD, PHASE I, AND PHASE II | 60 |
| E | WARDS DEFINED AS PROGRAM SUCCESSES AND FAILURES WHO DEPARTED FROM EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR BASELINE PERIOD, PHASE I, AND PHASE II | 61 |
| F | DISTRIBUTION OF WARDS INVOLVED IN LEVEL B DISCIPLINARY INCIDENTS IN EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR BASELINE PERIOD, PHASE I, AND PHASE II | 62 |
| G | RATES OF WARD INVOLVEMENT IN ESCAPES, BY LIVING UNIT SIZE | 65 |
| н | COMPARISON OF WARDS' MEAN SCORES ON POST-TEST OF CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION ENVIRONMEMT SCALES FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR PHASES I AND II | 66 |
| I | WARD PERCEPTIONS OF STAFF RELATIONSHIPS WITH WARDS, FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR PHASES I AND II | 67 |

.

APPENDICES

| Table Numbe | <u>r</u> | Page |
|-------------|--|------|
| J | WARD PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF, FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR PHASES I AND II | 68 |
| K | WARDS PERCEPTIONS OF PROGRAM, FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR PHASES I AND II | 69 |
| L | WARD APPRAISALS OF PROGRAM IMPACT, FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR PHASES I AND II | 70 |
| м | SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT PROBLEMS, ISSUES, AND EVENTS REPORTED FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR PHASES I AND II | 72 |
| N | ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF WARDS IN EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR PHASES I AND II | 76 |
| REFERENCES | | 77 |

SUMMARY

Federally funded through the Office of Criminal Justice Planning, the Preston Violence Reduction Project was carried out at the Preston School of Industry from January 1976 to September 1978. The purpose of the project was to evaluate the relative effects of changes in living unit size in relation to staffing. The project setting consisted of two open-dormitory living units.

On one living unit the average monthly ward population was maintained at 47 and an additional staff position was added, allowing for 6-post coverage. On the other living unit the average population was reduced to 38 wards and no staff was added, allowing for 5-post coverage. After 15 months, these conditions were reversed: the larger-population living unit was reduced to 38 beds and 5-post coverage, while the smaller unit was increased to 47 beds and 6-post coverage. With these changes in living unit size, the staff-to-ward ratio was held approximately equal (10 to 1).

The project results indicate that reduced living unit size--within the specified range (from 47 to 38 wards) and for the type of wards and setting considered--is conducive to less negative and violent behavior among wards, fewer escapes, fewer time adds and more time cuts, and an improvement in wardstaff relationships. Reduced ward population size is also accompanied by an improvement in social climate, including more clearly defined program expectations, less need for staff controls, and more emphasis on post-release problems.

Benefits include savings in bed space and program costs. By converting to the smaller unit, nine beds were given up but approximately 17 beds were

saved (because of a reduction in net time adds) during a one-year period. The net gain of eight beds represents an estimated savings of \$68,923 per year.

BACKGROUND

The Institutional Violence Reduction Project was initiated as an experimental study in January 1976. The project was funded by LEAA through the Office of Criminal Justice Planning in order to assess the relative effects of two living unit arrangements--reduced living unit size as compared to increased staffing. Measures of these effects are largely based on: 1) the frequency and types of disciplinary incidents; 2) the frequency of time adds and time cuts given to wards; 3) implications of time adds/time cuts with respect to program bed space and cost; 4) the incidence of staff sick leave and staff turnover; 5) ward perceptions of tension and related factors of social climate as reflected in questionnaires; and 6) staff accounts of significant living unit events and program developments during the study period.

The project was given impetus as a result of statistics gathered in two 50-ward dormitory living units (Evergreen and Fir) at the Preston School of Industry. The statistics revealed problems believed to be related to the effects of crowding and large living unit size. According to available data, there appeared to be excessive amounts of 1) staff sick leave, 2) staff turnover based on requests for transfer to more secure living units or to other institutions, and 3) early retirement for reasons of health. In addition there appeared to be an excessive amount of job dissatisfaction. This was perceived through inadequate staff control of wards, staff vulnerability to assaultive ward behavior without adequate backup, and a lack of staff time to take preventive measures.

- 3 -

Finally, information available for the two-year period showed an unusually large number of assaultive incidents which resulted in injuries and threats of injuries to both wards and staff. In one such incident, nine wards were stabbed or beaten and one ward died as a result of his injuries.

In view of these problems, the Institutional Violence Reduction Project was undertaken to explore the effects of varying ward population size in relation to staffing within the living unit. An experimental project was designed to determine the impact of changes in living unit size upon disciplinary incidents and acting-out behavior among wards, and more generally upon the level of ward and staff tension. The evaluation design, as stated in the project's grant application, involved: 1) lowering the ward population from 50 to 40 on one living unit while maintaining 5-post staffing,¹ and 2) increasing the staffing on a second unit from 5-post to 6-post while maintaining the ward population at 50. Under the two conditions, the staff-ward ratio remains virtually the same while living unit size is altered. The evaluation design and the measures used to assess the impact of the changes in living unit conditions are explained in the next section.

In short, the aim of the project was to investigate the effects of changing living unit ward population and staffing within specified ranges. The project was not designed, however, to determine an optimum ward population size or staffing for institutional living units. Thus, with greater reductions in ward population or with more enriched staffing than used in the project the results might have been even more positive than reported herein.

- 4 --

Post staffing refers to the number of staff--youth counselors and group supervisors--assigned to cover the living unit in different shifts during a 24-hour period. For example, 5-post means 5 staff were providing supervision or coverage of the living unit.

METHODOLOGY

Role of Project Research Staff

As an action research project, the evaluation was undertaken primarily by research staff but with considerable support and assistance by the project director, who functioned as Treatment Team Supervisor of the two living units used in the study. The essential evaluation plan for the study was prepared by the project researchers. The data collection procedures were developed and implemented jointly by the researchers and project director, as detailed below. Responsibility for the data processing, analysis, and writing of the evaluation report was assumed by the project researchers.

Research Design

A conventional test of the effects of reduced living unit size would arrange for the random assignment of wards to the two aforementioned conditions. From an administrative standpoint, however, it was not feasible to use random assignment because of complications that would be posed in managing the flow of ward population through the institution. Instead, it was decided to use a quasi-experimental design in which pre- and post-comparisons are made within each of the two living units.

The experimental procedure consisted of comparisons of the project conditions over three study periods. One set of comparisons involved an 8-month Baseline period (May to December 1975) and Phase I (January 1976 to March 1977). A second set of comparisons involved the Phase I and Phase II (July 1977 to September 1978) periods. During Phase I, one living unit (Fir) was to reduce

- 5 ---

its average ward population from 50 to 40 while maintaining a 5-post coverage; the other unit (Evergreen) was to maintain an average of 50 wards but increase staffing from 5-post to 6-post coverage.

During Phase II, the ward population and staffing conditions were to be reversed between the two living units. That is, Fir was to increase its average ward population bed space capacity from 40 to 50 and increase staffing from 5-post to 6-post; Evergreen was to decrease from 50- to 40-bed capacity while reducing staffing from 6-post to 5-post coverage.² The essential research design is summarized in Chart 1.

CHART I

SUMMARY OF PROJECT RESEARCH DESIGN

| Research Phase | Dates | Evergreen Status | Fir Status |
|-------------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Baseline | May 1, 1975 to | 50-bed, 5-post | 50-bed, 5-post |
| Period | December 31, 1975 | staffing | staffing |
| Phase I | January 1, 1976 to | 50-bed, 6-post | 40-bed, 5-post |
| | March 31, 1977 | staffing | staffing |
| Phase II | July 1, 1977 to | 40-bed, 5-post | 50-bed, 6-post |
| | September 30, 1978 | staffing | staffing |

NOTE: Last three months of Baseline period represent a transition during which Phase I conditions were introduced but did not attain full operational stability. Also, April to June 30, 1977 was a transitional period during which the Phase II conditions were introduced in the two living units.

² The staff-to-ward ratio within a living unit was approximately 1:10 during Phases I and II. Calculation of this ratio excludes the night supervisor on duty while wards are sleeping. Thus, for the 5-post, 40-ward unit: 4:40 = 1:10; and for the 6-post, 50-ward unit: 5:50 = 1:10.

The comparisons used in the design entail several limitations which stem from the definition of the Baseline period, the short duration of this period relative to that of Phases I and II, differences in the types of wards assigned to the two project living units, and a program change which was introduced into the living unit programs in the fall of 1976.

The first limitation relates to the characteristics of the Baseline period. The last three months of this period (October to December 1975) were, in effect, a transitional period during which the project was started. One staff person was added to Evergreen unit in October 1975, and the number of beds allocated to Fir unit was decreased to 40. By January 1976, the project was deemed to be fully operational and program adjustments resulting from staff/bed capacity changes no longer posed significant problems on either living unit. For purposes of the evaluation, therefore, January 1976 was designated as the start of Phase I. Thus, the Baseline period includes the project's transitional phase; hence, comparisons between the Baseline and Phase I periods may not fully reflect the extent to which there were differences on the measures used.

A second limitation arises from the fact that the Baseline period consists of eight months while the Phase I and Phase II periods each cover 15 months. Comparisons involving the Baseline period, therefore, include considerably smaller sample sizes and would be more subject to seasonal fluctuations. The optimum comparisons in the analysis are those involving the Phase I versus the Phase II periods within each of the two project living units.

A third limitation concerns the comparisons of changes between living units. Although the overall emphasis in the evaluation is on the changes

_ 7 _

observed between Phases I and II within each of the two living units, comparisons are also made of the relative changes noted <u>between</u> the units. These comparisons are limited by the possibility that changes were influenced by differences in the types of wards assigned to the two units. Wards who were seen as "passive-dependent" were more often assigned to Evergreen while wards classified as "assertive" were usually sent to Fir.

A further limitation is that a program revision was introduced into both living units in September 1976. This revision provided for a ward's early Board appearance on the basis of points earned by demonstrated good behavior. A ward was allowed to earn up to 12 days per month by meeting 10 behavioral objectives in his living unit and school activities. A second provision enabled a ward to either ask for or reject formal counseling by staff without any effect on his case disposition. Since the program revision was implemented in a similar manner on both living units, it probably did not bias the comparisons between the two units, although some possible effects are discussed in a later section of this report.

Objectives

As specified in the project's grant application, the objectives were to:

- Increase knowledge of the relative merits (for future program planning) of an enriched staffing pattern versus reduction of living unit ward population.
- Reduce the level of ward and staff tension, thereby substantially reducing the number of confrontations.
- 3. Reduce the number of incidents and thereby decrease the disciplinary continuances resulting in additional time by 20% or more.

- 8 -

Based on the evaluation plan, three hypotheses were to be tested by the project, as follows:

- 1. There will be a significant reduction in tension in both living units during the initial experimental period, or Phase I, as compared to the Baseline period. That is, both a decrease in living unit population (by about ten wards) on one unit and added staffing (by one post) on the other unit are believed to be important factors in diminishing tension.
- 2. The decrease in living unit population is a more critical factor in tension reduction than the addition of staff in the project. It is assumed that tension level is more closely correlated with size of living unit than with number of staff (Moos, 1975). The notion is that positive peer group interaction is achieved primarily by decreasing group size--a condition likely to lead to smaller and/or fewer clique formations, less social distance between groupings and more overall solidarity among wards.
- 3. There will be a relative reduction in living unit tension as ward population size is decreased and the staff-to-ward ratio remains unchanged, as implemented in Phases I and II. As in the foregoing hypothesis, it is assumed that decreased size is conducive to more positive, and more widely dispersed, peer group interaction.

Data Collection

Several types of data were collected by the project researchers with the help of living unit staff. These data consisted of the following:

- 1) Monthly living unit reports prepared by the Treatment Team Supervisor;
- 2) Records of disciplinary incidents; and
- Questionnaires and interviews relating to social climate of the living unit and perceptions of program impact.

- 9 -

The monthly reports furnished by the Treatment Team Supervisor included information on significant program developments, together with a wide range of statistics on ward movements, background characteristics, and time adds and time cuts, as well as staff sick leave and turnover. The statistics were compiled by living unit staff on a routine basis each month, using a format developed by the project researchers and the Treatment Team Supervisor.

Records of disciplinary incidents, involving the Disciplinary Decision Making procedure of the Youth Authority, were maintained by living unit staff. The records showed the type of incident with which each ward was charged and the date of each incident. Incidents for which the case was dismissed or the ward was acquitted were excluded from the analysis.

Disciplinary incident data available in the Research Division's Information Systems during the project period were not used in the analysis, because these data are based on disposition dates which were generally 2 to 3 months after the occurrence of the incident. A separate analysis, however, was done with regard to disciplinary incidents, using the disposition data. The results were similar to those obtained in the present report.

In addition, the project researchers administered questionnaires to wards during the Baseline period (August 1975), near the end of Phase I (February 1977), and at the end of Phase II (September 1978). The questionnaires were designed to tap perceptions of ward and staff relationships, social climate,

- 10 -

and appraisals of various aspects of the living unit program. As a supplement, periodic interviews were also held during 1976 with panels of wards and a corresponding brief questionnaire was given to staff from both living units in order to elicit feelings and impressions about critical incidents and program developments. The results of these interview data were set forth in a summary report (Seckel and Turner, 1976).

FINDINGS

The major findings obtained for the Baseline, Phase I, and Phase II periods are discussed below. The results are divided into several sections relative to the project objectives. First, statistics concerning the ward population flow are presented based on the monthly number of admissions and departures reported for the two project living units. Second, data are presented on the violence history of the study populations from the two living units. Third, data are summarized with regard to indicators of ward and staff tension, as shown by the rates of negative transfers from the two living units, disciplinary incidents, escapes, and time adds and time cuts, as well as rates of staff sick leave and staff turnover. Fourth, changes in ward tension associated with shifts in the project conditions are examined on the basis of ward responses to questionnaires pertaining to ward and staff relationships and related factors of social climate. Finally, the monthly reports regarding major events and developments in the two project living units are analyzed to 1) determine the extent to which they reflect changes in the level of tension, and 2) provide clues as to factors contributing to the observed changes in indicators of tension.

Movement Statistics

Presented in Table 1 are population movement data for the Baseline, Phase I, and Phase II periods. A number of features are worth noting. During the Baseline period, the average monthly ward population was 47.1 for Evergreen and 44.6 for Fir. Thus, both units were below their budgeted 50-bed capacity. During Phase I, Evergreen remained at its previous level with an average population

- 12 -

of 47.4, while Fir declined by about six wards to an average of 38.7. As indicated earlier, the research plan called for Evergreen to continue its ward population at the Baseline level and for Fir to reduce living unit size by ten beds. This plan could not be closely adhered to, however, because of ward population pressures involving the flow of admissions to and departures from Preston, which were beyond the control of institutional administrators. Thus, the average population of the Fir unit was reduced only by six wards during Phase I.

TABLE 1

| MONTHLY | MOVEMENT | STATISTICS | FOR | EVERGREEN | AND | FIR | LIVING | UNITS, |
|---------|----------|------------|------|-----------|-----|-----|--------|--------|
| | | BY ST | YUUT | PERIOD | | | | • |

| Living Unit by Movement Status | Baseline Period (6 Mos.) ^a | Phase I (15 Mos.) | Fhase II (15 Mos.) |
|--|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Evergreen | | | |
| Mean number of wards at start of each month | 46.7 | 47.4 | 38.4 |
| Mean monthly admissions Mean monthly departures | 7.7 6.8 | 8.1 8.1 | 8.7 8.6 |
| Mean number of wards at end of each month | 47.5 | 47.4 | 38.5 |
| Average monthly population b | 47.1 | 47.4 | 38.4 |
| C Turnover rate | 15.4 | 17.1 | 22.5 |
| Fir | | | |
| Mean number of wards at start of each month | 44.7 | 38.7 | 47.5 |
| Mean monthly admission Mean monthly departures | 7.5 7.7 | 5.7 6.0 | 9.9 9.9 |
| Mean number of wards at end of each month | 44.5 | 38.6 | 47.5 |
| Average monthly population b | 44.6 | 38.7 | 47.5 |
| Turnover rate ^C | 17.0 | 15,1 | 20.8 |

^aPopulation Movement data were not available for May and June 1975, as the data collection was initiated in the last half of 1975. The above average monthly population figures are used in this report as estimates of the eight-month period May through December 1975.

^bThe average monthly ward population represents the mean of the number of wards at the start and end of each month during the Baseline period.

^CTurnover rate represents the mean of the number of admissions and departures as percent of the average monthly population during each period. Comparing Phase I and Phase II, Evergreen's average population decreased from 47.4 to 38.4 whereas Fir's average increased from 38.7 to 47.5. These changes in population levels were in accord with the research plan which required a reversal in living unit size conditions between Phase I and Phase II.

Also seen in Table 1 are the population turnover rates for each of the study periods. The rates remained fairly stable during the Baseline and Phase I periods; from Phase I to Phase II, however, the rates increased from 17.1 to 22.5 for Evergreen and from 15.1 to 20.8 for Fir. The higher turnover indicates wards were staying in the living unit programs for shorter periods. It also suggests there was more disruption of interpersonal relationships and increased ward tensions. Since the higher turnover rate, however, affected both of the living units to a similar extent between Phases I and II, this factor would not be expected to bias the results for the two units.

Detailed data on the monthly number of admissions and departures for the project period are shown in Appendices A to C.

Violence History

Living unit staff furnished monthly data on the percent of the ward population in each of the two living units with prior histories of violence.

- 14 -

Staff obtained the data from an examination of the wards' case records. Table 2 summarizes the percents of the ward populations in Phases I and II who had been involved in various types of violent acts and who were disciplinary transfers.

,

TABLE 2

VIOLENCE HISTORY OF WARDS PRIOR TO ADMISSION EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR PHASES I AND II

| • | Phase I (1 | L5 Mos.) | Phase II (15 Mos.) | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Living Unit, and Prior History Violence | Mean Number of Wards per Month ^a | Percent of Ward Popula- tion ^b | Mean Number of Wards per Month ^a | Percent of Ward Popula- tion ^b | |
| Evergreen | | | | | |
| Violence against staff: | | | | | |
| In jail, court or County camp In YA facilities, excluding Preston | 1.9 3.8 | 4.0 8.0 | 3.1 | 8.1 10.7 | |
| Violence against peers: | 0.4 | 0.8 | 1.L | 2.9 | |
| In jail, court or County camp In YA facilities, | - | 6 5 | - | 17.0 | |
| In Preston | 4.9 | 10.3 | 6.8 | 17.7 | |
| Prior use of weapons | 28.9 | 61.0 | 27.5 | 71.6 | |
| Disciplinary transfers from: | | | | | |
| Other YA institutions . Other Preston living | 15.4 | 32.5 | 20.3 | 52.9 | |
| units | 3.0 | 6,3 | 6.7 | 17.4 | |
| Fir | | | | | |
| Violence against staff: | | | | | |
| In jail, court, or County camp | 2.5 | 6.5 | 2.3 | 4.8 | |

| | Phase I (1 | 5 Mos.) | Phase II (15 Mos.) | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Living Unit, and Prior History Violence | Mean Number of Wards per Month ^a | Percent of Ward Popula- tion ^b | Mean Number of Wards per Month ^a | Percent of Ward Popula- tion ^b | |
| In YA facilities, | | | | | |
| excluding Preston | 2.9 | 7.5 | 3.3 | 6.9 | |
| In Preston | 0.8 | 2.1 | 0.6 | 1.3 | |
| Violence against peers: | | | | | |
| In jail, court or | | | | | |
| County camp In YA facilities. | 5.2 | 13.4 | 1.7 | 3.6 | |
| excluding Preston | 9.0 | 23.3 | 10.1 | 21.3 | |
| In Preston | 7.3 | 18.9 | 4.8 | 10.1 | |
| Prior use of weapons | 19.3 | 49.9 | 34.0 | 71.6 | |
| Disciplinary transfers from: | | | | | |
| Other YA institutions . | 8.4 | 21.7 | 23.6 | 49.7 | |
| units | 7.9 | 20.4 | 6.9 | 14.5 | |

TABLE 2 (Con't)

^aRepresents the mean of the monthly number of wards in the living unit's ward population whose case records indicate the specified types of violent history prior to admission to the unit (Evergreen or Fir).

^bRepresents mean number of wards per month shown in first column as percent of mean ward population (Evergreen = 47.4 for Phase I and 38.4 for Phase II; Fir = 38.7 for Phase I and 47.5 for Phase II).

It was apparent there were <u>increases</u> in the proportions of Evergreen wards with histories of violence and disciplinary transfers for all of the categories shown during Phase II as compared to Phase I. On the other hand, there were <u>decreases</u> in the proportions of Fir wards with reported prior violence for seven of the nine categories. Holding aside other factors, one might expect, therefore, that the Evergreen population was more violence prone during Phase II, while the Fir population was somewhat less violence prone. Some implications of these changes between Phases I and II, in terms of the expected versus the actual rate of violent acts, will be considered in this report.

Indicators of Living Unit Tension

Statistics relating to the day-to-day program operation can serve as partial indicators of the level of tension generated on the living units during the study periods. The chief indicators used for this purpose are 1) the proportions of wards who were transferred from the units for negative reasons; 2) the rates of wards involved in disciplinary incidents; 3) the rates of wards who received time adds or added length of stay for their involvement in disciplinary incidents; 4) the rates of wards who received time cuts or reductions in length of stay for their achievement of behavior objectives; 5) the rates of staff usage of sick leave; and 6) the number of staff who requested or obtained transfers for reasons related to job dissatisfaction or stress. Of additional interest in this section are the ratios of time adds to time cuts, which also have implications for program planning and policy.

Transfers

Table 3 shows the percentages of wards who departed from Evergreen and Fir units during the three study periods in terms of three categories: Wards who were <u>released to parole or discharged</u> directly from the Youth Authority; wards who were <u>transferred for negative reasons</u> involving disciplinary actions, actual or attempted escapes and protective custody; and wards who were <u>transferred</u> <u>for other reasons</u> not involving anti-social or undesirable behaviors. The rate of negative transfers can be regarded as an index of living unit tension. Thus, wards reported for disciplinary incidents reflect a delinquent activity affecting living unit tension. Similarly, wards involved in attempted or actual escapes were often influenced by delinquent peer interaction on the unit.

- 17 -

Also, wards transferred because of protective custody--vulnerable to assault by peers to such an extent that adequate protection could not be given--reflect a relatively high level of aggression and tension among wards on the unit.

TABLE 3

DEPARTURES STATISTICS FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR BASELINE PERIOD, PHASE I, AND PHASE II

| | Baseline Period (15 Mos.) | | Phase I (15 Mos.) | | Phase II (15 Mos.) | |
|---|---------------------------------|--------------|----------------------|--------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| Living Unit and Departure Status | | 8 | No. | Ŗ | No. | £ |
| Evergreen | · | | | | | |
| Total departures | 41 | 100.0 | 122 | 100.0 | 129 | 100.0 |
| Paroled or discharged | 19 | 46.3 | 52 | 42.6 | 38 ^a | 29.5 |
| Negative transfers ^D Other transfers ^C | 15 7 | 36.6 17.1 | 42 28 | 34.4 23.0 | 43 48 | 33.3 37.2 |
| Fir | | | | | | |
| Total departures | 46 | 100.0 | 90 | 100.0 | 148 | 100.0 |
| Paroled or discharged | 16 | 34,8 | 49 | 54.4 | 50 | 33.8 |
| Negative transfers ^D Other transfers ^C | 20 10 | 43.5 21.7 | 21 20 | 23.3 22.2 | 63 35 | 42.6 23.6 |

^aIncludes one Evergreen ward and two Fir wards who were discharged directly from the Youth Authority upon departure from Preston.

^bRefers to wards transferred for disciplinary, escape, and protective custody reasons.

^CRefers to wards transferred for reasons of self request, need for intensive counseling program, drug program, college/trade/or camp program, and other factors which do not reflect distinctly negative or anti-social behavior of wards in the living unit. A glance at Table 3 reveals several aspects that deserve comment.³ For the comparison between the Baseline period and Phase I, there is little change in Evergreen's percent distribution. That is, the increase from 5-post to 6post coverage was not accompanied by any appreciable change in the percent of wards who left the unit as Negative Transfers or in a Parole/Discharge status. For Fir, however, there was a statistically significant reduction, or greater than would be expected to occur by chance, in the proportion of Negative Transfers. In other words, the decrease in average population (from 44.6 to 38.7) was associated with a substantial reduction in the percent of Negative Transfers (43.5% to 23.3%).

The pattern of changes found between Phases I and II varies somewhat from these results. Thus, the reduction in Evergreen's average population (from 47.4 to 38.4) was followed by little relative change in Negative Transfers (34.4 to 33.3). By comparison, the increase in Fir's average population (from 38.7 to 47.5) was accompanied by a significant increase in the percent of Negative Transfers (23.3 to 42.6).

These results take on additional meaning when seen in relation to the changes in the proportions of wards with histories of prior violence. As explained earlier, the proportion of violence-prone wards (as defined by prior violence history) increased on Evergreen and decreased on Fir. In light of these shifts, the differential change in the proportion of Negative Transfers between the two units seems understated. That is, had the two units been

- 19 -

³Detailed data concerning the statistical tests of significance used for Table 3 are given in Appendix D.

comparable on violence-prone wards, there might have been an even greater differential change in Negative Transfers (greater proportion on Fir and smaller proportion on Evergreen).

In an alternate analysis, wards who were Paroled/Discharged were defined as Program Successes and those who departed as Negative Transfers were defined as Program Failures. The results are largely similar to the findings above. (See Appendix E.) With Fir's increase in ward population, the proportion of Program Successes decreased significantly, or to a greater extent that would be expected merely by chance. With Evergreen's decrease in staffing, there was no change in the proportion of program successes.

Summing up, the above comparisons generally show that reduced ward population size is related to a decrease in the proportion of wards transferred from the unit for negative reasons. No relationship was apparent (in the Baseline and Phase I comparisons) between the slightly increased staffing and the proportion of negative transfers.

Disciplinary Incidents

Another measure of living unit tension is based on the extent of ward involvement in disciplinary incidents for which formal disciplinary procedures were required. These procedures, referred to as the Disciplinary Decision Making System, are well defined and require stages of fact-finding, hearings, and dispositions.

The disciplinary incidents used in this analysis are limited to those of a relatively serious nature (Level B's) for which dispositions were required by

_ 20 _

the Youth Authority Board. The reporting of these types of incidents is assumed to be fairly reliable in that they are least likely to be influenced by staff discretion in applying disciplinary sanctions. For purpose of analysis, ward involvement in the disciplinary incidents was categorized as Serious violent acts, Less Serious violent acts, and Non-violent acts (see Appendix F). Serious violent acts are distinguished from those of a Less Serious nature in regard to degree to which they involved actual/potentially dangerous behavior resulting in bodily injury or harm. Non-violent acts were defined as those which did not clearly lead to actual or potential bodily harm. It should be added that these categories were developed for purposes of the project analysis and, as such, do not correspond to the coding categories used in the Y.A. Information Systems.

The rates of ward involvement in the three types of disciplinary incidents during the Baseline period, Phase I, and Phase II for both Evergreen and Fir living units are detailed in Table 4. A ward was counted more than once if involved in two or more incidents.

- 21--

TABLE 4

| | | Evergr | een | | Fir | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| Period by Type of Ward Involvement | Total number ward involvements | Ward involvements per month | Monthly average number of wards in unit | Involvements per ward per month | Total number ward involvements | Ward involvements per month | Monthly average number of wards in unit | Involvements per ward per month |
| Baseline Period ^a | | | 47.1 | | | | 44.6 | |
| Violent acts | 31 | 3.9 | 1 | .08 | 24 | 3.0 | | .07 |
| Serious | (8) | (1) | | (.02) | (2) | (.2) | | (.01) |
| Less Serious Non-violent acts TOTAL | (23) 7 38 | (2.9) .9 4.8 | | (.06) .02 .10 | (22) 21 45 | (2.8) 2.6 5.6 | | (.06) .05 .12 |
| Phase I | | | 47.4 | | | | 38.7 | |
| Violent acts | 74 | 4.9 | | .10 | 58 | 3.9 | | .10 |
| Serious | (33) | (2.2) | | (.05) | (10) | (.7) | | (.02) |
| Less Serious Non-violent acts TOTAL | (41) 48 117 | (2.7) 2.9 7.8 | | (.05) .06 .16 | (48) 25 83 | (3.2) 1.7 5.6 | | (.08) .04 .14 |
| Phase II ^b | 38.4 | | 47.5 | | | | | |
| Violent acts | 95 | 6.3 | | .16 | 101 | 6.7 | | .14 |
| Serious | (11) | (.7) | | (.02) | (45) | (3.0) | | (.06) |
| Less Serious Non-violent acts TOTAL | (84) 32 127 | (5.6) 2.1 8.4 | | (.14) .05 .22 | (56) 38 139 | (3.7) 2.5 9.2 | | (.08) .05 .19 |

RATES OF WARD INVOLVEMENT IN LEVEL B DISCIPLINARY INCIDENTS, BY TYPE, FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR BASELINE PERIOD, PHASE I, AND PHASE II

^aThe Baseline period was 8 months. Hence, the total number of wards involved was divided by 8 to obtain the number of monthly average number of wards involved.

^bThe Phase I and II periods were each 15 months in duration. Hence the total number of wards involved was divided by 15 to obtain the monthly average number of wards involved.

A comparison of the Baseline period and Phase I indicates that the <u>Total</u> <u>rate of involvement</u> in disciplinary incidents increased by 60% (.10 to .16) with the slightly enriched staffing for Evergreen, and 17% (.12 to .14) with decreased ward population for Fir. Stated differently, enriched staffing (by one post) on Evergreen was accompanied by 79 ward involvements in disciplinary incidents; by comparison, reduced living unit size on Fir (average of 44.6 to 38.7) was accompanied by 38, or about half as many ward involvements in incidents. Evergreen shows a considerable rate increase in <u>Serious violent acts</u> (.02 to .05), as well as in <u>Non-violent acts</u> (.02 to .06). Fir also exhibits an increase in <u>Serious violent</u> acts (.01 to .02) but little change with respect to <u>Non-violent</u> <u>acts</u> (.05 to .04).

As stated earlier, the Phase I and II comparisons are regarded as crucial in the evaluation. Phases I and II entail long exposure periods of equal duration (15 months) and include relatively large numbers of ward involvements in incidents, thereby enhancing statistical reliability.

Comparing Phases I and II, there were similar increases in the <u>Total rate</u> of ward involvement in incidents for Evergreen (.16 to .22, or 36%) and Fir (.14 to .19, or 38%). Of chief interest, however, are the differential rate changes between the two living units with respect to <u>Serious violent acts</u>. For Evergreen the rate of involvements per ward decreased (.05 to .02) while for Fir the rate increased substantially (.02 to .06). Thus, with a decrease in living unit size (47.4 to 38.4) the rate of <u>Serious violent acts</u> was reduced by over one half; by contrast, with increased unit size (38.7 to 47.5), the rate of violence was tripled.

The data pertaining to Serious violent acts are presented in Table 5 by

- 23 -

comparing the project conditions of large versus small living unit size. The Large Unit condition consists of Evergreen-Phase I, and Fir--Phase II, or an average ward population of 47.5. The Small Unit condition consists of Evergreen--Phase II, and Fir--Phase I, or an average ward population of 38.5.

- 24 -

TABLE 5

RATES OF WARD INVOLVEMENT IN LEVEL B DISCIPLINARY INCIDENTS WITH SERIOUS VIOLENT ACTS, BY LIVING UNIT SIZE

| Involvement Statistics | LARGE UNIT ^a | Ever- green Phase I | Fir Phase II | SMALL UNIT ^b | Ever- green Phase II | Fir Phase I |
|--|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|
| Total ward involvements | 39 | 33 | 45 | 10.5 | 1 11 | 10 |
| Ward involvements per month (A) | 2.6 | 2.2 | 3.0 | .7 | .7 | .7 |
| Monthly average number wards in living unit (B) | 47.5 | 47.4 | 47.5 | 38.5 | 38.4 | 38.7 |
| Involvements per ward per month (A ÷ B) | .0 | 5.05 | .06 | .0: | 2.02 | .02 |

^aRepresents mean of data shown for Evergreen--Phase I and Fir--Phase II. ^bRepresents mean of data shown for Evergreen--Phase II and Fir--Phase I.

Comparing the two project conditions, the rate of ward involvement in disciplinary incidents of serious violent acts for the Large Unit was .05 and for the Small Unit .02. While Unit size was reduced by 19% (47.5 to 38.5) the rate of ward involvement decreased disproportionately by 60%.

Viewed in perspective, the remults of Tables 4 and 5 reveal the following. For the Baseline-to-Phase I comparison, there is no clearcut relationship between the rate of violent behavior with either 1) reduced ward population (an average of six wards), or 2) increased staffing (by one-post coverage). The data do suggest, however, that reduced living unit size as compared to increased staffing is less likely to be associated with ward involvement in total disciplinary incidents.

The Phase I-to-Phase II comparisons show that reduced living unit size from about 47 to 38 wards is associated with a lower rate of serious violent behavior among wards. The diminished level of violence was found in terms of fewer actual or potentially dangerous acts resulting in bodily injury or harm.

A notable pattern included in the above data relates to the incidence of escapes for the Large Unit and Small Unit project conditions. As detailed in Appendix G, the escape rate (escapes per ward per month) was four times greater for the Large Unit than the Small Unit during the 15-month periods. In numerical terms, there were 25 escapes for the Larger Unit and only 5 escapes for the Smaller Unit. This pattern of differences between the two project conditions was consistent for both the Evergreen and Fir living units.

Time Adds and Time Cuts

Wards involved in relatively serious types of disciplinary incidents were given additional time to be served at the institution. However, wards who demonstrated that they were meeting the program's standards of performance on a monthly basis were given time cuts or a reduction in time to be served. Data relating to time adds and time cuts for the study period under consideration are presented in Tables 6 to 9.⁴

Set forth in Table 6 are monthly time adds per ward for the two living units with reference to the three study periods. A second measure shown is months of time adds per ward involved.

- 25 -

⁴The time add and time cut data used in the study were accumulated on a routine basis by the project secretary and parole agent. These data could not be obtained from the Research Division's Information System because the data were recorded for a ward's total institutional stay rather than for a portion thereof as required for purposes of the study.

TABLE 6

RATES OF TIME ADDS FOR WARDS IN EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR BASELINE PERIOD, PHASE I, AND PHASE II

| Living Unit by Time Add Statistics | Baseline Period (8 Mos.) | Phase I (15 Mos.) | Phase II (15 Mos.) |
|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| Evergreen | | | |
| Total number of wards with time adds (A) | 13 | 73 | 53 |
| Months of time adds (B) | 62 | 273 | 150 |
| Months of time adds per month (C) Monthly average number of wards in | 7.8 | 18.2 | 10.0 |
| unit (D) | 47.1 | 47.4 | 38,4 |
| (B ÷ A) | 4.8 | 3.7 | 2.8 |
| Monthly time adds per ward (C \div D) | .17 | .38 | .26 |
| Fir | | | |
| Total number of wards with time adds (A) | 12 | 37 | 78 |
| Months of time adds (B) | 56 | 147 | 402 |
| Months of time adds per month (C) Monthly average number of ward in | 7.0 | 9.8 | 26.8 |
| unit (D) | 44.6 | 38.7 | 47.5 |
| (B + A) | 4.7 | 4.1 | 5.1 |
| Monthly time adds per ward (C \div D) | .16 | .25 | .56 |

Between the Baseline period and Phase I, the monthly time adds per ward reveal a sizable increase for Evergreen (.17 to .38) of 129% and a lesser relative increase for Fir (.16 to .25) of 56%. From Phase I to Phase II, Evergreen's rate declined (.38 to .26) 31% while Fir's rate increased (.25 to .56) 124%. Similar relative changes can be noted between Phases I and II with regard to months of time adds per ward involved. In short, the data indicate that a reduction in living unit size was accompanied by a decrease in the rate of time adds. The differential rate during Phases I to II between the two units is (124% - 31%) 93%. Thus, the project met one of its objectives, as stated in the grant application, of reducing added institutional time resulting from disciplinary incidents by at least 20%. Table 7 discloses the relationship between unit size and staff with regard to time cuts. The Baseline to Phase I comparisons show that the rate of time cuts decreased slightly (.14 to .12) with additional staffing (by one post) on Evergreen. On the other hand, the rate increased (.17 to .20) with the reduction in the ward population (by an average of six wards) on Fir. More distinct changes in time cut rates are apparent in the comparisons of Phases I and II. Thus, the rate nearly doubled as the ward population was reduced (by an average of nine wards) on Evergreen; the rate remained unchanged (.20), however, as the population was increased (by an average of nine wards) on Fir.

As may be recalled, a program revision was carried out on both living units during Phase I (September 1976). Wards were allowed to earn more time cuts, up to 12 days per month, for meeting specified behavioral objectives. Conceivably, this revision affected the above-noted changes in time cut rates. Thus, in the Phase I to II comparisons, the doubling of time cut rates found for Evergreen may be understated, or might have been even greater without the program revision. Similarly, there would probably have been a small increase (rather than no change) in time cut rates with the increased unit size on Fir had there been no program revision allowing wards to earn more time cuts.

- 27 -

| ጥል | B | τ. | E | 7 |
|----|---|----|---|---|
| | | | | |

RATES OF TIME CUTS FOR WARDS IN EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR BASELINE PERIOD, PHASE I, AND PHASE II

| Living Unit by Time Cut Statistics | Baseline Period (6 Mos) | Phase I (15 Mos.) | Phase II (15 Mos.) |
|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| Evergreen | | | |
| Months of time cuts (A) Months of time cuts per month (B) Monthly average number of wards in | 40 6.6 | 85 5.7 | 132 8.8 |
| unit (C) Monthly time cuts per ward (B # C) | 47.1 | 47.4 | 38.4 |
| Fir | | | |
| Months of time cuts (A) Months of time cuts per month (B) Monthly average number of wards in | 47 7.8 | 118 7.9 | 144 9.6 |
| unit (C) Monthly time cuts per ward (B ÷ C) | 44.6 | 38.7 | 47.5 |

The rates obtained for time adds and time cuts over the three study periods are generally consistent with the earlier findings concerning the rates of negative transfers and rates of ward involvement in serious violent acts. With an increase in the average ward population in the living unit, the rate of time adds increased noticeably, while the rate of time cuts tended to decrease. The differential changes were more striking, however, for time adds than time cuts.

The ratio of time cuts to time adds were compared with respect to the two project conditions of Large Unit size versus Small Unit size. These data age seen in Table 8.

| TABLE 8 |
|---------|
|---------|

| Months of Time Cuts and Time Adds | LARGE UNIT ^a | Ever- green Phase I | Fir Phase II | SMALL UNIT ^D | Ever- green Phase II | Fir Phase I |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|
| Time cuts | 114.5 | 85 | 144 | 125 | 132 | 118 |
| Time adds | 337.5 | 273 | 402 | 148.5 | 150 | 147 |
| Ratio of cuts to adds | .34 | .31 | .36 | .84 | .88 | .80 |

RATIO OF TIME CUTS TO TIME ADDS, BY LARGE VERSUS SMALL LIVING UNIT SIZE

^aRepresents mean of time cuts or time adds shown for Evergreen--Phase I and Fir--Phase II.

bRepresents mean of time cuts or time adds shown for Evergreen--Phase II and Fir--Phase I.

For the Large Unit (average ward population of 47.5), for every month of time added one-third month of time was cut; on the other hand, for the Small Unit (average ward population of 38.4), every month of time added was offset by over three-fourths months of time cuts. The table also reveals that the ratios of time cuts to time adds were fairly consistent within the Large Unit (.31 and .36) and the Small Unit (.88 and .80) conditions.

These data were further examined in terms of the net time adds, or time adds minus time cuts, for the two project conditions. The comparisons are shown in Table 9 in conjunction with the average ward population for the two conditions.
TABLE 9

| Months of Time Cuts and Time Adds | LARGE UNIT ^a | Ever- green Phase I | Fir Phase II | SMALL UNIT | Ever- green Phase II | Fir Phase I | Percent Change ^b |
|--|------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|
| Time adds (A) Time cuts (B) Net time adds (A - B) Average ward population | 270 91.5 178.5 47.5 | 218 68] 150 | 322 115 207 | 118.8 100.0 18.8 38.4 | 120 105.6 14.4 | 117.6 94.4 23.2 | -56% +8% -89% -19% |

ANNUAL NET TIME ADDS, BY LARGE VERSUS SMALL LIVING UNIT SIZE

^aTime adds and time cuts reported for the 15-month periods of Phases I and II were prorated and shown in the table for 12-month periods.

^bRepresents percent change between Large Unit and Small Unit.

Of chief interest is that the net time added decreased from 178 months for the Large Unit to 19 months for the Small Unit, or an 89% decrease. By contrast, the average ward population from Large Unit to Small Unit size decreased by only 19%. These data suggest that, given similar ward populations and program operations, a substantial amount of time adds can be saved when living unit size is reduced from an average population of 47 wards to 38 wards.

Bed Space and Cost Savings

The above results have further implications in terms of potential savings of bed space and cost per ward. Both aspects are examined below.

In changing from the 47-ward to the 38-ward unit, nine beds were, in effect, given up. This apparent loss, however, was more than offset by a savings of 17.4 beds, based upon 160 months of fewer net time adds realized in the 38-bed unit. In converting from the larger unit to the smaller unit, therefore, an average of 8.3 additional beds (17.4 - 9.1) were made available in the smaller unit during a one-year period. These results are summarized in Table 10.

TABLE 10

SAVINGS IN NET TIME ADDS AND BED SPACE IN CHANGE FROM 47-BED TO 38-BED UNIT

| Living Unit Size | Months of Net Time-Adds per Year | Beds Saved per Year ^a |
|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| 47.5-bed unit, 6-post staffing | 178.5 18.8 | |
| Difference: 9.1 beds | 159.7 | 17.4 |

^aDerived by dividing the difference in average annual net time-adds (159.7) between the 47.5-bed unit and 38.4-bed unit by the mean length of stay (9.2 months) for Preston wards for calendar years 1976 through 1978.

Cost savings resulting from the decrease in net time adds can be derived from these data. Based on the 8.3 additional beds made available per year and an estimated average annual cost per bed of \$8,304,⁵ the net savings would amount to \$68,923 per year with reference to the two project living units. Potential net savings involving reduced ward population for a larger number of living units or at an institutionwide level would require a more elaborate cost analysis including marginal costs, such as capital outlay and support services.⁶

⁶It is recognized that the above aggregate analysis provides an approximation of savings realized in terms of bed space and cost. A more precise analysis would have tracked time adds and time cuts for individual wards during their stay in the large and small living unit conditions. It was not feasible to do this for a variety of reasons; for example, the same wards were, in some cases exposed to both the Baseline and Phase I periods or to the Phase I and Phase II conditions, thereby posing problems of contamination.

⁵The cost data were provided by the Departmental Budget Office. The \$8,304 represents the budgeted cost per ward for direct staff services for the two project living units for fiscal year 1978-79. Excluded are costs for supportive services and capital outlay. It was assumed that these costs did not vary appreciably between the two living units.

Summing up, the above data suggest that reduced living unit size, as carried out in the project, yields benefits in terms of fewer time adds, more time cuts, as well as savings in bed space and per capita costs.

Staff Sick Leave

Summarized in Table 11 are statistics on staff sick leave for the two living units over the three study periods. The data focus on two rates: hours per usage of sick leave, and hours of sick leave per month per staff.

| T/ | AB | LE | 1 | 1 |
|----|----|----|---|---|
| - | | _ | _ | _ |

SICK LEAVE STATISTICS FOR STAFF OF EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR BASELINE PERIOD, PHASE I, AND PHASE II

| Living Unit and Sick Leave Statistics ^a | Baseline Period (6 Mos.) ^b | Phase I (15 Mos.) | Phase II (15 Mos.) |
|---|---|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| Evergreen | | | |
| Number of staff using sick leave one or | | | |
| more times per month (A) | 11 | 14 | 28 |
| Hours of sick leave (B) | 110 | 122 | 268 |
| Hours of sick leave per month (C) Number of staff assigned to living | 13.8 | 8.1 | 17.9 |
| unit (D) | 6.5 | 8.5 | 6.5 |
| Hours per usage of sick leave $(B \div A)$ Hours of sick leave per month per | 10.0 | 8.7 | 9.6 |
| staff (C 🕂 D) | 2.1 | 1.0 | 2.8 |
| Fir | | | |
| Number of staff using sick leave one or | | | |
| more times per month (A) | 12 | 30 | 51 |
| Hours of sick leave (B) | 184 | 348 | 687 |
| Hours of sick leave per month (C) Number of staff assigned to living | 23.0 | 23.2 | 45.8 |
| unit (D) | 6.5 | 6.5 | 8.5 |
| Hours per usage of sick leave (B ? A) Hours of sick leave per month per | 10.0 | 11.6 | 13.5 |
| staff (C 🕂 D) | 3.5 | 3.6 | 5.3 |

^aExcludes sick leave for Family illness, since this was assumed to be generally unrelated to a staff member's reaction to tension within the lodge setting. An individual staff member was counted once for the total sick leave used within a month; similarly, a staff was counted separately for each month of reported sick leave usage.

The sick leave results do not disclose any consistent trend in relation to changes in the two project conditions of ward population size and staffing. For Evergreen, additional staffing was related to lower rates of sick leave. For Fir, however, the opposite relationship was apparent; additional staff was associated with higher rates of sick leave.

Staff Turnover

As part of the background data submitted for the grant application, statistics were compiled on the number of staff who left Evergreen and Fir living units and the reasons for their transfer or departure during the period January 1972 through December 1973. Although comparable data were not maintained for the two-year period preceding the project, these statistics were collected during the project period of January 1976 through September 1978, and for the post-project period October 1978 through September 1979. Tables 12 to 14 show the staff turnover data for these periods.

TABLE 12

STAFF DEPARTURE STATISTICS FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, BY REASON, 1972-1973

| Reason for Departure | No. of Staff | |
|---|--------------|--|
| Promoted | 4 | |
| Other planned or actual departures: | 20 | |
| Transferred by own request | (3) | |
| Requesting transfer | (6) | |
| Resigned | (5) | |
| Plans to resign within one year | (3) | |
| Released at end of TAUPlans to retire due to stress-related | (1) | |
| illness | (1) | |
| Deceased | (1) | |
| TOTAL PLANNED OR ACTUAL DEPARTURES | 24 | |

As shown in Table 12 a total of 24 staff either left Evergreen and Fir or planned to do so during the period 1972-1973. Of this number, 20, or about 83% voluntarily left or planned to leave for reasons other than promotions. Thus, nine requested to be transferred or were transferred by their own request;

- 34 -

eight resigned or planned to resign; one left at the end of his temporary appointment; and one employee planned to retire because of stress-related illness; another employee shown as deceased was killed in an auto accident. It should be noted that of the nine staff members who left the unit or requested transfers a majority involved medical reasons which were related to stress. Considering the five-post staffing of each of the two living units, the departure of about 10 staff members per year for reasons other than promotion can be regarded as a relatively high turnover.

Table 13 presents staff departure statistics for the project period. Of the five employees who left the project units, two were transferred at their own request, two were promoted, and one retired in accordance with plans. There were no requests for transfers during the project period.

TABLE 13

| | mot al | Ever | green | Fir | |
|---|--------------------|------------|--------------|------------|------------------------|
| Reason for Departure | Number of Staff | Phase I | Phase | Phase I | Phase II |
| Promoted | 2 | 1 | 1 | - | - |
| Other Departures Transferred by own request Retired | 3 (2) (1) | - | 1 (1) | - | 2 (1) <u>(1)</u> |
| TOTAL DEPARTURES | | 1 | 2 | - | 2 |

STAFF DEPARTURE STATISTICS FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, BY REASON, JANUARY 1976 - SEPTEMBER 1978

Summarized in Table 14 are staff departure data pertaining to the one-year period following termination of the project. A total of 12 staff left the two units, with the majority (7) transferred at their own request. Among these were two staff members who voluntarily accepted demotions in order to facilitate

_`35 _

il.

transfer to other units. The greater number of staff transfers during this period was also influenced by the availability of more staff openings as a result of an expansion of living units at Preston and other institutions.

TABLE 14

| OCIOBER 1978 - SEFIEMBER 1979 | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|-----------|-----|--|--|--|--|
| T Reason for Departure | otal Number of Staff | Evergreen | Fir | | | | |
| Departures | | | | | | | |
| Transferred by own request On disability leave (due to | 9 | 4 | 5 | | | | |
| injury from battery by ward). | 1 | 1 | - | | | | |
| Terminated on probation | 1 | 1 | - | | | | |
| Resigned | 1 | <u> </u> | | | | | |
| TOTAL DEPARTURES | 12 | 7 | 5 | | | | |

STAFF DEPARTURE STATISTICS FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, BY REASON, OCTOBER 1978 - SEPTEMBER 1979

The above data indicate there was relatively little staff turnover, as defined by staff departures for reasons other than promotions, during the 30month duration of the project. These results are, of course, tenuous since comparable data were available only for the earlier 1972 and 1973 period and not for the two years immediately preceding the project. Nevertheless, it is clear that the number of staff departures during the project period is of a much smaller magnitude than both during 1972 to 1973 and during the year after the project termination. Various possible explanations can be offered. Perhaps the project conditions of reduced ward population or added staffing (by one post) were conducive to less perceived stress and/or job dissatisfaction among staff which, in turn, encouraged staff to remain in the two units. Alternatively, staff may have identified to some degree with the project and therefore postponed any contemplated departures--except for promotions--until after termination of the project.

_ 36 _

Ward Perceptions of Social Climate

Research staff measured ward opinions with regard to social relationships in the living unit, the treatment program, and the day-to-day program operation in terms of the clarity of rules and procedures used and the controls employed by staff. For this purpose, a standardized instrument known as the Correctional Institution Environment Scale, or CIES, (Moos, 1975), was administered to wards five months prior to Phase I, at the end of Phase I, and at the end of Phase II. The present analysis is limited to the Phases I and II test results, with a long interval (14 months) between the two test administrations. In conjunction with the CIES, a supplemental questionnaire was administered to elicit ward perceptions about related aspects of program impact and social climate.

Ward Responses to Correctional Institution Environment Scale

Chart II shows the differences obtained in mean scale scores between the Phase I and Phase II administrations of the CIES. The scales are divided into three sectors pertaining to social climate of the living unit: Relationship, Treatment, and System Maintenance.

The first sector, Relationship, consists of three scales. The Involvement scale concerns the extent to which wards become involved with one another and with the overall program. The Support scale deals with the extent to which wards find support from peers and from staff. The Expressiveness scale is designed to measure the degree to which wards are free to express feelings in their social interactions.

In the Relationship area, Evergreen reveals a significant increase on the Expressiveness scale. This suggests that as wards experienced less crowding and more personal space, they felt more secure in expressing their feelings. By contrast, Fir wards show relatively little change on this scale from Phase I to II. It should be noted, however, that Fir wards exhibit a significant increase on the Involvement scale when living unit size increased. This could mean that wards

- 37 -

CHART II

MEAN DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PHASE I AND PHASE II POST-TEST SCORES ON CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION ENVIRONMENT SCALES FOR WARDS OF EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS



Note: See Appendix H for detailed data.

*Mean difference is statistically significant, or greater than would be expected to occur by chance.

- 38 -

responded to questions about involvement in terms of identification with delinquent groups. As unit size increased, wards may have become more involved with delinquently oriented groups and turned to delinquent groups more often for protection and to confirm their peer status. This interpretation is consistent with ward questionnaire results presented in the next section; namely, that with increased population size wards were more likely to go to wards rather than staff for help on their problems.

The second sector, Treatment, is made up of three scales--Autonomy, Practical Orientation, and Personal Problems Orientation--intended to measure the extent to which basic dimensions of treatment are emphasized. The autonomy scale assesses the extent to which wards are encouraged to become self-sufficient and take responsibility for their own decisions. The Practical Orientation scale pertains to the extent to which wards are prepared to cope with problems after release from the program such as job or school goals. The Personal Problems Orientation scale deals with the extent to which wards are encouraged to become aware of personal problems and feelings.

With reference to the Treatment, Evergreen wards show the most change on the Practical Orientation scale when living unit size decreased. With the reduced ward population in Evergreen during Phase II, the wards in this unit may have received more counseling concerning their long term problems of parole adjustment. Fir wards reveal a significant positive change on the Personal Problems Orientation scale, when living unit size increased; by comparison, Evergreen wards manifest only a small increase on this scale. These results suggest there was an increased emphasis on personal problems of adjustment rather than long-term practical problems. Thus, with the increased ward population in Fir during Phase II, personal problems of adjustment in the living unit appeared to be of greater concern among wards.

The third section relates to System Maintenance dimensions, including the three scales of Order and Organization, Clarity, and Staff Control. Order and

_ 39 _

Organization encompasses 1) how orderly wards look, 2) what staff do to encourage order, and 3) how well the facility is kept. Clarity measures the extent to which wards know what to expect and how explicit the program rules and procedures are. Staff Control refers to the extent to which staff control ward behavior such as through imposition of rules, scheduling of activities, and structuring relationships between wards and staff.

As seen in Chart I, Evergreen and Fir wards show contrasting patterns of changes on the three scales relating to System Maintenance from Phase I to II. Evergreen's mean score changed toward increased Order and Organization, and Clarity but toward decreased Staff Control when living unit size was decreased. With reduced ward population, the day-to-day operation of program appeared to become more coherent, including better ward understanding of what is expected and less staff concern with strict enforcement of rules. The smaller ward population may have enabled staff to operate a more clearly defined program while loosening up on formal procedures to control ward behavior.

The CIES results can be summed up as follows. With reduced living unit size, wards seemed to express personal feelings more freely in interpersonal relationships. With increased unit size, wards appeared to become more involved with peers, interaction much of which probably entailed delinquent behaviors.

In the area of treatment, reduced living unit size was associated with more emphasis on preparing wards for problems after release to parole. Increased unit size, on the other hand, led to more emphasis on short-term problems, such as personal adjustment on the living unit.

Regarding system maintenance, smaller living unit size was accompanied by a more clearly defined and organized program, with less need for staff controls. Increased size, however, seemed to lead to a less coherent program with great need for staff controls.

- 40 -

A supplemental questionnaire was administered to wards in order to tap areas of social climate and program impact. These areas covered: 1) Staff relationships with wards; 2) Ward relationships with staff; 3) Staff-staff relationships; 4) Ward appraisals of the overall programs; and 5) Ward and staff appraisals of program impact. Wards completed the questionnaire in conjunction with the Correctional Institution Environment Scale inventory, at the end of Phases I and II. Table 15-17 below summarize ward responses to the questionnaire; more detailed response distributions are shown in Appendices I through L.

Staff Relationships with Wards

Presented in Table 15 are ward responses to questions regarding staff relationships with wards. Several aspects of interest can be seen in the table. Though not statistically significant, living unit size was related to ward views on how well staff understands their problems and needs, with wards in the smaller unit being more likely to respond positively in this regard. Also, wards in the smaller unit were significantly more likely to say that staff take a personal interest in them. Living unit size does not seem to be clearly related to 1) ward responses as to whether staff "really care what happens to you," and 2) ward appraisals of how fair staff are with wards.

Ward responses concerning their relationships with staff are summarized in Table 16. With reduced living unit size, wards more often indicated they know one or more staff well enough to discuss their personal problems. This response is consistent with wards in the smaller unit saying that staff understand their problems and needs.

- 41 -

TABLE 15

WARD PERCEPTIONS OF STAFF RELATIONSHIPS WITH WARDS, FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR PHASES I AND II

(In Percent)

| | | Evergr | een | Fir | | |
|-----|--|--------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--|
| | | Phase I | Phase II | Phase I | Phase II | |
| Ite | m | (N=35) | (N=33) | (N=34) | (N=41) | |
| 1. | DO YOU THINK MOST OF THE STAFF IN THIS PROGRAM ARE JUST "WORKING A SHIFT" OR DO YOU THINK THEY REALLY CARE WHAT HAPPENS TO YOU? | | | | | |
| 2. | They really care They're just working a shift HOW DO YOU SEE THE STAFF-WARD RELATIONSHIP IN THIS PROGRAM? | 17.1 74.3 | 9.1 63.6 | 8.8 70.6 | 12.2 63.4 | |
| 3. | Staff are pretty fair with the wards HOW WELL DO YOU FEEL THAT STAFF IN THIS PROGRAM UNDERSTAND YOUR PROBLEMS AND NEEDS? | 21.9 | 24.2 | 36.4 | 35.0 | |
| 4. | They usually/sometimes understand HOW MANY STAFF IN THIS PROGRAM TAKE A PERSONAL INTEREST IN THE INDIVIDUAL WARDS? | 28.5 | 45.4 | 58.8 | 41.5 | |
| | All/most/half of them | 5.8* | 30.3* | 14.7 | 17.1 | |

*Significant difference, or change in proportions is greater than would be ordinarily expected to occur merely by chance.

- 42 -

TABLE 16

WARD PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF, FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR PHASES I AND II

(In Percent)

| | | Evergre | en | Fir | | |
|-----|--|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--|
| Ite | m | Phase I | Phase II | Phase I | Phase II | |
| 1. | HOW MANY STAFF IN THIS PROGRAM DO YOU KNOW WELL ENOUGH TO DISCUSS YOUR PERSONAL PROBLEMS | (N=35) | (N=33) | (N=34) | <u>(N=41)</u> | |
| | One or more | 34.3 | 54.5 | 60.8 | 43.9 | |
| 2. | DO YOU FEEL THAT YOUR RELATION- SHIPS WITH STAFF ARE: | | | | | |
| | Better than/about what you expected | 62.8 | 75.8 | 97.0* | 60.0* | |
| 3. | HOW WELL DO YOU PERSONALLY LIKE MOST OF THE STAFF IN THE PROGRAM? | | | | | |
| | Very much/pretty much | 20.0 | 18.1 | 23.5 | 17.1 | |
| 4. | HOW MANY TIMES IN THE LAST TWO WEEKS HAVE YOU TALKED TO A COUNSELOR SERIOUSLY FOR AT LEAST A FEW MINUTES? | | | | | |
| | One or more times | 62.9 | 54.5 | 44.1 | 41.5 | |
| 5. | WHEN YOU WANT TO TALK TO SOMEONE HERE ABOUT A PERSONAL PROBLEM, WHO WOULD YOU GO TO FIRST FOR ADVICE? | | | | | |
| | A staff member Another ward No one here | 45.5 39.4 15.1 | 50.0 12.5 37.5 | 44.1 29.4 26.5 | 30.0 40.0 30.0 | |

*Significant difference, or change in proportions is greater than would be ordinarily expected to occur merly by chance. As seen in Item 2 of Table 16, more wards in the smaller living unit said their relationships with staff are better than or about what they expected. Thus there was a relative improvement in ward-staff relationships, as judged by wards, after the reduction in the average ward population.

A further contrasting pattern appears from Item 5. As the average population size decreased, an appreciably higher percentage of wards said they would go to a youth counselor or to "no one here" for advice on a personal problem, while a substantially lower percentage said they would seek out another ward. With larger living unit size, smaller proportions indicated they would go to a youth counselor and higher proportions would confide in another ward. The detailed response breakdowns are shown in Appendix J.

Overall Program Appraisal

As shown in Table 17, three questions were asked about the overall program. The first item, concerning perceptions of tension on the living unit, shows minor shifts indicating a possible decline in tension on Evergreen with smaller living unit size and a possible increase in tension on Fir with larger unit size, although these could be chance fluctuations.

The second item, pertaining to ward liking of the overall program, shows more positive views by Evergreen wards as their living unit size was decreased; by comparison, Fir wards expressed more positive views after their living unit population was increased. These shifts, however, were of small magnitude and could reflect chance variations.

Specific Program Appraisals

Eight items of the questionnaire dealt with ward appraisals of the living unit program and its effect upon ward adjustment, both short-term and long-term. (See Appendix L.) Statistical tests did not disclose significant shifts--or any

- 44 -

TABLE 17

WARD PERCEPTIONS OF PROGRAM, FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR PHASES I AND II

| | | | reen | Fir | | |
|--------|---|---------|----------|---------|----------|--|
| T.t.o. | _ | Phase I | Phase II | Phase I | Phase II | |
| | M | (N=35) | (N=33) | (N=34) | (N=41) | |
| 1. | HOW MUCH OF A TENSE OR RELAXED FEELING DO YOU THINK THERE IS IN THIS PROGRAM? | | | | | |
| | Pretty relaxed/kind of relaxed | 45.8 | 51.5 | 57.5 | 42.5 | |
| 2. | WHAT DO YOU THINK OF THIS PLACE? | | | | | |
| | A lot better/better than I expected | 35.4 | 40.6 | 67.7 | 56.4 | |
| 3. | IF YOU HAD A CHANCE, WOULD YOU WANT TO TRANSFER TO ANOTHER PROGRAM EVEN THOUGH IT WOULD TAKE JUST AS LONG TO BE PAROLED? | | | | | |
| | No, I definitely don't want to/I don't think I'd want to be transferred | 48.6 | 30.3 | 47.0 | 42.5 | |

fluctuations greater than would occur by chance--between the Phase I and II surveys on the eight items included in the table. For those items showing some degree of change, no consistent differences appear between Phases I and II for the change in size of the two living units. Nevertheless, appreciable positive changes can be seen for both units in the response distributions for Items 1 and 4. Substantially higher proportions of wards of both units indicated in Phase II than in Phase I that "some" or "many" of their peers would "stay out of trouble with the law after they are paroled;" also, a considerably higher proportion in Phase II saw their peers as being able to "get along better with wards and staff in this program."

Staff Description of Living Unit Events

To gain insight into the nature and extent of change in living unit tension as observed by the project director during the study period, research staff analyzed the monthly reports on program implementation submitted by the project director. Of chief interest was the section of the report which focused on "significant problems" on the unit. This section dealt with the project director's observations regarding significant events in the program operation, behavioral incidents and acting-out tendencies among wards, and appraisals of the overall level of tension on the unit. The reports were analyzed in order to: 1) rate the level of tension for each month; and 2) identify critical problems and events observed on the two living units.

Ratings of Tension Level

Two researchers rated the degree of tension on the two units as described (directly or indirectly) in the monthly reports. Using a three-point scale to

- 46 -

The raters were Joachim P. Seckel, Principal Investigator, and Jesse Garcia, Staff Analyst, who assisted in the data analysis.

indicate low, medium, and high tension, the two raters agreed on 93% of their ratings for the 30-month project period.

TABLE 18

MONTHLY RATINGS OF DEGREE OF TENSION IN EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR PHASES I AND II

| | Pha | se I (15 | mos.) | Pha | se II () | 15 mos.) |
|-------------|------|----------|--------------------|------|----------|---------------------|
| | Degr | ee of Te | nsion ^a | Degr | ee of T | ension ^a |
| Living Unit | Low | Medium | High ' | Low | Medium | High |
| Evergreen | 5 | 8 | 2 | 9 | 2 | 4 |
| Fir | 8 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 8 |

^a"Low" refers to a relatively low level of tension associated with reported events and social interaction on the living unit. "Medium" refers to a distinctly more noticeable, recurring, or persistent level of tension. "High" refers to an extreme level of tension which is occurring or persistent. In determining the relative level, comparisons were made to the preceding 2-3 months.

Shown in Table 18 are the distributions of ratings of the degree of tension (Low, Medium, and High) for the two living units, as derived from the 15 monthly reports examined for Phases I and II, respectively. A differential pattern emerges between the two units when comparing Phases I and II. For Evergreen the most frequent rating was Medium during Phase I and Low during Phase II, after the reduction in living unit size. For Fir, tension was rated most frequently as Low during Phase I and as High during Phase II, after living unit size was increased. While the differential shift in degree of tension between Phases I and II is more pronounced for Fir than for Evergreen, the data suggest there is a relationship between the level of tension reported and the living unit size.

Significant Problems and Events

The monthly reports disclosed both negative and positive factors in ward-ward and ward-staff relationships for both of the living units. The reports were based on the personal observations of the program administrator and upon information furnished to him by staff of the two units. (An outline of the various types of problems and events is contained in Appendix M.)

Many of the problems seen during the project period reflect the institutional code and attitudes fostered by delinquently oriented peer groups. A common behavior observed on both units involves the use of threats and intimidation by a group against one or more of wards designated as "weak"--or less sophisticated in delinquent ways, not as institution-wise and easily victimized. Aggression against these wards served to boost the perceived peer group status of the aggressor wards. Often the pressure upon wards seen as "weak" took place in areas away from the living unit or in "blind" spots where close supervision could not be readily provided.

A second type of problem Wäß the frequent conflict and violence which erupted between, and sometimes within, ethnic groups. The major groups consisted of White, Black, and Mexican-American wards, with the latter split into Northern and Southern factions. Mexican-American wards were generally compelled to join the Northern or Southern factions, depending on their geographic origin. The two factions were largely modeled after the Nuestra Familia (North) and Mexican Mafia (South) prison gangs and were, therefore, relatively well organized.

- 48 -

With virtually all Mexican-American wards designated as members of either faction, the influence and power exercised by these groups was related to the number of Mexican-American wards in the living unit.

A third problem arose when population turnover was high, with a fairly large number of wards admitted to or departing from the unit within a short period. High turnover often caused a temporary ethnic imbalance, which was followed by an increase in aggression between White, Black, and Mexican-American groups. Moreover, newcomers were generally subjected to wards' "internal classification system" by which their peer group status was determined in the delinquent subculture. As a consequence, new wards were labeled as "weak" or "strong," "snitches," or by other inmate stereotypes and were often challenged to prove their "macho," "heart" or gang allegiance through aggressive acts. On some occasions, however, a high turnover also resulted in a number of very aggressive wards leaving the unit, thereby bringing about a lessening of tension.

Comparing the types and number of problems in ward relationships between Phases I and II brings to light several program events and dynamics associated with the living units' changes in ward population size. Since these relationships were derived from descriptive material in the monthly reports, they should be regarded as suggestive clues rather than as definitive findings.

With the reduced ward population on Evergreen, the pressuring and intimidation of "weaker" wards decreased noticeably during Phase II. One of various factors which appeared to contribute to this diminished tension was a staff intervention that was used for a brief period. Large numbers of wards who had been involved in disciplinary incidents and negative behavior were removed for several days to another living unit with individual rooms. The wards were reoriented to staff expectations, and a highly structured approach was used,

- 49 -

including close supervision and extensive counseling. It should be added that during this brief period a large number of highly aggressive Fir wards were also transferred to the living unit with individual rooms and received a similar reorientation. While these wards also showed improved behavior, the impact did not appear to be as lasting as among Evergreen wards.

A second factor involved in the diminished Phase II tension on Evergreen was a substantial decline in the level of conflict between the Northern and Southern gang factions among Mexican-American wards. This improvement was brought about by a "truce" which staff arranged by conferring with the two factions. Although a similar "truce" was also arranged between the two corresponding factions on Fir living unit, it lasted only about three months. The more enduring "truce" on Evergreen may have been influenced by the smaller proportion of Mexican-American wards on this unit (Appendix N). Thus, wards in the two Mexican-American factions were, perhaps, less subject to massive peer pressure and, with smaller group size, could interact more normally on an individual basis.

A third factor involved in the lessening of Phase II tension on Evergreen was a reduced degree of conflict between White, Black, and Mexican-American groups of wards. In part, this could be attributed to the more balanced proportions of wards comprising these groups during Phase II, particularly the reduced proportion of White wards. In this regard, living unit staff have often observed that tension is lowered when wards of the three major ethnic groups become more evenly distributed within the unit population.

Two main patterns of change were noted on Fir in conjunction with this unit's increased ward population during Phase II. First, there was a wider rift between the Northern and Southern Mexican-American gang factions. This was part of a similar increase in conflict observed between the two groups in

- 50 -

most of the other living units at Preston. As indicated above, the "truce" arranged between the two factions on Fir was short-lived. Thus, Fir's high level of tension during Phase II seemed to emanate, in large part, from the actual and expected outbreaks of violence between these two groups.

A second tension-producing factor noted on the Fir unit was the higher ward turnover during Phase II than Phase I. This increased the aforementioned problems of ethnic imbalance and labeling and victimization of new wards, as well as power struggles among delinquent factions and among ward seeking peer recognition through bold, aggressive acts. With the larger living unit population in Phase II, staff were also less able to take quick and effective action to deal with these problems and prevent their escalation into major incidents.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

In reviewing the major findings and their implications, it is well to keep in mind several considerations. One of these is the extent to which the objectives set forth in the project's grant application were attained. A related matter is the extent to which the objectives of the separate evaluation plan were obtained, including tests of the hypotheses stated in the plan. In addition, the extent to which reduced living unit size was associated with savings in bed space and related costs is of concern in the study. Of further interest are the factors and dynamics which seem to underlie the findings obtained in the project.

Grant Objectives

As may be recalled, one project objective as stated in the grant application was to increase knowledge of the relative merits of enriched staffing versus a reduction in living unit size. While the project's emphasis was on the effects of reduced living unit size, data were obtained in the Baseline and Phase I comparisons to shed light on the above objective. It was shown that reduced average ward population, as compared to increased staffing, was accompanied by a smaller rate of increase of ward involvement in disciplinary incidents (Table 4). These results were supported by related sets of data, as summarized in Table 19. Comparing the Baseline and Phase I periods, the various rate changes (wards transferred for negative reasons, involvement in serious violent acts, time adds, and time cuts) were generally in a more favorable direction with reduced living unit size (Fir) than with increased staffing (Evergreen).

Two related objectives were to decrease the level of living unit tension and to reduce the number of disciplinary incidents, particularly those involving time adds. The various types of project data collected suggest that these

- 52 -

objectives were met. Thus, reduced living unit size relative to increased unit size (by an average population change of nine wards) was associated with lower rates of ward involvement in serious violent incidents, lower rates of time adds, and higher rates of time cuts as summarized in Table 19. Based on these indicators, there was a lowering of tension as living unit size was reduced. Ward responses to questionnaires supports this finding, although to a lesser degree. An analysis of the monthly reports regarding events and developments in the living units also shows that with reduced unit size there was lessening of tension among wards.

A further project objective was to reduce the number of time adds received by wards by at least 20%. As indicated earlier (Table 8), the change from the Large Unit to the Small Unit conditions--representing a 19% reduction in average ward population--was followed by 56% decrease in the number of time adds. Moreover, the net time adds, or time adds minus time cuts, decreased by 89% when comparing the change from the Large Unit to the Small Unit.

Evaluation Objectives

Various sets of data were used to test the three hypotheses set forth in the evaluation plan. The first hypothesis stated there would be a significant reduction in tension on both living units from the Baseline period to Phase I. That is, both the reduction in ward population on Fir and the enriched staffing from 5- to 6-post coverage on Evergreen would be accompanied by a substantial decline in the level of tension. This hypothesis was not supported by the major findings, as shown in Table 19. Neither enriched staffing (by one post) nor reduced living unit size (by an average of six wards) was accompanied by a consistent and appreciable decline in tension from the Baseline period to Phase I as defined by the key indicators used in the study. For both conditions,

- 53 -

there was <u>absolute</u> increases from the Baseline to Phase I in the rates of wards transferred for negative reasons, rates of involvement in serious violent acts, and rates of time adds. Only the rate of time cuts shows a minor decrease with increased staffing (Evergreen) and an increase with reduced living unit size (Fir).

The second hypothesis stated that a decrease in living unit population is a more critical factor in lowering tension than the addition of staff. As summarized above, the <u>relative</u> rate changes in the Baseline to Phase I comparisons were more often in a favorable direction, or were less negative, for Fir than for Evergreen. Based on these data, it appears that decreased ward population plays a more important role in lowering tension than does enriched staffing.

TABLE 19

KEY RESULTS OF PROJECT EVALUATION FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR BASELINE PERIOD, PHASE I, AND PHASE II

| | Ev | ergree | n | Fir | | |
|--|-------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Key Indicators | Base- line (47.1) | Phase I (47.4) | Phase II (38.4) | Base- line (44.6) | Phase I (38.7) | Phase II (47.5) |
| Proportion of wards transferred for negative reasons | 36.6 | 34.4 | 33.3 | 43.5 | 23.3 | 42.6 |
| Rate of ward involvement in merious violent acts | .02 | 2 .05 | .02 | .01 | .02 | .06 |
| Rate of time adds | .17 | .38 | .26 | .16 | .25 | .56 |
| Rate of time cuts | .14 | .12 | .23 | .17 | .20 | .20 |
| Rate of staff sick leave | 2.1 | 1.0 | 2.8 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 5.3 |

Note: Numbers in parentheses indicate average monthly ward population.

The third hypothesis stated there would be a decline in tension associated with the reduction in ward population size as shown by the Phase I versus Phase II comparisons. This hypothesis was largely confirmed based on the key indicators of tension used in the study.

As discussed in the report, several factors probably contributed to the apparent changes in tension on the living units. Information obtained from the monthly project reports regarding significant problems and events observed on the living units provides clues to the dynamics underlying changes in tension. Examination of the descriptive reports suggests that with smaller living unit size there was a lessening of tension because: 1) wards were able to interact more closely and gain a better understanding of one another, thereby counteracting delinquent labels imposed by negative peer groups; 2) fewer delinquent factions were formed or they were of a smaller size; and 3) there was less militant gang activity involving well organized groups with ethnic affiliations. Other possible explanatory factors can be found in a review of research literature on the effects of crowding in correctional settings. The studies generally show that with less crowded conditions inmates perceive more personal space, show more positive behavior and emotional responses, and exhibit fewer psychological/physiological stress symptoms (Seckel, 1978).

In light of the above findings, a number of benefits would probably be realized with a shift to a smaller living unit size (from 47 to 38). The major benefits include a sizable decrease in ward involvement in serious violent behavior, a decline in time adds, and increases in time cuts. Consequently, there would also be a substantial decrease in net time adds (time adds minus time cuts) which would result in savings in bed space capacity and program costs.

- 55 -

Seen in perspective, the results of this study generally support the conclusion that reduced living unit size is an important factor in attempts to lessen tension and violent behavior among wards. In addition to promoting safer and more humane conditions, reduced size is also likely to bring about fewer time adds, which translate into savings in bed space and operating costs. These and other related project findings are applicable in the long-term program planning for ward populations and settings similar to those under considerations.

APPENDIX A

MOVEMENT STATISTICS FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR BASELINE PERIOD

| | | Baseline Period | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|--|--|
| Living Unit and Movement Status | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Mean | | |
| EVERGREEN | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of wards at start | 45 | 47 | 47 | 47 | 47 | 7 | 46.7 | | |
| Admissions | 11 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 10 | 7.7 | | |
| Departures | 9 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 6.8 | | |
| Number of wards at end | 47 | 47 | 47 | 47 | 47 | 50 | 47.5 | | |
| Average monthly population ^a | | | | | | | 47.1 | | |
| Turnover rate ^b | | | • | | | | 15.4 | | |
| FIR | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of wards at start | 44 | 51 | 47 | 43 | 41 | 42 | 44.7 | | |
| Admissions | 13 | 9 | 1 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 7.5 | | |
| Departures | 6 | 13 | 5 | 10 | 7 | 5 | 7.7 | | |
| Number of wards at end | 51 | 47 | 43 | 41 | 42 | 43 | 44.5 | | |
| Average monthly population ^a | | | | | | | 44.6 | | |
| Turnover rate ^b | | | | | | | 17.0 | | |

^aThe average monthly ward population represents the mean of the number of wards at the start and end of each month during the Baseline period. Population movement data were not available for May and June 1975, as the data collection was initiated in the last half of 1975. The above average monthly population figures are used in this report as estimates to obtain rates covering the eight-month period May through December 1975.

^bTurnover rate represents the mean number of admissions and departures for the Baseline period expressed as a percent of the average monthly population. For example, Evergreen's turnover rate = mean of admissions and departures (7.25) divided by average monthly population, (47.1) X 100 = 15.4.

APPENDIX B

MONTHLY MOVEMENT STATISTICS FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR PHASE I

•

1 1

| | | | | | | | | Pha | se I | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|------|
| Living Unit and - Movement Status | | 1976 | | | | | | | | | | | 1977 | , | | |
| | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Mean |
| Evergreen | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of wards at start | 50 | 46 | 48 | 48 | 48 | 48 | 49 | 49 | 48 | 43 | 43 | 50 | 49 | 46 | 46 | 47.4 |
| Admissions | 8 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 10 | 12 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 9 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 8.1 |
| Departures | 12 | 6 | 8 | 6 | 10 | 11 | 8 | 11 | 15 | 7 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 8.1 |
| Number of wards at end | 46 | 48 | 48 | 48 | 48 | 49 | 49 | 48 | 43 | 43 | 50 | 49 | 46 | 46 | 50 | 47.4 |
| Average monthly population | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 47.4 |
| Turnover rate | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 17.1 |
| Fir | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of wards at start | 43 | 41 | 41 | 41 | 41 | 41 | 42 | 41 | 35 | 33 | 35 | 37 | 38 | 35 | 37 | 38.7 |
| Admissions | 5 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 5 | 13 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 5.7 |
| Departures | 7 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 5 | 12 | 7 | 11 | 10 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 6.0 |
| Number of wards at end | 41 | 41 | 41 | 41 | 41 | 42 | 41 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 37 | 38 | 35 | 37 | 39 | 38.6 |
| Average monthly population | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 38.7 |
| Turnover rate | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 15.1 |

.

4 A

APPENDIX C

.

| | Tra I | ansition Period | | | | Phase II | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--|
| | | | | | | 19 | 77 | | | | | | | 1978 | | | | | |
| Living Unit and Movement Status | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Mean |
| Evergreen | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of wards at start Admissions Departures Number of wards at end Average monthly population . Turnover rate | 50 1 15 36 | 36 9 5 40 | 40 5 6 39 | 39 14 20 33 | 33 12 5 40 | 40 5 8 37 | 37 8 5 40 | 40 5 4 41 | 41 6 11 36 | 36 14 14 36 | 36 7 3 40 | 40 4 3 41 | 41 4 5 40 | 40 10 11 39 | 39 9 9 39 | 39 9 13 35 | 35 13 8 40 | 40 10 10 40 | 38.4 8.7 8.6 38.5 38.4 22.5 |
| Fir | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of wards at start Admissions Departures Number of wards at end Average monthly population . Turnover rate | 39 5 9 35 | 35 16 1 50 | 50 3 9 49 | 49 6 7 48 | 48 7 9 46 | 46 9 5 50 | 50 5 11 44 | 44 15 9 50 | 50 2 7 45 | 45 15 11 49 | 49 13 12 50 | 50 7 8 49 | 49 9 9 49 | 49 6 7 48 | 48 8 8 48 | 48 10 17 41 | 41 27 22 46 | 46 9 6 49 | 47.5 9.9 9.9 47.5 47.5 20.8 |

MONTHLY MOVEMENT STATISTICS FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR TRANSITION PERIOD AND PHASE II

- 59 -

:

•

.

t

APPENDIX D

Baseline Period Phase I Phase II Living Unit and Departure Status 8 No. No. 8 No. 8 Evergreen 41 100.0 122 100.0^d 129 100.0^d Total departures 42.6^g 38^a 29.5^{ag} Paroled or discharged 46.3 52 19 Negative transfers^b 15 36.6 42 34.4 43 33.3 Other transfers^C 17.1 23.0 37.2 8 28 48 Fir 100.0^d 148 46 100.0^d 100.0^d 90 Total departures 54.4⁹ 50^a 33.8^{ag} Paroled or discharged 16 34.8 49 23.3^{ef} 63 Negative transfers^b 43.5^C 20 42.6 21 Other transfers^C 10 21.7 20 22.2 35 23.6

DEPARTURES STATISTICS FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR BASELINE PERIOD, PHASE I, AND PHASE II

^aIncludes one Evergreen ward and two Fir wards who were discharged directly from the Youth Authority upon departure from Preston.

^bRefers to wards transferred for disciplinary, escape, and protective custody reasons.

^CRefers to wards transferred for reasons of self request, need for intensive counseling program, drug program, college/trade/or camp program, and other factors which do not involve negative or anti-social behavior.

^dA significant difference was obtained between the percent distributions for Phases I and II of Evergreen: X² = 9.07, df = 2, p < .05; for Baseline period and Phase I of Fir: X² = 6.57, df = 2, p < .05; and for Phases I and II of Fir: X² = 11.65, df = 2, p < .01.

Wards in Baseline period and Phase I were compared on the proportion of Negative Transfers versus the combined proportion of Paroled/Discharged and Other Transfers. Significant difference was obtained for Fir: $x^2 = 5.86$, df = 1, p < .05.

^fWards in Phases I and II were compared on the proportion of Negative Transfers versus the combined proportion of Paroled/Discharged and Other Transfers. Significant difference was obtained for Fir: $X^2 = 9.07$, df = 1, p < .01.

⁹Wards in Phases I and II were compared on the proportion of Paroled/Discharged versus the remaining proportions. Significant differences were obtained for Evergreen: $X^2 = 4.72$, df = 1, p < .05; and for Fir: $X^2 = 5.45$, df = 1, p < .05.

APPENDIX E

WARDS DEFINED AS PROGRAM SUCCESSES AND FAILURES WHO DEPARTED FROM EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR BASELINE PERIOD, PHASE I, AND PHASE II

| | Base | eline riod | Pha | se I | Pha | se II |
|--|------|-------------------|-----|-------------------|-----|-------------------|
| Living Unit and Departure Status | | ÷ | No. | 8 | No. | 9 |
| Evergreen | | | | | | |
| Program Successes (paroled/ discharged ^a) | 19 | 55.9 | 52 | 55.3 | 38 | 46.9 |
| Program Failures (negative trans- fers ^D) | _15 | 44.1 | 42 | 44.7 | 43 | 53.1 |
| TOTAL ^C | 34 | 100.0 | 94 | 100.0 | 81 | 100.0 |
| Fir | | | | | | |
| Program Successes (paroled/ discharged ^a) | 16 | 44.4 ^đ | 49 | 70.0 ^e | 50 | 44.2 ^e |
| Program Failures (negative trans- fers ^b) | 20 | 55.6 | _21 | 30.0 | _63 | 55.8 |
| TOTAL | 36 | 100.0 | 70 | 100.0 | 113 | 100.0 |

¹Includes one Evergreen ward and two Fir wards who were discharged directly from the Youth Authority upon departure from Preston.

^bRefers to wards transferred for disciplinary, escape, and protective custody reasons.

^CTotal excludes wards transferred for reasons of self-request, need for intensive counseling program, drug program, college/trade/or camp program, and other reasons which do not involve distinctly negative or antisocial behavior of wards in the living unit.

^dWards in Baseline Period and Phase I were compared on proportion of Program Successes. Significant difference was obtained for Fir: $X^2 = 6.55$, df = 1, p < .01.

^eWards in Phases I and II were compared on proportions of Program Successes. Significant difference was obtained for Fir: $X^2 = 11.54$, df = 1, p \lt .001.

APPENDIX F

DISTRIBUTION OF WARDS INVOLVED IN LEVEL B DISCIPLINARY INCIDENTS IN EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR BASELINE PERIOD, PHASE I, AND PHASE II

| | Eve | rgreen | | Fir |
|------------------------------------|------|----------|------|--------|
| Period by Type of Incident | No. | % | No. | ક |
| BASELINE PERIOD | | • | | |
| Serious violent acts | 8 | 21.1 | 2 | 4.4 |
| Battery, use/possession of weapons | (8) | (21.1) | (1) | (2.2) |
| Other ^a | - | - | (1) | (2.2) |
| Less serious violent acts | 23 | 60.5 | 22 | 48.9 |
| Fighting | (15) | (39.5) | (15) | (33.3) |
| Intimidation, threats | (6) | (15.8) | (1) | (2.2) |
| Disruptive Acts | (1) | (2.6) | (2) | (4.4) |
| Other ^b | (1) | (2.6) | (4) | (8.9) |
| Non-violent acts | 7 | 18.4 | 21 | 46.6 |
| Escapes | (2) | (5.3) | 6 | (13.3) |
| Drug possession/use | (2) | (5.3) | (7) | (15.8) |
| Theft/property destruction | - | - | (2) | (4.4) |
| Program failure | (1) | (2.6) | (1) | (2.2) |
| Other ^C | (2) | (5.3) | (5) | (11.1) |
| TOTAL | 38 | 100.0 | 45 | 100.0 |

APPENDIX F (Cont'd)

DISTRIBUTION OF WARDS INVOLVED IN LEVEL B DISCIPLINARY INCIDENTS IN EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR BASELINE PERIOD, PHASE I, AND PHASE II

-

| | Evei | rgreen | Fi | .r |
|------------------------------------|------|--------|------|--------|
| Period by Type of Incident | No. | 8 | No. | 8 |
| PHASE I | • | | | |
| Serious violent acts | 33 | 28.2 | 10 | 12.0 |
| Battery, use/possession of weapons | (24) | (20.5) | (10) | (12.0) |
| Other ^a | (9) | (7.7) | - | - |
| Less serious violent acts | 41 | 35.0 | 48 | 57.8 |
| Fighting | (28) | (23.9) | (31) | (37.3) |
| Intimidation, threats | (3) | (2.6) | (9) | (10.8) |
| Disruptive acts | (7) | (5.9) | (3) | (3.6) |
| b Other | (3) | (2.6) | (5) | (6.0) |
| Non-violent acts | 43 | 36.8 | 25 | 30.1 |
| Escapes | (15) | (12.8) | (3) | (3.6) |
| Drug possession/use | (12) | (10.3) | (15) | (18.0) |
| Theft/property destruction | (11) | (9.4) | - | - |
| Program failure | - | - | - | - |
| Other ^C | (5) | (4.3) | (7) | (8.4) |
| TOTAL | 117 | 100.0 | 83 | 100.0 |

APPENDIX F (Cont'd)

DISTRIBUTION OF WARDS INVOLVED IN LEVEL B DISCIPLINARY INCIDENTS IN EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR BASELINE PERIOD, PHASE I, AND PHASE II

| | Ever | green | F | ir |
|------------------------------------|------|--------|------|----------|
| Period by Type of Incident | No. | 8 | No. | <u> </u> |
| PHASE II | | | | |
| Serious violent acts | 11 | 8.7 | 45 | 32.4 |
| Battery, use/possession of weapons | (9) | (7.1) | (40) | (28.8) |
| Other ^a | (2) | (1.6) | (5) | (3.6) |
| Less serious violent acts | 84 | 66.1 | 56 | 40.3 |
| Fighting | (41) | (32.2) | (29) | (20.9) |
| Intimidation, threats | (20) | (15.7) | (16) | (11.5) |
| Disruptive acts | (19) | (15.0) | (7) | (5.0) |
| Other ^b | (4) | (3.2) | (4) | (2.9) |
| Non-violent acts | 32 | 25.2 | 38 | 27.3 |
| Escapes | (2) | (1.6) | (10) | (7.2) |
| Drug possession/use | (9) | (7.1) | (14) | (10.0) |
| Theft/property destruction | (6) | (4.7) | (4) | (2.9) |
| Program failure | (8) | (6.3) | (4) | (2.9) |
| Other ^C | (7) | (5.5) | (6) | (4.3) |
| TOTAL | 127 | 100.0 | 139 | 100.0 |

^a"Other" consists of: sexual assault, inciting riot, and setting a fire.

b"Other" consists of: Contraband and negligent acts.

^C"Other" consists of: Fraud, inappropriate use of medications, indecent conduct, lying at DDMS Hearing, lying to staff, possession of anothers property, slander of staff, unauthorized use of phone/mail, and use/possession of institution keys.

APPENDIX G

RATES OF WARD INVOLVEMENT IN ESCAPES, BY LIVING UNIT SIZE

| Escape Data | LARGE UNIT ^a | Ever- green Phase I | Fir Phase II | SMALL UNIT | Ever- green Phase II | Fir Phase I |
|---|----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------------------|----------------|
| Total ward escapes | 12.5 | 15 | 10 | 2.5 | 2 | 3 |
| Ward escapes per month (A) | .83 | 1.00 | .66 | .17 | .13 | .20 |
| Monthly average number of wards in living unit (B) | 47.5 | 47.4 | 47.5 | 38.5 | 38.4 | 38.7 |
| Escapes per ward per month (A÷B) | .017 | 7.02 | .01 | .004 | .003 | .005 |

^aRepresents mean of data shown for Evergreen--Phase I and Fir--Phase II.

b Represents mean of data shown for Evergreen--Phase II and Fir--Phase I.
APPENDIX H

COMPARISON OF WARDS' MEAN SCORES ON POST-TEST OF CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION ENVIRONMENT SCALES FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR PHASES I AND PHASE II

| | F | hase I | Pł | asë II | |
|---------------------------------------|------|------------------------------------|------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Living Unit, by Sectors and Scales | Mean | Standard Deviation ^a | Mean | Standard Deviation | Mean Difference |
| EVERGREEN | (N= | =37) | (N= | =31) | |
| Relationship | | | | | |
| Involvement | 3.62 | 2.20 | 3.45 | 1.86 | 17 |
| Support | 3.32 | 1.86 | 4.00 | 2.27 | .68 |
| Expressiveness | 1.81 | 1.39 | 2.71 | 1.46 | .90* |
| Treatment | | | | | 1 |
| Autonomy | 2.59 | 1.96 | 3.19 | 1.65 | .60 |
| Practical Orientation | 5.40 | 2.19 | 6.29 | 1.73 | .89* |
| Personal Problems | | | | | |
| Orientation | 3.35 | 1.29 | 3.39 | 1.41 | .04 |
| System Maintenance | | | | | |
| Order and Organization | 3.27 | 2.29 | 3.52 | 2.15 | .25 |
| Clarity | 4.27 | 1.94 | 5.06 | 1.62 | .79* |
| Staff Control | 6.76 | 1.22 | 6.26 | 1.50 | 50 |
| FIR | (N= | =33) | (N= | =41) | |
| Relationship | } | | | | |
| Involvement | 3.03 | 1.57 | 4.05 | 2.00 | 1.02* |
| Support | 3.85 | 1.69 | 4.46 | 1.90 | .61 |
| Expressiveness | 2.39 | 1.74 | 2.56 | 1.59 | .17 |
| Treatment | | | | | |
| Autonomy | 3.00 | 1.58 | 3.00 | 1.81 | .23 |
| Practical Orientation | 5.15 | 1.58 | 5.10 | 1.62 | 05 |
| Personal Problems | 1 | | | | |
| Orientation | 3.00 | 1.37 | 3.85 | 1.49 | .85* |
| System Maintenance | | | | | |
| Order and Organization | 4.06 | 2.27 | 3.88 | 2.23 | 18 |
| Clarity | 4.79 | 1.09 | 4.41 | 1.95 | 38 |
| Staff Control | 6.24 | 1.33 | 6.61 | 1.62 | .38 |

*Tests of statistical significance, based on Student's t technique, were conducted for each of the scales to determine if the difference between the Phase I and Phase II mean scores were greater than chance expectation. A difference was regarded as significant when a probability of .05 or less was attained, that is, when the difference could be attributed to chance no more than five times out of a hundred. A two-tailed test was used, indicating that no assumption was made about the direction (positive or negative) of the differences between the Phase I and II mean scores. Significant differences are designated by asterisks.

APPENDIX I

WARD PERCEPTIONS OF STAFF RELATIONSHIPS WITH WARDS, FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR PHASES I AND II

| | | E | vergree | n | | | F | ir | _ |
|-----|---|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------------|---|
| | | Phas (N= | e I 35) | Phas (N= | e II 33) | Phas (N= | se I =34) | Phase II (N=41) | |
| Ite | m | No. | 8 | No. | 8 | No. | \$ | No. 8 | |
| 1. | DO YOU THINK MOST OF THE STAFF IN THIS PROGRAM ARE JUST "WORKING A SHIFT" OR DO YOU THINK THEY REALLY CARE WHAT HAPPENS TO YOU? | | | | | | | | |
| | They really care They're just working a | 6 | 17.1 | 3 | 9.1 | 3 | 8.8 | 5 12.2 | |
| | shift Don't know | 26 3 | 74.3 8.6 | 21 9 | 63.6 27.3 | 24 7 | 70.6 20.6 | 26 63.4 10 24.4 | |
| 2. | HOW DO YOU SEE THE STAFF-WARD RELATIONSHIPS IN THIS PROGRAM? | | | | | | | | |
| | Staff are too harsh with the wards Staff are pretty fair with | 13 | 40.6 | 8 | 24.2 | 9 | 27.2 | 10 25.0 | |
| | the wards | 7. | 21.9 | 8 | 24.2 | 12 | 36.4 | 14 35.0 | |
| | with most wards | 2 | 6.3 | 6 | 18.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 5.0 | |
| | about the wards | 10 | 31.2 | 11 | 33.3 | 12 | 36.4 | 14 35.0 | |
| | No response ^a | . 3 | | | | 1 | | | |
| 3. | HOW WELL DO YOU FEEL THAT STAFF IN THIS PROGRAM UNDER- STAND YOUR PROBLEMS AND NEEDS? | | | | | | | | |
| | They usually understand | 4 | 11.4 | 1 | 3.0 | 6 | 17.6 | 4 9.8 | |
| | They sometimes understand They don't usually under- | 6 | 17.1 | 14 | 42.4 | 14 | 41.2 | 13 31.7 | |
| | stand They almost never under- | 11 | 31.4 | 9 | 27.3 | 10 | 29.4 | 9 22.0 | |
| | stand | 14 | 40.0 | 9 | 27.3 | 4 | 11.8 | 15 36.5 | |
| 4. | HOW MANY STAFF IN THIS PROGRAM TAKE A PERSONAL INTEREST IN THE INDIVIDUAL WARDS? | | | | | | | | |
| | All of them | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.0 | 2 | 5.9 | 1 2.4 | |
| | About helf of them | 1 i | 2.9 | 7 | 21.2 | 2 | 2.9 5.9 | 2 4.9 4 9.8 | |
| | Few of them • None of them | 25 8 | 71.4 22.9 | 15 8 | 45.5 24.2 | 22 7 | 64.7 20.6 | 23 56.1 11 26.8 | |
| | | l | | | | | | | |

^aExcluded in percent computations.

^bSignificant difference between proportions with categories combined as shown by brackets: $\chi^2 = 6.48$, df = 1, p > .05.

APPENDIX J

- 68 -

WARD PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF, FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR PHASES I AND II

| | | E | vergree | en | | Fir | | | |
|-----|---|---------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | Phas (N= | se I 35) | Phas (N= | e II 33) | Phas (N= | e I 34) | Phas (N= | e II 41) |
| Ite | | No. | 8 | No. | * | No. | 8 | No. | 8 |
| 1. | HOW MANY STAFF IN THIS PROGRAM DO YOU KNOW WELL ENOUGH TO DISCUSS YOUR PERSONAL PROBLEMS? | | | | | | | | |
| | None 1-2 3-4 5 or more | 23 10 0 2 | 65.7 28.6 0.0 5.7 | 15 15 2 1 | 45.5 45.5 6.0 3.0 | 13 17 4 0 | 39.2 50.0 11.8 0.0 | 23 11 3 4 | 56.1 76.8 7.3 9.8 |
| 2. | DO YOU FEEL THAT YOUR RELA- TIONSHIPS WITH STAFF ARE: | | | | | | | | |
| | Better than you expected About what you expected Worse than you expected No response ^a | 6 16 13 | 17.1 45.7 37.1 | 9 16 8 | 27.3 48.5 24.2 | 7 25 1 1 | 21.2 ^b 75.8 ^b 3.0 | 6 19 16 | 14.6 ^b 46.3 ^b 39.0 |
| 3. | HOW WELL DO YOU PERSONALLY LIKE MOST OF THE STAFF IN THE PROGRAM? | | | | | | | | |
| | Very much Pretty much So-so Not much Not at all | 5 2 13 8 7 | 14.3 5.7 37.1 22.9 20.0 | 1 5 12 6 9 | 3.0 15.1 36.4 18.2 27.3 | 0 8 16 6 4 | 0.0 23.5 47.1 17.6 11.8 | 2 5 18 8 8 | 4.9 12.2 43.9 19.5 19.5 |
| 4. | HOW MANY TIMES IN THE LAST TWO WEEKS HAVE YOU TALKED TO A COUNSELOR HERE ABOUT YOUR- SELF SERIOUSLY FOR AT LEAST A FEW MINUTES? | | | | | | | | |
| | Not at all Once or twice Several times Very often | 13 13 7 2 | 37.1 37.1 20.0 5.7 | 15 13 4 1 | 45.5 39.4 12.1 3.0 | 19 14 1 0 | 55.9 41.2 2.9 0.0 | 24 12 5 0 | 58.5 29.3 12.2 0.0 |
| 5. | WHEN YOU WANT TO TALK TO SOME- ONE HERE ABOUT A PERSONAL PROBLEM, WHO WOULD YOU GO TO FIRST FOR ADVICE? | | | | | | | | |
| | Youth Counselor Social Worker Treatment Team Supervisor Psychiatrist Teacher Another Ward No one here No response ^a | 5 2 3 1 4 13 5 2 | 15.2 6.1 9.1 3.0 12.1 39.4 15.1 | 9 5 1 2 0 4 12 | 25.0 15.6 3.1 6.3 0.0 12.5 37.5 | 12 2 1 0 0 10 9 | 35.3 5.9 2.9 0.0 29.4 26.5 | 9 0 1 2 0 16 12 1 | 22.5 0.0 2.5 5.0 0.0 40.0 30.0 |

a Excluded in percentage computations.

bSignificant difference: $\chi^2 = 15.1$, df =1, p >.001.

APPENDIX K

WARDS PERCEPTIONS OF PROGRAM, FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR PHASES I AND II

| | | Evergr | een | | | Fir | | |
|--|---------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| | Phas (N= | e I 35) | Phas (N= | e II 33) | Phas (N= | e I 34) | Phas (N= | e II 41) |
| Item | No. | 8 | No. | 8 | No. | 8 | No. | 8 |
| 1. HOW MUCH OF A TENSE OR RELAXED FEELING DO YOU THINK THERE IS IN THIS PROGRAM? | | | | | | | | |
| Tense, uptight, - everyone nervous most of the time Somewhat tense - possibility of fights often Kind of relaxed - only a few | 2 17 | 5.7 48.6 | 3 13 | 9.1 39.4 | 3 | 9.1 33.3 | 3 16 | 7.5 40.0 |
| beefs Pretty relaxed - not much nervousness No response | 8 | 22.9 22.9 | 12 5 | 36.4 15.1 | 15 4 1 | 45.4 12.2 | 14 7 1 | 35.0 17.5 |
| 2. WHAT DO YOU THINK OF THIS PLACE? | | | | | | | | |
| A lot better than I expected Better than I expected Worse than I expected A lot worse than I expected No response ^a | . 1 10 11 9 4 | 3.2 32.2 35.5 29.8 | 5 8 10 9 1 | 15.6 25.0 31.3 28.1 | 4 19 9 2 | 11.8 55.9 26.5 5.9 | 5 17 11 6 2 | 12.8 43.6 28.2 15.4 |
| 3. IF YOU HAD A CHANCE, WOULD YOU WANT TO TRANSFER TO ANOTHER PROGRAM EVEN THOUGH IT WOULD TAKE JUST AS LONG TO BE PAROLED? | | | | | | | | |
| Yes, I would <u>definitely want</u> to be transferred Yes, I <u>might want</u> to be | 8 | 22.9 | 15 | 45.5 | 14 | 41.2 | 15 | 37.5 |
| transferred No, I don't think I'd want to | 10 | 28.6 | 8 | 24.2 | 4 | 11.8 | 8 | 20.0 |
| be transferred No, I definitely don't want | 9 | 25.7 | 9 | 27.3 | 8 | 23.5 | 13 | 32.5 |
| to be transferred No response | 8 | 22.9 | 1 | 3.0 | 8 | 23.5 | 4 1 | 10.0 |

^aExcluded in percentage computations.

APPENDIX L

WARD APPRAISALS OF PROGRAM IMPACT, FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR PHASES I AND II

| | | E | vergree | en | | Fir | | | |
|-----------|--|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| | | Phase I Phase II (N=35) (N=33) | | Phase I Phase II Phase I F (N=35) (N=33) (N=34) | | Phas (N= | e II 41) | | |
| Ite | m | No. | 8 | No. | £ | No. | 95 | No. | 8 |
| IN WAI | YOUR OPINION, ABOUT HOW MANY RDS IN THIS PROGRAM ARE HELPED: | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | TO STAY OUT OF TROUBLE WITH THE LAW AFTER THEY ARE PAROLED? | | | | | | | | |
| | None Few Some Many | 6 20 7 2 | 17.1 57.1 20.0 5.7 | 3 16 12 2 | 9.1 48.5 36.4 6.1 | 8 16 9 1 | 23.5 47.1 26.5 2.9 | 8 15 15 3 | 19.5 36.6 36.6 7.3 |
| 2. | TO ADOPT MORE MATURE BEHAVIOR AND ATTITUDES WHILE IN THIS PROGRAM? | | | | | | | | |
| | None Few Some Many | 6 18 7 4 | 17.1 51.4 20.0 11.4 | 9 13 9 2 | 27.3 39.4 27.3 6.1 | 7 12 12 1 | 20.6 35.3 35.3 8.8 | 8 14 15 4 | 19.5 34.1 36.6 9.8 |
| | No response | | | | | 2 | | | |
| 3. | TO LEARN HOW TO FIND AND HOLD A JOB AFTER THEY ARE PAROLED? | | | | | | | | |
| | None Few Some Many | 4 13 15 3 | 11.4 37.1 42.9 8.5 | 3 13 16 1 | 9.1 39.4 48.5 3.0 | 9 15 9 1 | 26.5 44.1 26.5 1.9 | 7 18 15 1 | 17.1 43.9 36.6 2.4 |
| 4. | TO GET ALONG BETTER WITH WARD AND STAFF IN THIS PROGRAM? | | | | | | | | |
| | None Few Some Many | 8 13 11 3 | 22.9 38.1 31.4 8.6 | 3 11 16 3 | 9.1 33.3 48.5 9.1 | 6 17 9 2 | 17.6 50.0 26.5 5.9 | 8 15 16 2 | 19.5 36.6 39.0 4.9 |
| 5. | TO CONTROL THEMSELVES SO THEY WON'T GET INTO FIGHTS? | n | | | | | | | |
| | None Few Some Many | 8 11 9 7 | 22.9 31.4 25.7 20.0 | 8 12 11 2 | 24.2 36.4 33.3 6.1 | 12 10 10 2 | 35.3 29.4 29.4 5.9 | 11 15 13 2 | 26.8 36.6 31.7 4.9 |

APPENDIX L (CONT'D)

.

WARD APPRAISALS OF PROGRAM IMPACT, FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR PHASES I AND II

| | E | vergree | en | | 1 | Fir | | |
|--|-------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| | Phas (N= | e I 35) | Phas (N= | e II 33) | Phas (N= | e I 34) | Phas (N= | e II 41) |
| Item | No. | ક | No. | 95 | No. | 8 | No. | 8 |
| 6. TO KEEP CALM AND USE GOOD JUDGMENT IN TENSE SITUATIONS? | | | | <i>A</i> | | | | |
| None Few Some Many | 7 19 6 3 | 20.0 54.3 17.1 8.6 | 7 14 10 2 | 21.2 42.2 30.3 6.1 | 7 16 6 5 | 20.6 47.1 17.6 14.7 | 12 13 11 5 | 29.3 31.7 26.8 12.2 |
| 7. TO PLAN FOR THE FUTURESUCH AS JOB, SCHOOL, AND LIFE ON PAROLE? | | | | | | | | |
| None Few Some Many No response ^a | 4 15 10 5 1 | 11.8 44.1 29.4 14.7 | 4 9 16 4 | 12.1 27.3 48.5 12.1 | 4 18 9 3 | 11.8 52.9 26.5 8.8 | 7 18 12 4 | 17.1 43.9 29.3 9.8 |
| 8. TO UNDERSTAND THEMSELVES BETTER? | | | | | | | | |
| None Few Some Many No response ^a | 2 12 18 3 | 5.7 34.3 51.4 8.6 | 3 12 16 2 | 9.1 36.4 48.5 6.1 | 8 14 7 4 1 | 24.2 42.4 21.2 10.1 | 6 13 13 7 2 | 14.6 31.7 31.7 17.1 |

a Excluded in percentage computations.

.

APPENDIX M

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT PROBLEMS, ISSUES, AND EVENTS REPORTED FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR PHASES I AND II

| | | Phase | Phase |
|-----|---|-------|-------|
| Li | ving Unit - Significant Problems or Events | I | II |
| EV | ERGREEN | | |
| 1) | Racial tension centering around relationships between Black and Mexican-American wards. Assault/intimi- dation of one group on the other. | x | |
| 2) | Feeling among some wards that staff are using incon- sistent supervision practices. | x | |
| 3) | Group of self-proclaimed "strong" wards exerts pres- sure on perceived "weak" wards through threats and intimidation to force them into transferring out of the living unit. | x | x |
| 4) | White wards organize into a "nazi" group, usually in response to institution-wide "nazi" faction and put pressure on a group of White wards designated as "knacks" (easily victimized who are not too insti- tution-wise and regarded as "weak"). | x | |
| 5) | Large number of new wards admitted into living unit. New wards are tested by and designated as "strong," "weak," "snitches" etc. New wards may be asked to "prove" themselves through fights or show of "heart." | | x |
| 6) | Diversity of background, sophistication, maturity of wards in unit makes for unstable, volatile group behavior. | x | X |
| 7) | Pressure and intimidation by some wards on other wards seen as "weak" takes place in "blind" spots off lodge or areas not under close supervision. | x | x |
| 8) | Increasing cleavage between Northern and Southern Mexican-American gangs. This has led to deep tension and serious assaultive behavior. | | x |
| 9) | Mass assault by White wards on few Black wards, reflecting extreme ethnic imbalance of ward population on living unit. | | x |
| 10) | Longstanding feud between Northern and Southern Mexican-American wards affiliated with rival gangs has been alleviated by truce agreed to by both sides. | | x |

APPENDIX M (Cont'd)

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT PROBLEMS, ISSUES, AND EVENTS REPORTED FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR PHASES I AND II

| | Phase | Phase |
|--|-------|-------|
| Living Unit - Significant Problems or Events | I | II |
| 11) Increasing number of wards request counseling ses- sions. | | x |
| 12) Staff-ward field day picnics improves group tone and staff-ward relationships. | | x |
| 13) "Positive" leaders from the three main ethnic groups of wards have help to keep down disciplinary incidents. | | x |
| 14) Staff form more co-counseling groups (led by two staff members for large and small group meetings. | 3) | x |
| 15) Toward end of project period, staff express anxiety about raising ward population back to 50. | | х |
| 16) Last month of project periodtension is rising among wards, with heavy group pressure put on "weaker" wards to intimidate them into transfer- ring out of the living unit. | | x |
| 17) Ward assaults Youth Counselor (female). | x | |
| 18) Severe assault on Mexican-American ward by Black wards. | x | |
| 19) All wards of unit locked down for one day in individual rooms on another unit after some White wards told staff Mexican-American wards had armed themselves and were about to start a riot. Proved to be rumor started by White wards. | | x |
| 20) Eighteen wards temporarily housed on another living unit to reorient them to program expectations, following a rash of acting-out behavior incidents. Thereafter, closer supervision and counseling by | | |
| staff. | | x |

APPENDIX M (Cont'd)

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT FROBLEMS, ISSUES, AND EVENTS REPORTED FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR PHASES I AND II

| | | Phase | Phase |
|-------------|---|----------|-------|
| <u>Livi</u> | ng Unit - Significant Problems or Events | <u> </u> | II |
| FIR | | | |
| 1) " | 'Conspiracy of silence' among all wards, regardless of group affiliation. Neither victims nor witnesses will testify to delinquent acts of others. | x | |
| 2) M | Mexican-American groups of wards remain on edge of defiance, often coming across very non-cooperative, verging on arrogance. | x | |
| 3) E | Black and White wards come close to physical confronta- tion. Group meetings are held and tension subsides but feelings are still strong. | x | |
| 4) S | Several White wards involved in stabbing of Black ward. | x | |
| 5) Y | Youth Counselor is seriously assaulted by ward. | x | |
| 6) M | Nounting tensions between Northern and Southern Mexican-American Wards. | x | |
| 7) M | Major increase in tension between Black and White wards, with rumors of impending riot and confronta- tions. Situation defused by transferring wards considered most volatile to Adjustment Center (temporary lockup unit). | x | |
| 8) (| Confrontation between Mexican-American and White groups of wards. Quick staff action keeps situa- tion at verbal level. | x | |
| 9) ī | Ward population jumps from 34 to 50 in just 15 days, unsettling wards and staff. Ethnic count grossly out of balance, relatively large number of White wards and few Black wards. One day nearly all White wards on unit attack Black wards without provocation. | | x |
| 10) S | Staff attention is concentrated on supervision problemslittle time left for casework and counseling. | | x |

APPENDIX M (Cont'd)

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT PROBLEMS, ISSUES, AND EVENTS REPORTED FOR EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR PHASES I AND II

| | | Phase | Phase |
|--------------|--|-------|-------|
| <u>Livir</u> | ng Unit - Significant Problems or Events | I | II |
| 11) E | Both Mexican-American and White wards increase pres- sure on wards they decide are "unwanted" on the living unit. Wards are told to get off unit or else they would get hurt. Staff unable to stop this pressure. | | x |
| 12) s | Seventeen wards are temporarily housed on another unit with individual rooms to reorient them to program expectations and halt major increase in acting-out behavior leading to serious incidents. Problems diminished afterwards. | | x |
| 13) H | Escalation of tension after Mexican-American ward aligned with Northern gang stabbed Mexican-American ward identified with Southern gang. | | x |
| 14) (| Group of sight wards begin pressuring new White wards out of their personal possessions by threats and intimidation. | | x |
| 15) H | Black wards as a group function well with relatively few problems. | | x |
| 16) ' | "Truce" is arranged between Northern and Southern Mexican-American wards, who have been involved in longstanding feud. | | x |
| 17) i | Nearly all Mexican-American wards attack Black group of wards without provocation. Also, other assaults and batteries by Mexican-American wards on Black wards. | | x |
| 18) : | Increase of friction within Mexican-American group. | | x |
| 19) \$ | Staff express anxiety about reverting to 5-post coverage after termination of project. | | x |

APPENDIX N

ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF WARDS IN EVERGREEN AND FIR LIVING UNITS, FOR PHASES I AND II

(In Percent^a)

| Livi | ng Unit, by Ethnic Group | Phase I | Phase II |
|------------|--------------------------|---------|----------|
| Ever | green | | |
| | White | 46.5 | 38.0 |
| | Black | 25.8 | 23.6 |
| | Spanish Surname | 27.7 | 34.8 |
| | Other | - | 3.6 |
| | TOTAL | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| <u>Fir</u> | | | |
| | White | 33.6 | 33.5 |
| | Black | 32.1 | 27.3 |
| | Spanish Surname | 34.3 | 39.2 |
| | Other | _ | _ |
| | TOTAL | 100.0 | 100.0 |

^aPercents were derived from the cumulative number of wards reported for each ethnic group on a monthly basis.

REFERENCES

- Moos, R., <u>Evaluating Correctional and Community Settings</u>. New York: John Wiley & Sons. 1975.
- Seckel, J. P., and Turner, J. K., "Summary of Ward Research Committee Interviews and Staff Interviews for Evergreen and Fir Lodges: April 1976-November 1976." California Youth Authority, Division of Research.
- Seckel, J. P., "Review of Literature Relating to Impact of Differences in Living Unit Size and Staffing." California Youth Authority, Division of Research. January 1979.

