BEHM HOME, INCORPORATED: A QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF COMMUNITY TREATMENT FOR DELINQUENT BOYS

By

NANCY JANE PRESNALL

Bachelor of Arts

Phillips University

Enid, Oklahoma

1973

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degre of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
July 30, 1976

Thesis
1976
P934b
cop. 2

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

BEHM HOME, INCORPORATED: A QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF COMMUNITY TREATMENT FOR DELINQUENT BOYS

Thesis Approval:

Jack E. Bynum

Dr. Jack E. Bynum, Thesis Adviser

George Arquitt

Dr. George Arquitt, Committee Member

Richard Dodder

Dr. Richard Dodder, Committee Member

Norman N. Durham

Dr. N. N. Durham,
Dean of the Graduate College

953390

PREFACE

First of all, I wish to express my gratitude to the staff members and residents of "Behm Home, Inc." for their part in this study; working with these individuals was truly a pleasure that few social researchers have the opportunity to experience. During the course of researching and writing this thesis, I have developed a deep respect for the dedicated staff of Behm Home, particularly the Executive Director, who seems to be a source of inspiration for staff and boys alike. I would like to mention all of these people by name; but in the interest of protecting the Home and its personnel from any harm that could result from disclosure of their identities, have elected to identify the Home and its residents by pseudonyms. I do not believe that an unbiased representation of the findings discussed in this paper could in any way damage the Home or its personnel; but unfortunately, researchers cannot assume that their findings will be used or interpreted in an unbiased way. The purpose of this study is neither to prove nor disprove the value of Behm Home's program in rehabilitating delinquent boys, but rather, to statistically and descriptively evaluate it. The vast body of data collected indicate that the program is highly successful, and my own interpretations as to why the program is successful are presented; had results been other-

wise, they would have been presented accordingly. Thus, I would like to state that if any person attempts to cite any part of this study as evidence arguing against the general effectiveness of Behm Home, then (s)he is grossly misinterpreting this study and its major conclusions.

Dr. Jack E. Bynum, my major adviser throughout this project, has provided me with invaluable assistance, suggestions, and guidance. For these, and also for his intuitive way of giving supportive words when they are most needed, I am deeply grateful to Dr. Bynum.

To Dr. Richard Dodder and Dr. George Arquitt, whose constructively critical thinking has contributed much to this thesis, I am thankful; their observations have been most insightful and challenging.

I am also thankful to Dr. Werner Gruninger, who arranged for me to conduct this study--and who, in his characteristically subtle and diplomatic manner, gently urged me on to completion of this project. For these, and for adding humor and a sense of perspective to many otherwise frustrating situations, I am sincerely appreciative.

Finally, to my parents, Max and Audrey Presnall, I wish to express my sincere personal appreciation for their support throughout this project--not the least of which was their unwavering belief that someday, it would be finished.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Introduction to the Research

This paper is primarily concerned with the success rate of Behm Home, Incorporated, a community-based residential treatment center for delinquent youth.[1] Behm Home is located in a large southwestern city, and at various times in the past has offered treatment for girls as well as for boys. However, because less than twenty girls have received treatment there, this study deals only with the boys.

During the past three years, approximately one hundred boys have entered this program. Of these, seventy-three are studied in the following chapters; these seventy-three cases constitute the majority of boys who resided at Behm Home from January 1973 until August 1975. For thirteen of the boys, who were among the first to receive treatment, data relevant to present purposes are not available; and since the collection of data was concluded some months ago, information on the newly-arrived boys is not included here.

To date, Behm Home has been relatively successful in the rehabilitation of youthful offenders; of the seventy-

---

[1] "Behm Home, Incorporated" is a pseudonym.

three boys who have entered the program, forty-one (56%) have been successfully reintegrated back into the larger society, while another three (4%) who completed the program have since recidivated. In addition, there is a third group of twenty-nine (40%) who were removed from the Home at some stage of their treatment and placed elsewhere (such as a state correctional institution, mental care facility, or drug rehabilitation center). Within this group are boys who ran away from the Home more than once, were found by clinical diagnosis to have serious psychological disorders (such as psychopathic or sociopathic tendencies), or who were not felt by staff members to be responding to treatment after a sufficient length of time.

Three groups of Behm Home residents have been discussed thus far: Forty-one (56%) who completed the program as graduates and have not committed new law violations; three (4%) who graduated from the program, were returned to the community, and then later recidivated; and twenty-nine (40%) who entered the program but did not graduate from it, either because they ran away or were placed elsewhere. It should be mentioned that the staff of Behm Home regards the first group as "successes" and the second and third groups as "failures;" in keeping with this, the present research uses the same criteria for defining cases as "successful" or "not successful." Before continuing, an observation regarding Behm Home's success rate should be noted: If the success rate is based upon the proportion of successes to

all boys who enter the program, it is shown to be over 56%; however, if based upon the proportion of successful to unsuccessful graduates of the program, the success rate is approximately 93%. Compared with a national average of approximately 30% success, either figure is impressive.[2]

Essentially, the purpose of this research is to analyze comparatively the records of these groups of boys. The specific aims of the research are stated more explicitly below.

The Research Objective

As previously mentioned, Behm Home has been characterized by a success rate that is higher than average. In view of this matter, several questions arise: Are there any specific, identifiable components of this treatment to which success may be attributed? What types of juvenile offenders are likely to benefit from this program? And finally, what role, if any, is played by the family in the success or failure of the treatment program?

This thesis investigates these and other related questions. By analyzing the case histories of these boys, this study will seek similarities, differences, and patterns in their records; hopefully, these will provide clues as to <u>why</u> Behm Home's treatment is successful in some cases but not in others. Stated otherwise, the analysis should indicate to some extent the types of young offenders that have

---

[2]This estimate is based upon data collected and reported by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

been successfully treated by Behm Home.

A further research objective is to qualitatively describe the highly-structured social environment of the Home, in order to ascertain to some degree its functions and effects in rehabilitating delinquent youth. These effects and functions are also assessed quantitatively and theoretically.

These research objectives may be summarized as follows: To present an evaluative and descriptive analysis of the Behm Home treatment program; to examine, qualitatively and quantitatively, the results of this program as measured by successful or unsuccessful reentry of its residents into the larger society; and to find whatever specific factors, if any, are predictive of success or failure of the Home boys in becoming nondelinquent.

One further clarification should be made at this point. Because of the nature of the topic of exploration, this study is essentially exploratory; as such, it attempts to generate, rather than test, hypotheses.

Organization of the Thesis

Chapter I is intended to introduce the reader to the subject matter of this research. The remainder of this thesis is organized as follows.

Chapter II describes Behm Home, its physical surroundings and atmosphere, gives an account of how boys are recruited into the program, describes the Home treatment

model (specifically, behavior modification and counseling); and tells about the staff members, their qualifications (with regard to academic degrees, experience, and the like), and the criteria they use in deciding at what point in a boy's rehabilitation he is ready to "face" the outside society.

In Chapter III, research findings relevant to present purposes are reviewed; a brief description of similar treatment models and techniques is also included (for example, since the Behm Home model employs counseling based upon Transactional Analysis, Gestalt Therapy, and Reality Therapy, brief descriptions of these techniques are given).

In Chapter IV the theoretical orientation of this research is presented; the treatment program of the Home is examined within the context of Containment Theory. Portions of the program that are theoretically viewed as attempts to develop inner and outer containment are identified and described.

Chapter V relates the qualitative and quantitative methodology utilized in collecting and analyzing the data, the specific variables studied and how these have been defined and measured; the relationships of these variables to Containment Theory (that is, the empirical definitions of inner and outer containment) are also explicated.

Chapter VI consists of the findings obtained from qualitative and quantitative analyses of the data. Quantitatively, the statistical relationships of variables to one

another are appraised and interpreted. In the final part of this chapter, qualitative and quantitative findings are synthesized and integrated with one another.

A summary of the research and its conclusions are given in Chapter VII, as well as the listing of hypotheses for further investigation.

CHAPTER II

BEHM HOME, INCORPORATED

The Facility Itself

Behm Home, Inc., is a community-based treatment facility for youthful offenders. Two separate homes are maintained, in addition to the main office building and recreation center. Periodically (depending largely upon available funding) one or the other of these homes is temporarily closed.

The Homes are located next door to one another; both are large, two-story, well-kept, attractive, "older" houses. In the upstairs part of each are four bedrooms; three of these belong to the boys, and the fourth to the houseparents. The first bedroom (the orientation room) is called the "Snoopy Room," and is occupied by boys new into the program. When a boy has progressed sufficiently in the program, he is moved into the second room, the "Romper Room;" and when he has progressed even more, he moves into the "Privileged Room." It should be noted that the rooms were named by the boys themselves, and that each carries a maximum capacity of four boys. The boys' Study Halls are also located upstairs.

Downstairs are the kitchen, living room, and dining room. Laundry facilities are in the basement. The boys are responsible for all cooking, housekeeping, and cleaning of

their home, as well as upkeep of the van, which is used for short trips and transportation to and from school. All household chores are assigned to the boys; the chores are rotated among the boys every two weeks.

The Personnel

The current Executive Director of Behm Home was appointed to that capacity in 1972, and has been serving in that position on a full-time basis since then; he holds graduate degrees in psychology, and besides supervisory and administrative duties of his position, acts as chief fund-raiser for the Home. According to the Executive Director, the cost of maintaining one boy in the Home is approximately $15.00 per day; funding comes mainly from private sources and donations, supplemented by federal and state monies.

The Assistant Director of Behm Home has been acting in that position since 1972; she holds the Bachelor's Degree in physical education, and is a former public school teacher.

Other staff members include part- and full-time counselors (one of whom acts as Aftercare Supervisor for boys on trial leave) and houseparents. The exact number of counselors varies (again, depending upon available funding), but there are rarely fewer than three full-time counselors; the ratio of staff members to boys is never fewer than one to five. Also, the services of other professionals (e.g., art teachers and student interns) are made available to the boys.

Staff members come from many different backgrounds; all

have college degrees (in physical education, social science, counseling, and other fields), and all have completed some graduate work. Most have had previous experience in working with adolescents (as in public school teaching) or counseling, or both. It is this writer's observation that staff members are highly qualified, academically speaking; also, they are extremely dedicated to their work.

Each Home contains facilities for a maximum of twelve boys at any one time. Before being admitted, boys are carefully screened through court records, psychological testing, behavioral observations, and staff consultation. Many boys admitted to the program have been adjudicated "delinquent" by the Court; most accepted into the program are felons, having been convicted of property and/or drug offenses. Boys with marked tendencies toward violent behavior are usually not accepted.

Recruitment into the program generally follows this sequence of events: When a boy goes to court, recommendations are made by various persons knowledgeable of his case history (probation officers, social workers, court psychologists, or even the judge) to the Court. When a boy is thought to be a likely candidate for Behm Home, the Executive Director is contacted; he goes to court to speak with the boy and other concerned parties. If all agree, the boy is brought to the Home for treatment. In sum, Home residents are referred by the Court system. When it is decided that a boy will go to Behm Home, his parents or guardians are re-

quired by court order to cooperate in the program; failure to do so (usually by refusing to attend family group sessions) constitutes legal grounds for prosecution.

While in residence, boys are required to attend school on a regular basis (except, of course, during the summer); staff members keep close watch upon the boys' academic progress and behavior at school. By arrangement with two public schools (one junior high and one high school), the boys are enrolled on a continuing basis, and thus their stay at Behm does not interrupt their education. After departing from the Home, boys generally finish the semester at the school attended while in residence.

The Treatment Model

The Behm treatment program is based upon two key components: Behavior modification and counseling. The behavior modification is based upon an elaborate system of points given for positive behavior, and deducted for negative behavior. Points are given for such behaviors as getting up on time, good personal appearance and hygiene, good manners, doing homework, going to bed on time, receiving good school reports, doing assigned chores, volunteering for extra work, preventing another boy from running away, reporting misbehavior of another boy (provided that this is not done gleefully, falsely, or to "set someone up"), and other actions such as writing contracts with family members and other Home boys.

A contract is basically a brief written report of some

conversation, agreement, or pact between two boys, a boy and his parents, or a boy and a staff member; included in the contract are the feelings, difficulties, or fears of each party, and also the steps that each plans to take in the future. Contracts are read and evaluated by the staff; this is one of the many ways that staff members keep in touch with the thoughts and experiences of their young charges.

Possession of nearly all privileges (such as playing games, watching television, going to get a coke with parents, getting first choice on second helpings at mealtime, and phone calls) requires that a boy has earned a specified minimum number of points. Also, the points system is used in determining at what point in a boy's stay he is permitted to move from the Snoopy into the Romper Room, or the Romper into the Privileged Room; and if his points and attitude drop considerably, he may be moved back into a "lower" room. Since the specific numbers of points attached to positive and negative actions changes from time to time, they are not given here; however, it deserves mention that the boys themselves play a direct role in the legislation of such Home rules.

Generally, the minimum length of stay at the Home is three and one-half months, excepting cases in which boys are returned to the Court for other placement. However, there are no hard-and-fast criteria used by the staff members in determining the precise time when a boy is ready to return to the larger society. Instead, the staff rely upon the degree of responsibility displayed by a boy (in dealing with

his own behavior and that of his peers), the relative success of the boy's trial visits at home, and their own personal knowledge of the boy. The timing of a boy's return to society depends not only upon the boy, but upon his parents as well; that is, if "undesirable" conditions exist at home (such as parental noncontrol or refusal to use discipline, or hostility among family members), then the boy remains in Behm Home until he and the staff members feel that his family has been rehabilitated. To summarize, it can be stated that a boy's reentry into society is temporally determined by three general criteria: (1) Whether the staff members feel that the boy can succeed at this point; (2) whether the boy himself feels that he can succeed at this point; and (3) whether the family believes that their son can succeed, and are willing to help him, following the suggestions of staff members. In no case is a boy returned to an "undesirable" family situation unless both boy and staff members believe that he is strong enough to "make it on his own;" and, there is always the possibility that arrangements can be made for the boy's placement in the military or a trade school. In sum, each individual case is considered as such--an individual case--and the decision to send the boy home, to place him elsewhere, or to keep him at the Home, is made on this basis.

Residents of correctional institutions usually face severe adjustment problems upon their release; they are taken from one social setting and thrust into another totally different environment, and are provided with few (if any)

mechanisms to cope with resultant readjustment problems. In light of this fact, one rather unique aspect of Behm Home treatment deserves mention here: Boys are gradually returned to society through a series of "trial leave" visits with their families. Typically, these begin with a weekend stay at home; then at some later date a boy spends an entire week with his parents. After each trial leave the boy returns to Behm Home; he, his parents, and staff members then evaluate the visit in order to recognize problems that may arise, seek solutions to these problems, and state the responsibilities to be accepted by each family member in facilitating the boy's successful readjustment to society. Only after a series of positive trial leave experiences is a boy returned home on a permanent basis. During the first several weeks of living at home, boys are minimally supervised by staff, through occasional contacts with the Aftercare Supervisor. At any time after release into parental care, whether it be one week or two years, boys may return to the Home for help, guidance, or a visit. Many graduates of the program keep in touch with staff members through phone calls, visits, and/or correspondence by mail.

CHAPTER III

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Correlates of Juvenile Delinquency

The literature indicates that boys with poor self-feelings are more likely to become delinquent than are boys with positive self-concepts (Reckless, 1967: 467) lists several factors related to "self" which influence an individual either toward or away from delinquent behavior; these are regarded as internally containing factors. Some of them are

> . . . self-concept, images, and perceptions; awareness of limited opportunity; rejection of middle-class values; norm retention or norm erosion; techniques of neutralization of offenses; types of alienation; and acceptance or rejection of blame.

Certain kinds of family situations may be more conducive to delinquency than are others. One major finding here is that delinquents more often come from homes characterized by disruption, conflict, parental apathy, rejection, and/or inconsistent disciplinary techniques; this is reported by studies included in the President's Task Force Report on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime (pp. 196-198) and The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society (p. 55).

Research conducted by Weeks and Smith (1939), Sheldon

and Eleanor Glueck (1950), Brown (1960), and Monahan (1957), reported in the Task Force Report (pp. 196-198), all show a higher incidence of broken, disorganized, or otherwise "unhappy" home situations in the backgrounds of delinquents than in those of nondelinquents. Toby (Task Force Report, p. 198) introduced age as an intervening factor, and results indicated that a broken home situation may have differential impact upon boys, depending upon their age. Toby states that

> . . . well-integrated American families generally have less control over their older, adolescent sons. As a result, family disorganization (broken homes) would have its greatest impact upon younger, preadolescent sons, where the well-integrated family could generally exert greater control.

Similarly, Cavan (1962, p. 118) reports that, among preteenage delinquents, there is a proportionately high quantity of broken homes. Lee and Newson (1954) came to similar conclusions in their study of British delinquents; other studies (Nye, 1958; Weeks, 1940; Ferdinand, 1964) suggest that broken homes are more highly associated with some types of delinquency (e.g., incorrigibility, truancy, and other acts against authority) than others (Task Force Report, pp. 196-198).

From these data, the conclusion would seem to follow that most delinquency is produced by undesirable home conditions. However, Cavan (1962, pp. 111-112, 116-117) cautions us against accepting this as a general causal relationship:

> A commonly held psychiatric view is that virtually all delinquency is an indication of early

> assumptions. The great importance of family relationships cannot be doubted, and such parental attitudes as neglect, indifference, hostility, and rejection are closely associated with delinquent behavior. However, by every measure of family relationships used in comparative statistical studies, a large percentage of the delinquents--often almost half--have good parental relationships. Conversely, at least a minority of nondelinquents come from homes with unfavorable emotional relationships. A complete contrast in family relationships does not differentiate delinquents from nondelinquents. . . . Broken homes have been blamed for many years as the source of delinquent behavior. Older studies have little value, however, since the rates of broken homes among delinquents usually were not compared with corresponding rates among comparable groups of nondelinquents. Other studies grouped all types of broken homes together, whether from death, desertion, or divorce, disregarding the distinctive psychological reactions to each type of break. Others took no account of the social-class or ethnic attitudes toward broken homes and the possibility that in some groups, intermittently broken homes might be accepted as near-normal. More recent studies go beyond the rates to explore the implications of different types of broken homes for the personality development and behavior of the child.
>
> Contrary to popular assumptions, half or more of the delinquents live with their own parents. . . . (They) often have brothers and sisters, living in the same broken homes, who are not delinquent. . . . the broken home that produces one or several delinquents does not necessarily produce only delinquents. Conversely, unbroken homes produce half the delinquents.
>
> The mere fact of the absence of one or both parents is less significant than the relationships that exist in the family among whatever family members are present. The absence of one or both parents reduces the probability of adequate relationships but does not necessarily destroy all significant relationships. . . . (O)ne loving nondeviant parent may offset the effect of a rejecting or deviant parent. Broken or unbroken, these relationships are significant. The type of break is important in terms of the different kinds of interference that it makes in good interpersonal relationships within the family.

When the quality of intrafamilial relationships becomes the central focus of research, rather than the physical fact

of the home as "broken" or "unbroken," the relationship of family background to delinquency becomes clearer. Much literature has portrayed the female-headed household as being characteristic of social disorganization, innately pathological, and fertile for delinquency, presumably because of the lack of a masculine role model for the boy to emulate. However, research by McCord, McCord, and Thurber (Haskell and Yablonsky, p. 299) shows that paternal absence is not necessarily related to delinquent activity. In their sample of gang delinquents, there was a significantly higher proportion of boys whose parents quarreled but remained together than the proportion of boys whose fathers were absent. Similarly, McCord and McCord (Cavan, 1964, pp. 176-186) were able to show that quarrelsome and negligent home situations lead to more delinquent behavior than do "broken" homes. Haskell and Yablonsky (p. 300) discuss a distinction that seems to be very meaningful here: A home may be "socially broken" (by divorce, death, desertion, etc.) but yet be happy; likewise, a home may be "psychologically broken" (by quarrels, fights, apathy, etc.) although it is not reflected in divorce or other statistics.

Studies on the quality of interpersonal relationships within the family group have uncovered a variety of family-related factors that are associated with delinquency. Hirschi (1969, pp. 81-97) reports that a negative association exists between delinquent behavior and both the degree of intimacy of parent-child communication, and the degree of

attachment felt by a youth toward his parents. And according to Cavan (1962, p. 113), there is a relationship between deviance and actual or felt maternal rejection; furthermore, delinquent and nondelinquent boys alike tend to display a strong attachment to their mothers (even when they feel that their mothers are not particularly concerned about them), but delinquent boys more often than nondelinquents harbor hostile or neutral feelings toward their fathers.

Parental affection, acceptance, identification, and warmth are apparently crucial factors impacting the behavior of young people; parental rejection is frequently involved in the genesis of delinquency. Discipline techniques of the parents of delinquents and nondelinquents have been shown to differ; parents of delinquents tend to utilize very permissive, very strict, or inconsistent controls with their sons, while parents of nondelinquents more often practice "firm but kindly techniques" (Task Force Report, pp. 198-199; The Challenge of Crime, pp. 63-64). Findings have been summarized as follows (Task Force Report, pp. 198-199; The Challenge of Crime, pp. 63-64): "In short, the data suggest that the consistency of discipline and its fairness are importantly related to nondelinquency."

Several authors have listed ways in which the family may contribute to juvenile delinquency. For example, Haskell and Yablonsky (p. 300) maintain that the family contributes to delinquency by: (1) Being deficient as a socializing agency; (2) choosing the neighborhood of residence, either

voluntarily or involuntarily; (3) failing to influence the friendship patterns of the child; (4) failing to prepare the child adequately for a successful school experience; and (5) failing to influence the child in favor of nondelinquent clubs, play groups, and other interest groups. The same authors also summarize much of what has been stated in the foregoing discussion:

> The way in which the child will relate to other socializing agencies is influenced by his family but not determined by it. Where the family fails, therefore, other socializing agencies take on increasing importance.

A final aspect of family importance deserves mention here: The socioeconomic status of the family and its impact upon young people. After much research, the long-standing relationship between social class and delinquency still obtains--even when middle- and upper-class criminality are taken into consideration. Wheeler and Cottrell (The Challenge of Crime, p. 57) maintain that

> A balanced judgment would seem to be that, while there is indeed unreported delinquency and slower resort to official police and court sanctions in middle-class areas than in the central sectors of our cities, there is also an absolute difference in the amount and types of crimes committed in each area. In short, the vast differences represented in official statistics cannot be explained by differential police or court action toward children of varying backgrounds. There are, in fact, real differences leading to more frequent assaults, thefts, and breaking and entering offenses in lower socioeconomic areas of our urban centers.

Comparable Treatment Models

Most models of delinquency intervention are concerned with the cessation of delinquent behavior once it has occurred, although a few have focused on a pre-delinquency treatment strategy. One such effort was that of the Youth Development Project, conducted in Columbus, Ohio (Reckless and Dinitz); its stated objective was

> . . . to determine whether potentially delinquent and potentially drop-out boys who are given a year's intervention in the seventh grade will have a lower rate of delinquency incidence in a four-year follow-up period than the untreated group of potential delinquents and potential dropouts.

Boys were rated by their teachers and principals as "likely," "possible," and "unlikely" future dropouts and delinquents; the boys were then randomly assigned to control and experimental groups. Boys in the experimental group were placed in a self-contained class, with a male teacher (who was to function as a role model); when it became evident early in the program that their reading level was substandard, a remedial reading program was implemented. A total of 1,726 boys were tested in three successive school years (1963, 1964, and 1965). At the conclusion of the program, an overwhelming majority of the boys involved (97%) reported having positive feelings toward the Project; teachers were equally enthusiastic. However, as a delinquency prevention measure, the program was virtually unsuccessful. The authors concluded that better discriminating evaluations are needed to distinguish potential from nonpotential delinquents (lack of

accurate discrimination at the onset is a possible reason for the program's failure), that better measures of behavioral change of the youth are required, and that adequate role models should be provided for youth who are in danger of becoming delinquent.

Numerous theorists and researchers have pointed to the importance of the peer group in the genesis and continuation of delinquent behavior. Among the most well-known of these is Albert Cohen, who has devoted much effort to describing and understanding the delinquent subculture. Sutherland has emphasized how differential associations may make the difference between delinquent and socially-acceptable behavior patterns. In Cottage Six, Polsky has described the socialization of individual members within deviant primary groups. He has identified five interactive modes by which new residents of "Hollymead," a treatment program for delinquents, learn to conform to prevailing group norms (p. 55): Aggression (violence, physical domination), deviant skills and activities as a form of social control, threat-gestures, ranking (gain or loss of status), and scapegoating of lower-status members. In pointing to the "gap" between "casework life" (norms displayed by the boys in front of staff members) and "cottage life" (the true, "informal" norms and values that govern the boys' behavior), Polsky has illustrated a basic principle that has been ignored by too many treatment programs: Not only do subcultural influences often cause delinquent behavior, but they may prevent rehabilitation

within the institutional setting. It has too often been assumed, either explicitly or implicitly, that an institutional setting somehow will eliminate negative subcultural influences that may be operating informally among the residents. In actuality, if staff members do not "create" a social structure, the boys will; the resulting structure may be either supportive of or in opposition to institutional goals. One of Polsky's major conclusions is consistent with the foregoing proposition (pp. 5-8, 15-16): Hollymeade's focus upon "individualization" as the primary treatment target was insufficient, because it did not include situational or group treatment.

It follows from the previous discussion that, since peer groups do influence their members' behavior, the peer group itself can be an invaluable asset in the rehabilitation of youthful offenders. Several treatment programs have incorporated this principle. One of the earliest of these was the Highfields Experiment (Weeks; McCorkle, et al., 1958), which was inaugurated in New Jersey in 1950. The Highfields boys, who were officially on probation, lived together with a set of houseparents; they did not attend school, but were exposed to radio, newspapers, magazines, and other material; they were expected to work on some constructive projects (not as vocational training, but for gaining work experience), and were paid a small sum for this. The thrust of Highfields treatment was Guided Group Interaction, a group therapy technique described by Empey and Rabow (Giallombardo, p. 540) as

follows:

> Guided Group Interaction emphasizes the idea that only through a group and its processes can a boy work out his problems. From a peer point of view it has three main goals: (1) To question the utility of a life devoted to delinquency; (2) to suggest alternative ways for behavior; and (3) to provide recognition for a boy's personal reformation and his willingness to reform others.

Guided Group Interaction is based upon several assumptions about the functioning of the adolescent peer group, namely, that: (1) The peer group is a reinforcing agent for either delinquent or nondelinquent social values; (2) it sanctions conformity to the prevailing norms of the group; and (3) it provides status and sexual identification to group members (Pilnick, p. 181). Thus, the peer group acts as the prime impetus in change.

To a large extent the members themselves are the therapists, confronting, challenging, and supporting one another. Commitment to change is essential, and "conning" or refusal to accept responsibility for one's actions is strongly sanctioned by the group, as are any delinquencies committed.

The group leader guides, focuses, or redirects the members' key points of discussion; he or she often asks questions of the group, and at the end of the session, provides a summary with comments or suggestions to specific members on improvement or changes in their behavior. The peer group itself is the major therapeutic agent.

The Highfields Experiment obtained a seventy-seven per cent success rate (Weeks, p. 559). When Highfields boys

were compared with those treated at Annandale, a boys' reformatory, it was found that only about half of the latter were successful (i.e., nonrecidivist) after their release. Highfields was later used as a model for other treatment facilities; two of these were Essexfields and Collegefields. The graduates of these programs were often recruited into the program at a later date; that is, Highfields graduates were used to "seed" the Essexfields staff, and Essexfields graduates were used to "seed" the Collegefields facility.

Another program which emulated Highfields to some extent was the Provo Experiment, initiated in Provo, Utah during the 1960's (Empey and Rabow). This program deliberately minimized formal structure, and adult authorities took action only when the peer group failed to do so (in general). The primary source of change came from the peer group, largely through daily discussion sessions based upon Guided Group Interaction.

Juvenile Criminality and Recidivism

Delinquency and recidivism are regarded as a result of breakdown or malfunctioning of containing agents. Data on juvenile delinquency and recidivism show that the former is, on the whole, directed toward property rather than persons. According to Uniform Crime Reports (pp. 44, 123), 53.3% of all persons arrested in 1967 for burglary, 55% of those arrested for larceny-theft, and 61.8% of those arrested for auto theft were under eighteen years of age. However, mem-

bers of this age group were responsible for less than 20% of the arrests for assault crimes (such as homicide and rape).

A linear relationship exists between age and recidivism. In a four-year follow-up study on careers in crime (Uniform Crime Reports, p. 41), researchers found that of all persons released from prison in 1963, 38% of those ages 50 and over were rearrested within four years; 51% of those ages 40-49, 61% of those ages 30-39, 65% of those ages 20-29, and 70% of the persons under age 20, were rearrested within four years after their release.

In the same study, the relationship between offense and recidivism was investigated. It was found that 83% of the auto thieves, 80% of the burglarers, 76% of the larceny offenders, and 60% of the robbery offenders were rearrested within four years after their release in 1963; most of these arrests occurred during the first two years after the offenders' release (Uniform Crime Reports, p. 41).

These data clearly point to two conclusions: Juvenile offenders are typically property offenders; and whether one considers recidivism rates by age or by offense, the juvenile delinquent has the greatest liklihood of all kinds of offenders to become a repeater. A further note on recidivism deserves mention here; according to Cavan (1962, p. 123), a linear relationship tends to persist between socioeconomic status and recidivism. Recidivism tends to increase as status level decreases.

Research on the criminal careers of adult offenders

points to the importance of juvenile delinquency as a forerunner of adult crime; the earlier a youth is arrested or brought before the court, the more serious the first offense for which he is arrested (especially with regard to property offenses), and the more frequently he is processed by legal and correctional authorities, the more likely are his chances of carrying this criminal career into adulthood (The Challenge of Crime, p. 46).

In spite of the gloomy aspects of the foregoing discussion, attempts to rehabilitate juvenile offenders are not all mere "exercises in futility." Some of the more successful programs have been discussed; and as mentioned earlier, some fifty-six per cent of former Behm Home residents have not committed new offenses to date. Compared with a national average of approximately thirty per cent success, this figure is impressive. Any effort to evaluate delinquency rehabilitation programs must include some measure of their outcome; generally, this is done by considering recidivism rates. As a measure of the success of any given treatment program, recidivism rates are limited. Generally, they do not tell us whether the new offense is more or less serious than the old one(s); nor can they indicate any changes in criminal inclinations. Also, nonrecidivism may be a poor approximation of success, in that a boy may remain socially isolated and alienated but still commit no new offense. However, since it is virtually impossible to monitor a person's every post-release activity and thereby gain more meaningful

criteria for "success" and "failure," recidivism rates are the most reliable and readily available sources of information; as indexes of successful or unsuccessful treatment, their validity remains open to question.

An exploration of the techniques utilized by Behm Home in promoting rehabilitation and nonrecidivism is useful here; the following section is devoted to this purpose.

Techniques Used by Behm Home

Gestalt Therapy

Though countless practitioners have elaborated the art of Gestalt Therapy, it is essentially the creation of one clinician, Fritz Perls. The thrust of Gestalt Therapy is in teaching each individual how to provide tirself[1] with experiences that are emotionally nourishing, and how to avoid those experiences and individuals who are emotionally "poisonous."

---

[1] Cf. Warren Farrell, The Liberated Man (New York, 1975), p. xxx:

"The Human Pronoun:

Te (pronounced like tea) = he or she (nominative)
Tes = his or her (possessive)
Tir (rhymes with her) = him or her (objective)

The human pronouns are only used in place of a pronoun that could be referring to either a man or woman ("A person gets what he deserves" becomes "A person gets what te deserves.") But a reference to a specific man or the male gender stays the same (e.g., "A liberated man is secure within himself" would not change).

Each of the human pronouns consist of a t plus one letter from both the masculine and feminine gender of the old pronouns. Te takes the e from he and she; tes takes the e from her and the s from his; tir takes the i from him and the r from her.

All words are pretested for easy readability and pronunciation."

This type of therapy is designed to help people develop spontaneity, sensory awareness, freedom of movement, emotional responsiveness, expressiveness, ease, ability to relate well to others, intimacy, and other traits. Synthesizing and integrating ideas from psychoanalysis and Gestalt psychology, Gestalt Therapy focuses on self-awareness and personal growth. Perls' therapy focuses on the person's present reality, and is thus quite existentialist in its approach. In Perls' terms, "Now = Experience = Awareness = Reality" (Fagan and Shepard, p. 14). The central task of the therapist is to help the patient overcome the barriers that block awareness of the present.

A second type of interpretation and application of Gestalt technique deserves mention here, namely, the approach of Dr. Jerry Greenwald. Greenwald's work may be regarded as one of the more successful "popularized" versions of Gestalt Therapy; he describes it as follows (pp. 9-11):

> The philosophy of Gestalt holds that a person need not undo, work through, or otherwise eliminate the toxic effects of past experiences by delving into them. On the contrary, the deliberate attempt to probe into the past for this purpose simply perpetuates the destructive power of these obselete experiences which belong to the reality of an earlier era of the person's life. They serve largely to distort the reality of his present functioning, his concept of his self, and his ways of relating to the world.
>
> There is a beautiful simplicity and optimism about the philosophy of Gestalt. Granted that past relationships and experiences have shaped an individual's attitudes and ways of reacting in the present, the letting go of those attitudes and behavior patterns which are toxic begins the moment one focuses his attention on the present. The healthy person is in contact with his experiencing (thinking, feeling,

> acting) self in the present. His functioning is expressed in appropriate reactions and behavior based on his experiencing of the now. When he has "come to his senses," he cannot at the same time poison himself with his fears, anxieties, phobias, and catastrophic expectations based on past traumatic experiences.
>
> In Gestalt, reality exists only in the present. A person's memory of the past (despite his sincere denials of this fact) is a collection of obselete distortions and misperceptions. His future is an assortment of anticipations and anxieties (catastrophic expectations) of which the overwhelming proportion never materialize at all and of which those that do, rarely fit the agonizing preparations to which he may have devoted enormous energy for counteracting them. . . .
>
> The goal of Gestalt therapy is to melt the toxic power of the past by learning to focus on the present. When a person lives wholly in the now, the past with all its destructive effects recedes into the background of his behavior and loses its power.

Thus, psychological and social well-being is viewed as a process, the ultimate meaning of which exists in the present (rather than in past experience or expectations for the future). Whether present experience is psychologically negative or positive for an individual depends upon that individual's own actions and ways of relating to others; the Gestalt approach is highly self-deterministic (Greenwald, p. 39):

> Toxic attitudes begin when a person imposes, or clings to, unrealistic restrictions on himself on some basis other than his own self-regulating processes. No one gets everything his own way, and toxic processes are an inevitable aspect of living. It is our own responsibility to choose what toxic influences we will submit to and what toxic influences we will reject. . . .

Within this framework, personal well-being begins when one becomes aware of how one brings toxic and nourishing experience upon oneself. Behavior patterns culminating in

psychic self-poisoning can then be corrected; in this way, one learns to become psychologically self-nourishing. Seeking self-nourishment and utilizing antidotes for toxic behavior patterns or relationships are the responsibility of each individual in tes quest for personal happiness and continuing adjustment.

Reality Therapy

Reality Therapy, developed by William Glasser, M.D., constitutes a somewhat radical departure from traditional psychiatric orientations. While the more conventional views locate the causes of present behavior somewhere in a person's past experiences, whether these be traumatic or otherwise, practitioners of Reality Therapy imply that such explanations tend to become rather feeble excuses for why an individual is behaving as te is in the "here and now." In other words, the focus of Reality Therapy is on present behavior rather than upon past behavior and experience. Quite clearly, Reality Therapy is grounded in existentialist thought.

Glasser maintains that psychiatry and psychiatric counseling must be concerned with two basic needs: The need of the individual to love and be loved, and the need to feel worthwhile to oneself and to others. The basic purpose of Reality Therapy is to assist individuals in fulfilling these needs. In this regard, Glasser again departs from traditional psychiatric tenets by contending that the counselor should engage in active emotional involvement with the counselee.

The basic prerequisite for successful counseling is that the counselee must act with a sense of responsibility; the latter is asked to state tes life goals and aspirations, and is expected to work toward these through responsible and socially-acceptable means. The counselor rejects the client's irresponsible and unrealistic behavior, while at the same time provides the client with guidance in learning to fulfill tes needs responsibly and noncriminally. Also, the client is expected to anticipate, and to take sole responsibility for, the consequences of tes own behavior. People make a conscious decision as to how to behave in a given situation; one must take responsibility for one's own acts, and accept the consequences of these actions, whether these consequences are desirable or undesirable.

Reality therapy has been employed in several types of situations, such as in dealing with delinquent girls, hospitalized psychotic patients, and public school situations. Glasser contends that this technique can be especially useful in institutional settings--particularly juvenile institutions. Ideally, the entire staff is involved in the therapy and constantly confronts residents with the reality of their behavior. In practice, clients should be made aware of their faults tactfully, and taught that acceptable behavior patterns will elicit favorable responses from others.

Although this account of Reality Therapy is brief, it is evident that it bears much similarity to Gestalt Therapy,

at least insofar as basic principles are concerned. Both place high emphasis upon the existentialist approach, the idea of self-determinism, self-correction, and accountability for one's own actions. With regard to their underlying philosophies and basic points of emphasis, these approaches have much in common.

Transactional Analysis

Dr. Eric Berne is primarily responsible for the development of Transactional Analysis. According to Berne (Harris, p. 60), there are three states of being which motivate an individual to change tirself: Being sufficiently hurt, a life situation of boredom, or the realization that one can change. There is a natural inclination for people to maintain self-reliance, emotional health, and general harmony with themselves and others around them; however, if this balance is upset (as is the case with deviant behavior), this is assumed to be a result of "external oppressive influences" which virtually sap an individual's inner coping resources (Steiner, p. 110). However, T.A. maintains that regardless of what has happened in the past, an individual must realize and fully believe that te can change.

An ego state is a coherent system of feelings and is, operationally, a set of coherent behavior patterns. Advocates of T.A. maintain that an individual's transactions (or, social interactions) with others are manifestations of three ego states which, briefly, are: (1) Parent, consisting of

all external regulations imposed upon one during childhood by parents and parent-figures; (2) Child, consisting of the individual's inner and biological needs; and (3) Adult, which is a person's ability to distinguish among what one has been told about life, what one feels about life, and what one tem-self thinks life is about (Berne, 1964, p. 23). The Adult ego state processes messages from the Child, Parent, and external stimuli, and acts as a mediator between the Child and Parent. The Adult represents the "mature" part of the self.

Self-change is necessitated when one of the ego states dominates the others, or when there is an imbalance within the interactions of the three which create an unhealthy life situation, or, typical mode of interacting with others. According to practitioners of T.A., there are four basic life positions: (1) I'm not OK, You're OK; (2) I'm not OK, You're not OK; (3) I'm OK, you're not OK; and (4) I'm OK, You're OK (Harris and Harris, pp. 24-34). While the first three of these are to be avoided and corrected, achievement of the fourth is the primary goal of Transactional Analysis; it represents the life situation of the mature adult who is content with tirself and with others.

Self-change is possible when a person can identify and understand these three ego states within tirself and others; at this point, te can identify, choose, and enact alternative forms of behavior. In other words, only when a person recognizes that te is interacting with another on a Child-Parent

basis can te strive to change this, culminating in the "ideal" Adult-Adult transaction pattern.

Once motivation to change exists, and an individual has learned to recognize tes own ego states, the individual is guided in developing tes Adult. This is accomplished through five steps: (1) Recognition of the vulnerabilities and fears of the Child; (2) recognition of the admonitions, injunctions and fixed positions of the Parent; (3) recognition of the above in other persons; (4) differentiating the Parent and Child from reality; and (5) working out a system of values (Harris and Harris, pp. 95-96).

The counselor-counselee relationship should be one of equality. Both parties assume responsibility in working toward a goal, and both make contributions during this process. The therapeutic contract, a T.A. tool, consists of an agreement between counselor and counselee as to the goals of counseling and the specific responsibilities accepted by each partner in the realization of this goal (Steiner, p. 4). The system of contract writing utilized by Behm Home is based upon this principle.

Of the three techniques discussed here, T.A. is the least individually-oriented, in that it places responsibility for the origins of behavior disorders upon forces outside the individual; like the others, it emphasizes individual responsibility in self-change (although in this regard, T.A. places equal responsibility upon the therapist). Gestalt and Reality Therapies regard past experience as largely irrelevant to

the present, and imply that adjustment is an ongoing process requiring constant self-awareness and appraisal of ongoing events (thus, adjustment today does not guarantee that adjustment has been permanently achieved; tomorrow must "take care of itself"). T.A. does not share this existentialist approach, but considers both past and future life experiences.

Evidence of all three techniques can readily be observed in the Behm Home treatment program; the combined result is quite similar to Guided Group Interaction, as explained earlier. Theoretically, these techniques are viewed as attempts to provide Behm Home boys with internal and external constraints against delinquent influences, as explicated in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

THEORETICAL NEXUS

The Containment Approach

Theories of delinquency causation and rehabilitation tend to polarize themselves along a continuum, ranging from the psychological extreme (in which emphasis is placed upon self-determined sources of behavior) to the social extreme (which emphasizes the social causes of behavior and views most behavior as being a product of the social structure).

If one accepts the assumption that behavior is a product of both inner and outer directives, then it follows that in the area of juvenile delinquency we are lacking in theoretical approaches that take this principle into account.

One exception to this shortcoming is the approach of Walter Reckless who, in his containment theory, assumes that delinquent behavior (like other behavior) originates from forces both inside and outside of the individual; that is, both internal and external factors determine the type of behavior displayed by an individual, whether this behavior consists of delinquent or nondelinquent acts. Since delinquent behavior originates from both psychological and social sources, it follows that nondelinquent behavior (in a rehabilitative sense) must originate from both sources also.

In terms of containment theory, containing forces are those that control or regulate behavior and insulate an individual from the influences that are pushing tem toward deviant behavior. Antisocial influences (such as economic pressures or delinquent peer groups) will pull a person toward deviance; if the person has sufficient resources for containing or holding in check these forces, then the deviant behavior will not occur.

There are two potential sources of containment: Internal containment, consisting of the individual's own mental strength and resources; and external containment, which consists in the social forces operating in the individual's life. Reckless (1973, p. 63) has described inner containment as follows:

> Internal containment consists mainly of self components, such as self-control, good self-concept, ego strength, well-developed superego, high frustration tolerance, high resistance to diversions, high sense of responsibility, goal orientation, ability to find substitute satisfactions, tension reducing rationalizations, and so on. These are the inner regulators.

Outer containment "represents the structural buffer in the person's immediate social world which is able to hold him within bounds," and provides "institutional reinforcement" of acceptable norms and goals, "effective supervision and discipline," and "opportunities for acceptance, identity, and belongingness" (Reckless, 1973, p. 63). These and other necessary social controls are sanctioned by the agents of outer containment.

Theoretically, successful rehabilitation of delinquents is dependent upon a delicate, balanced combination of inner and outer containment. If a boy possesses strong internal containment, then his rehabilitation is less threatened by breakdowns in outer containment; on the other hand, forceful and effective external containment may compensate for some weakness in internal containment:

> If the individual has a weak outer containment the pressures and pulls (of the environment) will then have to be handled by the inner control system. If the outer buffer of the individual is relatively strong and effective, the individual's inner defense does not have to play such a critical role. Likewise, if the person's inner controls are not equal to the ordinary pusher, an effective outer defense may help hold him within bounds. If the inner defenses are of good working order, the outer structure does not have to come to the rescue of the person (Reckless, 1973, p. 63).

The containment approach provides a useful framework for present purposes; the treatment model utilized by Behm Home is now discussed within this framework.

Behm Home Treatment As Containment

Virtually all aspects of the Behm Home model can be expressed in terms of containment. The structured environment of the Home tends to insulate its residents from delinquent influences; also, the treatment attempts to instill inner constrainers within the boys, so that when they return to the community they will be able to rely upon themselves (rather than depending upon external directives).

At Behm Home the treatment places great emphasis upon

individual self-reliance; this is evident in the points system, individual counseling, contract-writing, and assignment of domestic responsibilities, all of which place importance upon self-direction in developing positive and nondelinquent behavior patterns. These are aimed primarily at the development of inner controls, although external controls (in the form of staff and peer influence) are involved as well. However, the prime impetus comes from within the individual, and it is stressed that behavior changes must be made by the boy himself. If a boy does not cooperate in these activities, no overt force is applied; at some point he may be returned to the Court, but until that time he is totally free to do as he chooses. So in a sense, boys who fail in the program are those who are unable to develop inner constraint, even under pressure from external sources (mainly peers).

A major objective of the counseling, points, and contracts are to help the boys improve their self-concepts, understand their past behavior and the reasons for it, and to strengthen their wills in refraining from the activities which got them into trouble. In short, the behavior modification program is integrated with attempts to enhance the boys' self-concepts and inner resources. So while initially a boy may write contracts, engage in counseling with staff, and conform to the points system as a result of peer pressure and the desire to be accepted by peers and staff, in time he is expected to do these things for and by himself,

and for his own benefit. Thus, earning points, counseling, and writing contracts are viewed theoretically as attempts to develop strong inner containment.

Similarly, the boys' groups are aimed primarily at the development of inner control, although in this instance peer pressure plays a more significant role in its development. In most delinquency literature (notably, that pertaining to delinquent subcultures), the peer group is considered to be an influential agent in delinquency causation. However, it may also operate as a containing force; associations with nondelinquent peers could keep a boy from enacting further delinquencies. Behm Home's emphasis upon the peer group is evidenced in boys' group, as well as in other areas of the treatment (for example, boys are expected to inform staff members of rule violations on the part of their peers).

During boys' group sessions, discussion is often focused upon each boy's responsibility for his own actions, and the belief that he and he alone is responsible for his past behavior, and will "make or break" his own future. The boys are expected to believe that they <u>do</u> have a behavior problem (otherwise, they would not be at Behm Home) and furthermore, that they must ultimately learn to rely upon themselves and their own inner strength to avoid further criminality. During boys' group sessions, the boys give each other a great deal of emotional support; however, when one of them attempts to "blame" his delinquent actions upon others (such as parents or friends), the others generally

refuse to accept this as a valid explanation for his delinquency. One notable exception to this reaction occurred when a boy related how his father had "persuaded" him, by threats, to assist him in several burglaries.

In sum, boys' group therapy consists largely of peer pressure, which is used as a medium for the development and strengthening of inner containment.

While in residence, a boy has two major sources of outer containment: The staff members and the peer group (his family takes on increasing significance as treatment progresses). As mentioned previously, both of these function primarily to build up the boys' internal controls; peer and/or staff pressures enter into play only when individual resources fail (for example, peers may prevent a boy from running away or from fighting at school). In terms of the success or failure of the treatment, our prime concern is with the external forces that will take on this containing function after the boys' release from Behm Home. In the majority of cases this function will be assumed by the family; theoretically, the family group sessions can be viewed as the family's preparation to perform this role in their son's rehabilitation. Research points to an association between delinquency and family disorganization (such as broken homes, parental apathy, and the like); when the family fails to perform its containing functions, the chances of delinquency are increased. Conversely, a well-integrated and positive family situation can facilitate a youth's suc-

cessful reintegration into the larger society.

If there are indications that the family will not be able to perform adequately in this regard, a number of different dispositions are possible after their son's departure from the Home: If the boy lacks inner control, he may go into the military or to a foster home, either of which could supply the needed external control; if he has developed high inner containment, he may return home or enter a trade school under minimal supervision. Thus, the conditions of a boy's release may be viewed theoretically as being dependent upon his inner containment; the terms of his release are negotiated on the bases of how much inner constraint he possesses, and whether he requires high outer containment to succeed in the nondelinquent world.

Although staff members do not speak in terms of "inner and outer containment" when discussing any boy's release, it is obvious that these considerations play a major role in their decision. For example, when indications exist that the boy is returning to a less-than-desirable family environment, he will be returned there anyway if he and the staff feel that he is "strong enough to handle it." If he is in need of "someone to keep an eye on him," he will be kept at the Home, or perhaps sent into the military or to a foster home. Again, such decisions are made on an individual basis, and there are no predetermined, official criteria governing the exact conditions of a boy's departure.

Thus, the treatment model of Behm Home may te theoret-

ically regarded as rehabilitation designed to develop the boys' inner containment, with secondary emphasis upon providing them with external buffers in the event that their inner control falters.

Attention now turns to the empirical definition and measurement of these internal and external containing agents.

CHAPTER V

METHODOLOGY

The Sample

Originally included in the sample are all boys who have received treatment at Behm Home from January 1973 through August 1975 (N=86). Files containing the case histories of these boys constitute the chief data base for statistical analysis. However, thirteen cases were eliminated because of insufficient data; this reduced the sample to a total of seventy-three.

At the time of their admission, these boys ranged in age from thirteen to seventeen years, with an average age of fifteen and one-half years. Only one boy is known to be a personal offender (he was charged with numerous property crimes as well). According to the criminal records of the boys, thirty-eight were known to have committed only property offenses, while four were guilty of only drug offenses (such as use, possession, or distribution of a "controlled dangerous substance"); the remaining twenty-seven had mixed drug and property offense patterns in their criminal records. The number of known felony convictions of the boys ranges from zero to twenty-one.

Six of the boys come from an upper-class home, ten from

a middle-class family, nineteen from the working class, and ten from a lower-class background. Of those whose race is known, the majority (fifty-one) are caucasian; there are also nine blacks, three Indian Americans, and several boys of oriental origin.

As mentioned previously, the data analysis includes both a qualitative and quantitative appraisal of the Behm Home program. These are described in the following sections.

Qualitative Analysis: Sources of Data

The staff members of Behm Home were extremely agreeable and cooperative in permitting me to observe all ongoing activities, such as group therapy sessions, staff meetings, individual counseling, and the boys' behavior during various "random" times (such as after school and at mealtime). Also, I was encouraged to converse with the boys, to get to know them, and was asked to participate in individual counseling. In order to observe as unobtrusively as possible, I elected not to take field notes while these events were actually occurring. However, records of these events were maintained, and constitute the basis of the qualitative analysis. For each resident boy a case history was written. Basically, these contain the same type of information that was collected for quantitative analysis (i.e., factors related to the boys' family backgrounds, delinquent activities, and dispositions); some of these data were obtained from case files, but for qualitative analysis, primary emphasis was placed upon the

researcher's conversations and unstructured interviews with boys, and observations of their behavior and interactive patterns. Similar records on parents and their relationships with their sons were also maintained. The qualitative analysis is based upon the same structure and type of information as the quantitative analysis; but in the former, case files were used only to supplement data gained through interviews and observation (usually this was not necessary).

Also, all accounts of staff members, their interactions with the boys, and their decision-making process, are based upon qualitative data sources (such as observation of staff meetings, group sessions, and informal situations).

A further source of supplemental qualitative data should be mentioned: The researcher was given full access to the contracts written by boys; these often proved to be valuable sources of information.

Quantitative Analysis: Sources of Data

Data appearing in quantitative analysis were obtained directly from Behm Home. Files on resident boys are regularly maintained; a complete file typically contains data on the boy's criminal background, in the form of court proceedings and official charges made against him; information on the boy and his family, found in reports made by caseworkers, probation officers, and/or other concerned persons; psychological data based upon clinical diagnosis (these contain the diagnostician's evaluation of the boy's intelligence,

social adjustment, personality, learning capabilities, and general maturity level); and staff evaluations of the boy's current behavior and progress (the most commonly found staff evaluations are the "weekly critiques," which include various types of information). Miscellaneous data are sometimes found, such as grades and reports from schoolteachers; and in the event that a boy is involved in some type of misbehavior, a report is present.

Most of these records were relatively complete, but often some data were missing; the staff members were helpful in supplying information to fill some of these gaps.

Definition and Measurement of Variables

As mentioned above, the researcher was permitted to use resident files in gathering data for analysis. In order to systematize and standardize the information collected for each case, a formal code sheet was used in the process of collecting data (the reader is referred to the Appendix for a copy of this instrument). Many of the variables listed on this code sheet were later eliminated from analysis because of missing data.

Variables relevant to this research fall into three general categories: (1) Factors related to the social and family background; (2) factors related to the delinquent act(s) committed; and (3) factors related to treatment outcome, that is, whether the boy is regarded as a success or a failure of the rehabilitation. Since all boys have been

exposed to virtually the same treatment, there is no need to treat intervention strategy as a fourth major factor. The specific variables examined, the categories used for each, their empirical definitions, and theoretical meanings are given in further detail below. Unless stated otherwise, data on each of these items was obtained from the files.

Social and Family Background

Here six variables are examined: Socioeconomic status, family structure, boy's relationship with both parents (or parent-figures), age of boy at onset of domestic conflict (if any), and full-scale IQ score. Parental relationships refer to the type of parent-son relationship existing at the time of the boy's admission to Behm Home, rather than at the time of his departure from that institution.

Socioeconomic status is measured by four categories: Lower, working, middle, and upper class. When this information was not explicitly stated in the files, categorization was based upon home address, or parental occupation or income. This variable is regarded as theoretically neutral, in that none of these categories is felt to be more or less containing than the others.

Three types of family structure are examined: Single-parent homes (which, in terms of Containment Theory, provide the least amount of external constraint), homes with both natural parents (which, according to Reckless, are expected to provide the highest degree of containment), and two-

parent home with one or more adoptive or step-parents (which is expected to provide a moderate degree of containment). In case histories characterized by more than one of these types of family structure, categorization was based upon the type that existed at the time of the delinquent act leading to the boy's placement in Behm Home.

The boy's relationship with his mother or mother surrogate is classified as follows: Positive (warm, caring), negative (parental apathy, rejection, or cruelty), and overprotective. The last category is reserved for relationships in which the mother persisted in "making excuses" for her son's delinquent behavior, forbidding him to participate in various activities of a nondelinquent nature, or in otherwise "babying" her son.[1] Theoretically, a positive type of parent-son relationship constitutes a situation of external containment; that is, this positive relationship should act as a "buffer" between the boy and delinquent influences. Likewise, a negative parent-son relationship is viewed as noncontaining, in that it provides no such buffer. Overprotection is regarded theoretically as a special type of outer containment, in which this containment takes rather extreme forms.

---

[1]For example, many parents refused to believe their son guilty of wrongdoing, and placed responsibility upon some other person (e.g., spouse, police, or friends). Another type of overprotection is illustrated by a rather extreme case, in which the mother forbade her son to see any motion picture without her approval; he was once grounded for attending a movie in which the word "damn" was spoken.

The next item, relationship with father, is defined and assessed exactly as the preceding.

It is possible that boys may be differently affected by home disturbances according to their age. Thus, if evidence of family disturbances were found, the boy's age at the time of that disturbance was recorded (some examples of disturbances found are death of a "significant other," physical violence or excessive verbal abuse between family members, marital infidelity, alcoholism, and divorce). Age categories were dichotomized into two groups: Less than ten years of age, and ten years or older.

Finally, full-scale IQ scores are grouped as follows: 60-79, 80-99, and 100-119.

Delinquent Activities

It has been shown that the younger the boy at the time of his first arrest, the greater the chances of a criminal career in his future. Therefore, ages of boys at the time of their first known legal encounter were extracted from their records for purposes of analysis. The age categories used for these are 12 or younger, 13-14, and 15 or older. Based upon the literature, we could expect to find a positive relationship between age at first arrest and success rate of treatment. However, it is not plausible to make any theoretical statement here, as there are no data on any boy's age when delinquent influences first entered his life. For example, it would be in error to imply that boys who were

nondelinquent until age fifteen possess "high inner containment" on this basis alone; perhaps they had never experienced the means, opportunity, or motivation to engage in delinquency until that point in their lives.

Offense behaviors are categorized as follows: Drug offense(s) only, property offense(s) only, and both drug and property offenses. To assess the amount, as well as the type of delinquent activity, the number of known offenses committed was recorded as follows: 0-2, 3-4, and 5 or more. Again, no meaningful theoretical statements may be made with regard to these variables.

Treatment Outcome

Here four aspects of treatment outcome are examined: Boy's attitude on arrival at Behm Home, length of time in residence, misbehavior while in residence, and agency disposition. The fourth of these, agency disposition, constitutes the operational definition of "success" and "failure" used in this research.

Attitude on arrival is dichotomized into "cooperative" and "uncooperative," based upon reports made to the Court by staff members. The length of time of residence in the Home is expressed in months (i.e., less than or equal to 2 months, 2-3 months, 3-4 months, and so on). Neither of these factors can meaningfully be expressed in terms of containment theory.

Four types of misbehavior while in residence are examined: "Criminal" behavior (such as stealing or drug use,

either in the Home or at school), absenteeism (running away and/or skipping school), both of these, and no misbehavior. Participation in any type of misbehavior is viewed as resulting from unsuccessful rehabilitative attempts aimed toward building inner containment. Likewise, it is presumed that "good" behavior is an indicator of containment.

Agency disposition, as mentioned previously, determines whether a boy's rehabilitation is deemed "successful" or "unsuccessful." The most common type of disposition is a return home for trial leave; others include military service, trade school, placement in a specialized rehabilitation institution (such as a psychiatric or drug treatment center), or return to the Court for other placement (i.e., placement in another juvenile institution). The first three types of placement constitute success, and the last two, failure.

The above-mentioned variables comprise the focus of this investigation. The interrelationships to be analyzed, and the measures involved in the analysis, are explicated in the following section.

Statistical Analysis

Quantitative findings are reported in six major sections. In the first of these, relationships among the several background variables, taken two at a time, are examined; this should indicate which, if any, background factors are associated with one another. The second major section contains analyses of associations between background and

act-related factors, the purpose being to find which (if any) background factors are related to or predictive of certain types of delinquent activities. In the third section, the interrelationships among act-related variables are examined and interpreted.

The fourth section deals with relationships between delinquent acts and treatment outcome, which should yield empirical insights into the relative effectiveness of the Behm Home program in rehabilitating different types of young offenders. The fifth section contains analyses and interpretations of the relationships among outcome variables.

Finally, in the sixth section, background factors are correlated with treatment outcome; the main purpose of this section is to determine to what extent the treatment program acts as an effective intervening variable between these two sets of factors. In other words, the major question here is whether intervention strategy actually affects chances of success and, if so, how much.

Because most of these variables are nominally measured, Chi Square and the corrected Contingency Coefficient ($\overline{C}$) are employed in the statistical analysis.

CHAPTER VI

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Results of Qualitative Analysis

Contents of this section are based upon my knowledge of twelve boys who were residents of Behm Home during the approximate time period from February 1975 through April 1975. Findings related to these twelve will be more meaningful when considered in the context of the boys' case histories. Because of this, and also to illustrate the uniqueness of each individual, the case histories of these boys are briefly given below. For purposes of convenience and future reference, I have identified these cases by code names; in no instance is a boy's real name mentioned.

> Ken, age sixteen, came from a middle-class home in which the natural father, several natural and step-siblings, and stepmother were present. According to reports by Ken, his brother, and his father, the natural mother was a drug addict who used excessive and often brutal physical punishment in dealing with her sons during their infancy and early years; this persisted until the natural parents divorced, and the father was awarded custody of the boys. Ken was convicted of burglary, and also had several previous drug charges in his record. Both he and staff members felt that his involvement with drugs was at the root of his behavioral problems. His father seemed to be caring but somewhat overprotective of Ken; it seemed that he found it difficult to openly express feelings for his son (family group sessions were evidently helpful in this area). The stepmother's relationship with Ken seemed to be negative,

reportedly ranging from moderate resentment to open hostility; shouting and exchanges of obscenities were not uncommon. According to Ken, the father was constantly placed in the role of referee. Ken's first trial visits at home were difficult, largely because of squabbles with his stepmother. The staff noted that when he went home "for good," the parents had redecorated his room in psychedelics as a kind of "welcome home" present. Whether this undermined Ken's efforts to abstain from drug use cannot be determined; but shortly after his return home, he was rearrested on a drug charge, returned to the Court, and placed in a state reformatory. According to staff reports, the parents were cooperative and supportive of the program. Psychological evaluation described Ken as a boy with pent-up feelings, who was explosive when finally angered.

Doug was ten years old at the time of his first known felony, which was theft of a go-kart. He stated that most of his delinquencies were committed with his mildly-retarded brother in a partnership arrangement. When brought to Behm he was fourteen, and had been convicted of six burglaries and grand larcenies. According to clinical diagnosis, his overall IQ score was 92, with a verbal of 77 and performance of 112; he was characterized as quiet, passive, and withdrawn, with feelings of inadequacy. Doug was a very small boy, and appeared young even for his age. Male staff members believed him to be overly self-conscious (this was attributed to his undersized penis), and discreetly told other boys to give him privacy while dressing and showering. Both natural parents were present in the home; they were apparently successful middle-class business people. Doug reported that familial relationships were quite poor, due to his father's habits of adultery and physical brutality; also, he appeared to be intimidated by his father (as was his mother). The mother appeared to be warm and caring, and possibly could have been "forced" to overprotect the boy in the face of the father's alleged brutality. From his first days in Behm, Doug was reluctant to cooperate in the program; he skipped school, ran away, and stole cigarettes from the other boys. He was returned to the Court and subsequently placed in a state institution after two months in residence. The following case may provide hints as to why the program was unsuccessful for Doug.

Jerry, age fourteen, came from a working-class family with both natural parents. He was the youngest of five children. One older brother was, at this time, serving a term in prison; an older sister, who apparently had been very important to Jerry, had died about two years before Jerry's admission. Jerry's criminal background consisted of two auto theft convictions (although he reported having taken part in numerous others). His overall IQ score was approximately 90, with a verbal and performance of 82 and 100, respectively. Psychological testing diagnosed him as defeated, lonely, depressed, passive, manipulative, nonadaptive, and isolated. From all indications, both parents were sincerely concerned about their son's welfare, although the father seemed to be somewhat domineering at times. The parents seemed to be reluctant in their participation in the program; but after about six weeks, their attitude seemed to change, and they began trying very hard to establish a sound, positive relationship with Jerry. However, he did not respond to this or to the treatment program, and after three months' residence he was placed in a boys' ranch. Staff members felt that Jerry's chronological age, emotional age, small size, and youthful appearance may have affected his performance in the program; the treatment relies upon peer pressure, and Jerry related to the other boys more as a "little brother" than as a social peer. Perhaps this applies to Doug's case as well.

Fifteen-year-old Teddy was an amiable and likeable youngster. His first felony conviction occurred when he was fourteen; offenses in his background included possession of a controlled dangerous substance, incorrigibility, runaway, burglary, theft of an unknown number of cars and motorcycles, and armed robbery. Clinical diagnosticians described Teddy as worried, anxious, insecure, alienated, but with good reasoning and judgment; his full-scale IQ score was measured as 109, with a verbal of 99 and performance of 120. During group sessions it seemed that he refused to let himself express any "negative" feelings, such as anger or dislike; he would do so only when "badgered" by the others, and afterward appeared to become sullen and guilty (on more than one occasion he expressed guilt for offering even mild criticism of others). At the time of his entry into Behm Home, he was living with his natural father and stepmother in a lower-class home. His natural parents divorced when he was seven; he expressed fond feelings for his natural mother, who was living in another state and contacted him

regularly. Teddy reported that his natural father drank most of the time, and that there was little or no relationship between them; they regarded each other with mutual apathy. The parents' attendance at family sessions was sporadic, and staff described their cooperation as minimal, at best. After two months in the program, Teddy was sent to live with his natural mother, and is not known to have committed any new offenses since that time (he left approximately ten months ago).

Keith was fourteen when admitted, and could well be described as the kind of youngster who effortlessly "wins the hearts" of adults. Psychologically he was depicted as moody, easily discouraged, impulsive, easily influenced, and suspicious, with feelings of inadequacy and a fear of close relationships. His full-scale IQ score was 81, with a verbal of 79 and performance of 86. Keith's parents were divorced, and he was living in a middle-class area with his natural mother. From all indications, she was a "good" mother. Keith repeatedly expressed a need for his father's attention, and displayed few emotional ties to his mother. The father's attitude toward Keith was apparently one of apathy, rejection, and general disgust of the role of father. The parents' relationship seemed to be one of hostility; the parents could not be together for even a few minutes without conflict. While in school, Keith was a habitual truant. His first felony conviction came when he was thirteen years old; among his delinquencies were runaway, breaking and entering, and burglary. He lived at Behm Home for one month, during which time he ran away twice; he was returned to the Court and placed in a state institution.

Mark was seventeen when brought to Behm Home; this was shortly after his first felony conviction, which was attempted rape of a six-year old girl. Mark is the only personal offender in the group. He stated that previously he had participated in at least one dozen offenses involving burglary and grand larceny. All of these offenses were, according to Mark, committed with his father (at the latter's insistence). Mark's natural parents were both in the home; he told of many incidents in which he and/or his sister were commissioned by parents to steal various items. Apparently, throughout his lifetime he was punished for criminal behavior only when it was undertaken on his own initiative, or when one

parent "requisitioned" something without the other's knowledge. Mark reported that he was pressured to assist his father in the property crimes mentioned above; the contraband (air conditioning equipment, furniture, etc.) was used in building and furnishing the family's new home. A few of these charges appeared in the boy's court record; according to Mark, his parents forced him to take the blame for these. Mark's stated feelings for his parents fluctuated, involving varying degrees of fantasy, fear, and hatred. Both parents, especially the mother, appeared to be domineering; one minor manifestation of this occurred in group counseling, when both parents answered questions directed toward Mark. They seemed to regard him as a somewhat stupid and blundering, but still functional, "means" for acquiring whatever they wanted. With regard to the program, they were uncooperative, and refused to accept any responsibility for Mark's past behavior or for his rehabilitation. Language is uncensored during group sessions, in the interest of spontaneous and free expression; therefore, four-letter words are not unusual. Mark's parents on more than one occasion expressed dissatisfaction and shock at "such language." IQ testing yielded a full-scale score of 79, verbal of 76, and performance of 86 for Mark. He was quite mechanically inclined, and while in residence seemed eager to make repairs and to fix things (which he did); it is my impression that he thrived on praise, but was self-effacing, especially in nonmechanical areas. He was clinically described as, on the surface, the "confidential, backslapping type," eager to please, open, easy-going, and friendly--but characterized by some deep-seated emotional disturbances, manifested in other characteristics (such as impulsive, aggressive, frightened, immature, naive, angry, and explosive, with lying behavior). His lying behavior was evident in his accounts of the attempted rape; the story changed each time he told it. However, his accounts of criminality committed with his father did not change. Mark reported fantasies of sex and murder; several times he related fantasies of killing both parents with a knife. On one occasion, after being angered by the housefather, Mark took a knife from the kitchen and announced that he was going to kill him; later that day he stated that he had been quite serious about this threat, and felt no guilt about it. According to the clinician's report, he would be dangerous (i.e., inclined to rape and/or kill) if left in an open setting. The cost of psychiatric institutionalization was prohibitive to his parents, and after three weeks at Behm Home Mark was placed into a state reformatory.

Joseph was fifteen when admitted to Behm Home. Basically, he and his mother (the father was not in the home) appeared to have a positive relationship, but she stated that it was impossible for her to discipline him, because she was trying to support and raise Joseph and nine other children. In family groups she related incidents in which Joseph would sneak out of his window at night (after she was asleep), meet his friends, and then go on a burglary "spree." These accounts were corrorborated by the boy; he stated that he felt guilty about his behavior, but at the same time felt a compulsion to burglarize. In some respects, Joseph's case is similar to the "dual personality" syndrome; on days when he felt like burglarizing, he wore a certain shirt and pair of jeans to school (this was the signal to his friends that, on that day, Joseph was "Lumpy" the burglar). Joseph was "himself" on nondelinquent days; on delinquent days, he went by the name of Lumpy. Lumpy and his friends would make plans for the evening; this continued until he was apprehended while attempting to burglarize the home of a policeman. He believed that his friends had "set him up" for this. He had been convicted of four burglaries, although he stated that he had been involved in many others. Psychological evaluation characterized Joseph as negligent, irresponsible, emotionally neutral, stubborn, and reserved, with lying behavior, poor social awareness, and poor interpersonal relationships; his full-scale, verbal, and performance IQ scores were 77, 74, and 84, respectively. While in residence, Joseph displayed initial cooperation with the program, but his behavior regressed as time passed. His mother's cooperation was rather neutral, and her attendance throughout Joseph's stay was erratic. Although her participation was not characterized by great effort, it seemed to this observer that she was involved in a well-meaning fashion. Joseph was returned to her care approximately ten months ago, and has committed no known delinquencies since that time.

When Ed was about sixteen, his mother died after a three- or four-year illness. During her illness, Ed felt that the care of her and his three younger siblings had unfairly been placed upon him; he reported that the relationship with his father became one of deep resentment and bitterness, especially when he learned that his father and the family doctor had "hidden" from him the fact that his mother was dying. According to their own reports, both father and son felt that the other was

behaving irresponsibly, and a situation of hostility and physical conflict developed; until this time Ed had never displayed any behavior problems, but shortly after his mother's death he became heavily involved in drugs and was arrested for armed robbery of a convenience grocery store. Psychological testing yielded full-scale, verbal, and performance IQ scores of 101, 106, and 96. The clinician described him as a lonely, frightened, depressed, bright youngster, with good reasoning and judgment, but unable to express himself. In one group role-playing session, a staff member was acting as Ed's father; during this interaction, Ed became enraged at "his father" and physically attacked him. The staff member was not injured. This illustrates Ed's attitude toward his father; also, it serves as an example of the standing rule that no boy is punished for anything he says or does during group sessions. Since the purpose of these sessions is the recognition, free expression, and release of inner feelings, staff members do not wish to inhibit the boys' words or actions. In another highly emotional therapy session that occurred later, Ed spontaneously embraced his father; after this point their relationship slowly became stronger and more positive. Ed was in residence for slightly over three months, and since his return home (about ten months ago) he has committed no new known offenses.

Steve was living with his natural mother and four younger sisters and brothers when placed in Behm Home for car theft (this was preceded by two burglary convictions). He described his relationship with his mother and siblings as generally warm and affectionate, although he did have mixed feelings toward his mother; apparently he did not attach great importance to his father's absence. There are no indications that he or the other children had ever been physically or verbally mistreated by the mother. Throughout Steve's stay in the program, staff members report that the mother gave her full cooperation. The clinical psychologist who tested Steve characterized him as a sensitive and easily hurt, friendly, eager-to-please, and easily influenced young man, with a low self-concept. Also, she stated that Steve had difficulty in forming and maintaining interpersonal relationships. On the IQ measures he scored 91 (full-scale), 95 (verbal), and 87 (performance).

During one boys' group session, Steve "confessed" that he had been "pimping" his nine-year-old sister for several months. The staff informed his mother of this; she questioned her daughter (who denied it), took her to a doctor for examination, and then reported to the staff that Steve had been lying. Under pressure, the boy stated that he had been lying; that he loved his mother, but had wanted to hurt her and had made up the story to do so. His desire to hurt her, he felt, was related to some of her past behaviors with male acquaintances. She acknowledged her "mistakes," he expressed guilt at his lying behavior, and both stated their wish to "make up for it" in the future. Steve was released to her home about ten months ago, and is not known to have participated in delinquency since then.

Jack was living with both natural parents at the time of his placement in Behm Home. According to his case file, he and his mother were usually on good terms; but there were reports of conflict between father and son which had existed for several years. Also, his file contained information that intense rivalry was present between Jack and his siblings (particularly his younger brother). Staff reports indicated that Jack's parents were fully cooperative in the treatment, and that his brother attended family group sessions regularly although not required to do so. Evidently Jack had presented school officials with numerous discipline problems. The psychologist who tested Jack described him as aggressive, impulsive, and stubborn, and measured his full-scale IQ at 108 (verbal and performance scores were 108 and 106). According to Court records, Jack's delinquent behavior began at age fifteen (which was also his age at the time of his admission to Behm); there were five burglary convictions in his report. At the time of his admission, staff members described his attitude as one of resentful acceptance of the program; later reports indicate that his progress was slow but steady, and that as time passed his responsibility increased to the extent that he was appointed Assistant Housefather. While serving in this capacity, Jack reportedly assumed a respected leadership role with the other boys, but occasionally behaved in a manner that was rather "bossy." Jack was at Behm for approximately six months, after which time he returned to the home of his parents; he is not known to have committed further delinquencies.

Tony was sixteen when admitted to Behm; he had no felony convictions, but had previously been arrested for breaking and entering (charges were dropped); the offense for which he was admitted was calling in a false bomb threat to the school he was attending. Tony lived with both natural parents, who reportedly were very religious people and had forced him to attend church all his life. According to Tony's case file, Tony had previously presented discipline problems but when counseling was recommended for him and his family, his father refused to participate or permit any other family members to participate. It was also reported that after Tony's last encounter with the law, his parents disowned him; they stated that they could not attend family sessions at Behm because these would conflict with their church schedule. Since family participation is a required part of Behm treatment, arrangements were made with Tony's aunt and uncle, who are now his adoptive parents. Staff members reported that his aunt and uncle were fully cooperative with the program; it was observed that much time in family group sessions was directed toward helping Tony face the idea that his natural parents would never reconcile with him (it seems that this was not done with the intent of embittering Tony toward his natural parents, or to emphasize any rejection he might have felt, but rather to enable him to face the real possibility that his parents might never again accept him as their son). Tony had five brothers and sisters, living in the home, and reported that positive relationships existed among all siblings. Tony lived at Behm Home for about six months, and during the last weeks of his residence served with Jack as Assistant Housefather; according to staff reports, he was much respected by the other boys (although he was less aggressive in exerting authority than was Jack). Approximately ten months ago he returned home with his adoptive parents (the aunt and uncle mentioned above), and from all indications has refrained from delinquency.

Richard was sixteen when he came to Behm Home, after having been convicted of six crimes (among which were car theft, other property offenses, and drug offenses). His parents had been divorced for approximately five years. Richard was living with his natural father, who had remarried; reportedly, Richard and his father were usually in a state of conflict, and the boy was largely indifferent to his stepmother. Their home was described as middle-class. School reports indicate that Richard had been "legitimately" involved in school activities;

his first known encounter with legal officials occurred shortly after the end of his ninth-grade football season. Staff described his attitude on arrival as one of cooperation; psychological evaluation characterized him as inconsistent, impulsive, apathetic, and manipulative, with a lack of identity. According to his case file, his parents were cooperative in the program, but his father at times was reluctant to discipline him. Richard's case is somewhat different from the others given here; he was first admitted to the program during the summer of 1974, and released after five months; three months after this release, the staff learned that he had committed new delinquencies, which were relatively minor yet serious enough that Richard could have been rearrested. He and a female friend had decided to drive to another state, and during this trip were carrying open containers of beer; also, he had stolen money and several items from his parents. These delinquencies were not brought to the attention of legal officials. Instead, Richard was returned to Behm Home; he stayed for about one month, and was again sent home on trial leave. Since that time, he has committed no new known offenses. On the night of Richard's return to the Home (after the incident related above), a boys' group session was in progress. When Richard entered the room, accompanied by the Executive Director of the Home (who was visibly upset, but in control), the reactions of all present were unforgettable. The incident had a particularly upsetting effect upon two of the boys, Jack and Tony, who were preparing to go home on trial leave the following week; it seems that prior to this incident, Richard had been looked up to by the others as "living proof" that they could "make it" and "stay straight." The implication of his return was clear: If Richard could not resist temptation, how could they? Now they were visibly terrified that the same thing would happen to them. In short, they were given strong support (by staff members and other boys, including Richard); by the end of the session, they appeared to be even more determined than ever to prove that they could succeed. In sum, this incident seemed to have a profound effect upon the boys; the implications of this effect are to be discussed later.

As evidenced by the foregoing summaries of twelve case histories, boys bring with them to Behm Home a variety of

family situations, behavior patterns, and experiences. Nonetheless, some empirical conclusions may be drawn from these data.

Qualitative findings presented here are actually based upon two distinct but complementary levels of observation. The first of these, which may be termed the "micro" or case history perspective, takes as its units of analysis the actual case studies of these boys and describes commonalities and patterns emerging therein; the following section is devoted to this purpose.

A second level of analysis, referred to as the "macro" or structural level, takes an overall view of the Home social setting, the interdependence of the various parts, and the functions (both manifest and latent) performed by the treatment model and its components. A subsequent section of this paper is set aside for this topic.

Case History Analysis and Interpretation

This section is based upon the writer's personal observations and knowledge of the twelve boys whose case studies have just been given. Although we are dealing with a relatively few number of cases, some general patterns emerge from these which deserve attention; these are discussed below.

Behm Home's emphasis upon parental cooperation is based upon the assumption that rehabilitation is greatly enhanced by strong, positive parent-son relationships. In the qualitative analysis, this assumption is validated to a large de-

gree. It seems that, at the time of admission, no boy was on positive terms with his natural father, or with a step-parent of either sex. Boys from broken homes were as likely to have positive relationships with their mothers as were boys from unbroken homes (and perhaps more so, in fact). In some cases boys refused to respond to positive overtures made by parents, and in others the reverse occurred; however, it is seen that in all cases where positive parent-son relationships were developed during treatment, the boys have refrained from further delinquencies. Noncooperation on the part of boys and/or their parents usually results in agency disposition of the boy back to the Court, indicating failure in the Behm program (although not necessarily indicating either a subsequent delinquent or nondelinquent future).

Since we are primarily concerned with the outcome of treatment, several factors felt to be predictive of success should be included here: No domestic conflict (or conflict beginning at age ten or later), positive mother-son relationship at the time of the boy's admission, later onset of delinquency, a background of drug and property offenses, no misbehavior or absentee behavior while in residence, a stay of four months or longer, a relatively high IQ (i.e., 100 or above), and success in the establishment of positive parent-son relations during treatment. Also, it appears that the program is slightly more successful for boys age fifteen or older than for younger boys.

Conversely, several other factors appear to be somewhat

predictive of failure.[2] These are: Early history of domestic conflict (i.e., when the boy was age nine or younger), poor mother-son relationship, earlier onset of delinquent behavior (i.e., when the boy was age thirteen or younger), an IQ score of 80 or lower, a history of only property offenses, the manifestation of certain types of misbehavior while in residence (specifically, stealing and threat-making behavior), failure of boy and/or parents to establish good relations with one another, and a chronological age of fourteen or younger.

Interestingly, attitude on arrival seems to be inversely related to successful treatment outcome; it is my observation that most boys who were initially more open, seemingly willing to discuss themselves and their behavior, and are from all appearences cooperative at arrival, tended to be returned to the Court. In making this generalization, I would point to the cases of Jerry, Mark, and Richard, whose success in the program might well have been nullified had his behavior become known to legal officials. Conversely, it seems that many of the boys who were initially sullen, noncooperative,

---

[2]In this context we are using a rather narrow definition of "failure," i.e., as failure in the Behm program. Needless to say, this does not in itself connote failure in terms of recidivism. Since no follow-ups on boys returned to the Court are available, we simply do not know whether these boys are recidivists or nonrecidivists, and therefore have no basis for supposing that failure in the program is an empirical precedent of recidivism (or any other treatment outcome). However, failures of the program, as will be shown later, may in themselves play significant parts in the rehabilitation of boys who do <u>not</u> fail in the program.

and even resentful of the program, prove to be among the most successful graduates, in terms of responsibility, leadership, and attitude change. The histories of Ed, Steve (whose attitude and demeanor implied more elements of "conning" than of outright resentment), Jack, and Tony, serve as cases in point. While there is obviously not a one-to-one relationship between attitude on arrival and treatment outcome, it is quite clear to this observer that an initial attitude of cooperation is in no way predictive of success; nor is an initially poor or even hostile attitude predictive of failure in the program. Suffice it to say that attitude changes do occur at Behm Home; these are manifested not only in mannerisms, behavior, and ways of relating to others, but even in the boys' faces.

Father-son relationship as a significant factor is not treated in the present discussion, because it was impossible to compare boys with "positive" father-son relationships (at the time of their arrival) with those having "negative" relations; none of these boys seemed to be on good terms with their fathers (or stepfathers) when admitted to Behm.

Much has been written on the effects of family structure upon young people. Usually, a home that is broken, by death, separation, or divorce, is regarded as being more conducive to delinquent behavior than is a home in which both natural parents are present. However, these cases show a higher incidence of domestic pathology in "unbroken" than in "broken" homes; at the very least, this should tell us that the formal

family structure is a poor indicator of the quality of family relationships.

Other general tendencies appeared in the data analysis; to avoid reduncancy, these are discussed in a later section synthesizing qualitative with quantitative findings.

As mentioned previously, observations were recorded and analyzed on two basic levels: The micro or case history level of inquiry, which has just been presented; and the macro or structural level, to which attention is now turned.

The Behm Home Social Structure

From the preceding discussion it seems that the success rate of Behm Home is more highly related to the treatment itself than to any other factors thus far investigated. Therefore, we shall now examine the specific components of Behm treatment, their functions, and their effects upon the youth in the program.

In the identification of specific, identifiable portions of treatment to which success can be attributed, this writer feels that the following components are of high significance: The role of the peer group; resident socialization and internalization of basic Home ideology; and the stratification system characteristic of the Home social structure.

If one single most significant part of treatment can be mentioned, it is certainly the peer group and its unique role in rehabilitation. Peer pressure and support serve as the primary rehabilitative and control mechanisms. By vesting

authority with residents who are felt to be highly responsible (i.e., by promoting them to the position of Assistant Housefather), by expecting boys to take an active part in group therapy sessions, and by creating a social structure based upon mutual and interdependent division of labor within the Home (as witnessed in preparing meals, other household chores, contract-writing, etc.), staff members have created a treatment program in which the peer group performs two major functions: (1) Many control mechanisms are placed in the hands of the boys themselves, hence, peer pressure (rather than raw authority imposed upon them by an "out-group" of adults) becomes a major source of social control; and (2) integration of peer-group interests with institutional goals functions to prevent the emergence of a resident subculture whose dominant values and behavioral standards operate in opposition to those encouraged by the institution. A related function of the peer group is the provision of group solidarity and cohesion among boys; the boys give one another reprimands, advice, and emotional support. In this regard, it should be mentioned that often the same processes operate among parents who attend group sessions; they acquire a sense of "groupness" with other parents, and also offer each other suggestions and support.

When a boy enters Behm Home, the initial stages of his socialization usually take place within his first few days. During this time he becomes acquainted with other residents and with staff members, and is expected to learn the rules

of the Home (and incidentally, is not punished if he inadvertently breaks a rule). Until staff members feel that he is sufficiently oriented into the routine, he is not expected to relate deeply personal self-disclosures to others or to participate fully in therapy sessions. Many boys are frightened or disoriented when they enter the program. Therefore, they are not subjected to pressures to "perform" when new to the program. Instead, emphasis is placed upon establishing a sound trust level.

Sociologically speaking, one basic requisite for the occurrence of socialization is the internalization of dominant beliefs, values, and behavior standards of the group that one wishes to join. Socialization into Behm Home society is no different; at some point in his residence, it is crucial that a boy internalize key points in the dominant Home ideology. When a boy first enters Behm Home, he enters an ongoing social situation with clearly-defined rules, relationships, and goals; to become an acceptable member, he must internalize, verbalize, and practice these. This process is accomplished through both formal (i.e., group therapy) and informal interactions with, and observations of, others whose acceptance by the group is firmly established. Status differentials (to be discussed shortly) play a major role in motivating boys to internalize dominant themes expressed at Behm Home.

Previously, mention was made of the ideology upon which rehabilitative efforts are based.[3] The following statements on Behm Home ideology are derived from my own observations

that certain emphases, themes, and points of discussion seem to recur in all aspects of treatment. This discussion is not intended to be a critical evaluation of the objective reality of Home ideology, but is included for three basic reasons: Belief systems are legitimate concerns in their own right; these yield insights into the assumptions and philosophies upon which the group's existence is based; and finally, belief systems provide the cohesiveness and solidarity that are necessary to maintain and perpetuate ongoing social systems.

Staff members firmly believe that family disturbances are often the source of antisocial and delinquent behavior; if family members expect the boy to improve himself, it is essential that they help him. Obviously, staff insistence upon parental participation is a reflection of this belief; as noted previously, parents are required by Court order to participate in the program once their son has been admitted. Some explanations for nonattendance are accepted as valid by staff members (such as working or illness); others are not. On one occasion the parents of a particular resident phoned to inform staff members that they would not be present in group session that evening, due to a dinner engagement. They assured the staff member that they would try to be there the following week, to which the staff member's reply, essential-

---

[3]"Ideology" in its present usage is defined as follows: "The ideas or manner of thinking characteristic of an individual or group; especially, the ideas and objectives that influence a whole group, shaping especially their political and social procedure" (Funk and Wagnalls, p. 665).

ly, was that "if you don't show up tonight, your son won't be here next week."[4] Reasons given by parents for not attending this group session were not felt to be valid by staff; the implication is that such lack of interest and support on the part of the parents show their son that they really do not care about him, and thus increase chances of his running away. I have observed that parental nonattendance, for non-validated reasons, does often precede misbehavior by the boys--especially running away. If parents do not attend group for reasons deemed valid by staff members, the boy is reassured that his parents had a legitimate reason for not coming.

Parents are expected to internalize the belief that their cooperation in the program is the only way that they can help their son; similarly, boys are expected to internalize the belief that only through reestablishing positive relations with their parents can they help themselves (unless, of course, their parents are uncooperative).

Other components of the belief system should be noted: The discovery, recognition, and ability to deal with one's

---

[4]This general attitude may in some cases be created by staff members; that is, it is conceivable that some boys may not interpret parental absenteeism or other noncooperation as evidence of negligence, apathy, or indifference until it is defined by staff members and/or other resident boys (based upon the latter's own experience or redefinitions of the situation) as such. In effect, this may be operating to actually predispose some boys to run away after the redefinition and reinterpretation of their parents' behavior--an unfortunate latent function of the emphasis upon family participation. So in a sense, such comments may act as "self-fulfilling prophecies" regarding the boys' behavior.

innermost feelings and needs are necessary prerequisites for rehabilitation; rehabilitation is necessary (i.e., the very fact that these boys have participated in delinquent activities indicates that they do need help); failure to change existing behavior patterns and their causes will result in a lifetime of hardship and trouble (in general, the boys have a great fear of being sent to a state institution--and for most of them, Behm Home truly is their "last chance" to avoid this fate); rehabilitation can be accomplished, but it is not easy, and can be done only through cooperation with the program; and, boys must learn to accept full responsibility for their own actions, and not attempt to place it upon others such as friends or parents.[5]

Boys and parents alike are expected to internalize these beliefs. In discussing the process by which this occurs, it is crucial to understand that a new resident is placed into a social system in which the only available peer-reference group consists of other boys who have accepted and placed

---

[5]Parental failure in the program is largely regarded as a factor predisposing a boy to failure in the program (or possibly afterward); but it is viewed as neither a necessary nor sufficient cause of any boy's failure, for in the event of parental noncooperation, other sources of support (i.e., staff, peers, and/or even foster parents) are made available to boys should their inner resources fail. And, as mentioned previously, the military remains a viable option for many boys.

In sum, parental failure is by no means viewed as a valid "excuse" for a boy's failure in the program (or afterward). This does not mean that staff become "hardened" toward boys returned to the Court; to the contrary, this is often taken with sadness and "if only. . ." remarks by both staff and boys. Sympathy is not lacking for "unsuccessful" boys; but in the final analysis, the bulk of responsibility for failure is still placed upon the boy himself.

legitimacy in these beliefs; so in order to win status and the approval of anyone in his environment, he too must learn to define these beliefs as legitimate. The same principle operates among parents, but to a lesser extent, because alternative sources of approval and social acceptance are more readily available to them.

Behavioral standards expected of boys by staff members are relatively conventional. For example, boys are expected to address all adults by the titles of "Mrs.," "Miss," "Ms.," or "Mr.," display customary courtesies and manners at all times (except during group and recreational sessions), abstain from the use of nonprescription drugs and alcohol, and finally, the boys attend church as a group every week. Homosexuality is strongly discouraged; staff members do not overtly encourage masturbation as an alternative to other forms of sexual behavior, but their consent is implied, as they are well aware of its frequent occurrence but take no action to prevent it. There is no formal dress code; in general, boys are allowed to dress and wear their hair however they wish, assuming that they do not become overly grubby.

On their arrival at Behm Home, boys have virtually no status or privileges. Previously the points system of behavior modification was described: New boys are placed in the Snoopy Room, and do not move into the next without some progress as measured by an increase in points; furthermore, some privileges (such as limited phone calls and between-meal

snacks) are not permitted until a specified number of points has accrued. These regulations perform many hidden functions. The withholding of phone call privileges, for example, is used as an incentive for boys to earn points; more covertly, it insures that a boy remains relatively isolated from outside influences until his socialization into the Behm system is becoming effective, as manifested in his points.

Underlying these rules is a subtle but very real stratification system based upon differential rights and status. In order to improve himself socially, a boy must conform to these rules to some extent. Furthermore, the fact that earned status and privileges can be revoked if behavior "backslides" gives boys incentive to improve their performance or, at the least, to maintain their present performance level. Removal of status and privilege is an effective means of social control; Behm Home makes use of this principle. Not once did this observer view attempts by staff members to humiliate boys by public ridicule or shouting, the assignment of meaningless physical tasks (such as moving brick piles back and forth from various locations), or physical abuse; when disciplinary measures are required, this is effectively taken care of through the removal of status and privileges.

The points system also serves to provide boys with role models, whose behavior and status they can realistically strive to emulate and achieve for themselves. Among the boys the Assistant Housefather carries many additional responsibilities (and thus risks disapproval from other boys); but he

is also held in high esteem, even by boys who may dislike him on a personal level. Thus, boys are exposed to role models from among their peers, as well as from adult staff members.

In conclusion, the treatment model seems to be based upon several fundamental assumptions: (1) That individuals are desirous of acceptance by their peers; (2) that they will conform to their peer group in order to win acceptance; (3) that there is a similar need for acceptance from parents; (4) that individuals wish to attain status within their peer group, by whatever definition of "status" is meaningful to that group; and (5) the needs for acceptance, status, and possession of privileges (as well as threatened loss of these necessities) are highly motivating factors.

Therefore, boys who fail to respond to the program are those who either cannot accept the other boys as a meaningful peer group, or who are largely indifferent to their peers' opinions about them. It is the peer group, not parents or staff, which socializes the boy into life in Behm Home; it is the other members of the peer group with which a boy compares, ranks, and evaluates himself and his own progress; it is also the peers before which a boy feels embarassed and ashamed if his behavior suffers a setback. Thus, in the opinion of this writer, the unique manner in which the peer group is put to use in all parts of the program--group therapy, behavior modification, and interpersonal relationships--is at the heart of successful rehabilitation in this program.

Another aspect of peer group significance appears in an

extremely subtle, rather ironic fashion that has not yet been touched upon. While no one at Behm welcomes news of the return of any boy to the Court, in a very real sense, those who do not succeed are, by the very fact of their failure, making possible the success of others in the program. In other words, it is this writer's observation that some failures are necessary for the overall success of the program.

In an earlier portion of this chapter (p. 63), one incident was described in which Richard, a respected graduate of the program, was returned to Behm for misbehavior. Although the other boys were visibly upset by this turn of events, the situation rapidly turned to one of group support, cohesion, and solidarity; many boys voiced a strengthened determination to "make it" as a nonoffender. Obviously, Richard's "close call" was an ominous reminder of what could happen to any of the boys at any time in the future, should they succumb to a momentary impulse. In much the same way as residents of a small community deal with the aftermath of a natural disaster, the boys seemed to unite against their "common enemy"--the re-emergence of delinquent behavior.

A similar reaction occurred when Keith was returned to the Court, although this did not seem to have so great an impact upon the boys; this was possibly because Keith, though well-liked by the others, was a relatively new resident, rather than an admired graduate of the program. As implied above, the boys seemed to feel that if Richard could "blow it," anybody could; this was not the case with Keith, nor with most

of the other boys returned to the Court. Still, when any boy fails in the program, those who remain are by no means left unaffected.

At this point we must inquire into why the boys seem to fear returning to the Court, which, in the vast majority of cases, means immediate placement into a state institution. Earlier mention was made of the boys' fear of such placement, and it was noted that this is a fundamental component of the dominant Home belief system. While on a purely objective level one might argue that the boys' fear of state juvenile institutions is exaggerated and unrealistic, the fact remains that this belief exists, and thus on a subjective level presents a very real threat to the boys who have internalized it. It is my impression that the boys are fearful of state institutions for two basic reasons: First, such facilities do not generally hold the highest of reputations with regard to living conditions, just and humane treatment of inmates, or prevention of internal conflicts, and assuming that such is the case, it is understandable that boys would be fearful; and secondly, many of the boys regard Behm Home as their last chance to receive professional help in putting an end to behavior patterns which, if not changed, will likely result in a lifetime of institutional confinement (or at least, a criminal record that will "haunt" them for the rest of their lives). It is possible that staff members are not only aware of this belief, but may subtly attempt to perpetuate it. Regardless of its origin, this fear seems to serve some very

real and necessary purposes in the program.

Let us consider for a moment some possible consequences of an alternative belief, namely, that state institutions, with regard to rehabilitative treatment, disciplinary techniques, interpersonal relationships, and general comfort level, are actually no better or no worse than Behm Home. Clearly, were such a belief prevalent in the Home, the element of some amount of fear would be missing. While fear itself is not necessarily a positive emotion, it is certainly one of the most reliable and effective motivating forces known; and in the case of Behm Home, it acts as an incentive for boys to succeed in the program. Of course, the boys do not live in constant terror of being "sent away;" but in the event that they fail at Behm, they face a future that is likely to be unpleasant, in an environment in which the chances of rehabilitation are reduced substantially. If failure were not defined in negative terms, the motivation for success would soon disappear.

Thus, we see that boys who fail in the program have the initially unsettling effect of reaffirming and validating the others' fears of failing in the program (which to the boys, seems to connote not only an unpleasant immediate future, but long-range life pattern as well); failures tend to increase group identity and solidarity, and reinforce motivation of the others to succeed in the program. In sum, it seems that some failures are necessary if there is to be any success in the program--and this, ironically, is the therapeutic role

assumed by boys who do not succeed.

As regards the role of the family in rehabilitation, it seems that the family is of secondary importance during a boy's actual residence in the Home; at this time the family is in a stage of anticipatory or preparatory socialization. That is, both boy and his family are being prepared for the day when he returns home on a permanent basis. When this occurs, the family must assume the functions formerly performed by the peer group; so at this point, the family becomes even more important than the peer group in terms of supplying the controls and support beneficial to continued rehabilitative success.

In the interest of providing as balanced and comprehensive a view of the data as possible, a quantitative analysis was also conducted. Quantitative findings, and the data upon which they are based, are presented in the following sections.

Quantitative Analysis: The Data

As mentioned previously, the data base consists of a total number of seventy-three cases; since not all information is available for each case, the entire sample cannot be included in all tables. Chi Square and the Contingency Coefficient are utilized as measures of statistical significance and association.

Interpretations of the data are based largely upon discrepancies between observed and expected frequencies for each cell. In some tables the average difference was one; these

discrepancies did not vary in any type of systematic or directional fashion, but were nonetheless reflected in a value of $\overline{C}$ that I felt to be misleadingly large. In other cases trends appeared which, though not reflected in the magnitude of statistical measures, were felt to be of substantive import. The following interpretations are based upon practical and substantive importance, as well as statistical results.

In the following pages, relationships among the three major sets of variables (background, delinquent act, and treatment outcome) are examined and interpreted.

Interrelationships of Background Factors

Socioeconomic class appears to be related to family structure as follows: The upper stratum contains a larger proportion of natural- and step-parent homes than does the lower, while single-parent homes tend to be underrepresented

TABLE I

SOCIOECONOMIC CLASS AND FAMILY STRUCTURE

	Socioeconomic Class							
	Lower		Working		Middle		Upper	
Family Structure	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Single-Parent	4	(09)	5	(12)	3	(07)	0	(00)
Natural Parents	1	(02)	8	(18)	3	(07)	3	(07)
Step-Parent(s)	5	(12)	5	(12)	3	(07)	3	(07)
N = 43	X^2 = 6.1043				$\overline{C}$ = .44			

in the upper class. As shown in Tables II and III, overprotective parents of both sexes are more common in upper-class families, while the middle class is characterized by more positive than other types of mother-son relationships.

TABLE II

SOCIOECONOMIC CLASS AND RELATIONSHIP WITH FATHER

Relationship With Father	Socioeconomic Class: Lower N	%	Working N	%	Middle N	%	Upper N	%
Good	1	(03)	2	(07)	2	(07)	0	(00)
Poor	3	(11)	8	(29)	5	(18)	3	(11)
Overprotective	1	(03)	0	(00)	1	(03)	2	(07)
N = 28	X^2 = 5.3988				C = .51			

TABLE III

SOCIOECONOMIC CLASS AND RELATIONSHIP WITH MOTHER

Relationship With Mother	Socioeconomic Class: Lower N	%	Working N	%	Middle N	%	Upper N	%
Good	0	(00)	1	(03)	4	(13)	0	(00)
Poor	3	(10)	7	(23)	4	(13)	3	(10)
Overprotective	0	(00)	4	(13)	1	(03)	3	(10)
N = 30	X^2 = 10.4928				C = .65			

Socioeconomic class seems to bear no relationship either to age at start of domestic conflict (Table IV) or to full-scale IQ score (Table V).

TABLE IV

SOCIOECONOMIC CLASS AND AGE AT HOME CONFLICT

Boy's age At start of Home conflict	Socioeconomic Class Lower N %	Working N %	Middle N %	Upper N %
10 or older	2 (07)	7 (24)	4 (14)	2 (07)
9 or younger	3 (10)	6 (21)	3 (10)	2 (07)
N = 29	X^2 = .3905		$\overline{C}$ = .16	

TABLE V

SOCIOECONOMIC CLASS AND IQ SCORE

Full-Scale IQ Score	Socioeconomic Class Lower N %	Working N %	Middle N %	Upper N %
100-129	3 (10)	4 (13)	4 (13)	2 (06)
80-99	3 (10)	9 (29)	3 (10)	1 (03)
60-79	1 (03)	1 (03)	0 (00)	0 (00)
N = 31	X^2 = 3.5826		$\overline{C}$ = .41	

As shown in Table VI, family structure is found to be significantly related to age at onset of domestic conflict. Step-parent homes tend to be characterized by earlier domestic conflict. Single-parent homes are associated with later conflict; this holds true, but to a lesser extent, for homes containing both natural parents as well.

Although family structure and father-son relationships (Table VII) are not significantly related, there is a tendency for single-parent homes to be characterized by more good relationships, and for step-parent homes to contain more poor relationships, than would be expected to obtain through chance. With regard to mother-son relationships and family structure (Table VIII), it appears that single- and step-parent homes contain a relatively high number of poor, and lesser proportion of overprotective mother-son relationships

TABLE VI

FAMILY STRUCTURE AND AGE AT HOME CONFLICT

Boy's age At start of Home conflict	Family Structure: Single-Parent N	%	Natural Parents N	%	Step-Parent(s) N	%
10 or older	12	(27)	9	(20)	3	(07)
9 or younger	6	(13)	3	(07)	12	(27)
N = 45	X^2 = 10.2455 (p<.01)				C = .63	

than do natural-parent homes; the latter tend to be characterized by fewer poor and more overprotective relationships than would occur by chance. These findings approach statistical significance at the .05 level of confidence.

TABLE VII

FAMILY STRUCTURE AND RELATIONSHIP WITH FATHER

Relationship With Father	Family Structure: Single-Parent N	%	Natural Parents N	%	Step-Parent(s) N	%
Good	5	(09)	5	(09)	0	(00)
Poor	9	(16)	13	(23)	17	(30)
Overprotective	2	(04)	2	(04)	3	(05)
N = 56	X^2 = 7.0930				$\overline{C}$ = .41	

TABLE VIII

FAMILY STRUCTURE AND RELATIONSHIP WITH MOTHER

Relationship With Mother	Family Structure: Single-Parent N	%	Natural Parents N	%	Step-Parent(s) N	%
Poor	2	(04)	4	(08)	1	(02)
Good	8	(15)	10	(19)	15	(29)
Overprotective	0	(00)	9	(17)	3	(06)
N = 52	X^2 = 9.4374 ($p<.05$)				$\overline{C}$ = .48	

With regard to IQ (Table IX), there is a tendency for lower scores (99 and below) to occur in single-parent homes, while boys of two-parent homes tend to have higher scores of 100 and above.

TABLE IX

FAMILY STRUCTURE AND IQ SCORE

Full-Scale IQ Score	Family Structure: Single-Parent N	%	Natural Parents N	%	Step-Parent(s) N	%
100-119	4	(08)	10	(19)	8	(15)
80-99	10	(19)	11	(21)	4	(08)
60-79	3	(06)	1	(02)	1	(02)
N = 52	X^2 = 5.6317		$\overline{C}$ = .38			

As seen in Tables X through XIII, relationships with parents (of either sex) are found not to be related either to full-scale IQ score, or to the boys' age at the start of domestic conflict.

TABLE X

RELATIONSHIP WITH FATHER AND IQ SCORE

Full-Scale IQ score	Relationship with Father: Poor N	Poor %	Good N	Good %	Overprotective N	Overprotective %
100-119	16	(41)	2	(05)	0	(00)
80-99	14	(36)	2	(05)	2	(05)
60-79	3	(08)	0	(00)	0	(00)
N = 39	X^2 = 2.8937				$\overline{C}$ = .32	

TABLE XI

RELATIONSHIP WITH MOTHER AND IQ SCORE

Full-Scale IQ Score	Relationship with Mother: Poor N	Poor %	Good N	Good %	Overprotective N	Overprotective %
100-119	10	(23)	4	(09)	5	(11)
80-99	10	(23)	4	(09)	6	(14)
60-79	3	(07)	1	(02)	1	(02)
N = 44	X^2 = .2414				$\overline{C}$ = .09	

TABLE XII

RELATIONSHIP WITH FATHER AND AGE AT HOME CONFLICT

Boy's age At start of Home conflict	Relationship with Father: Poor N	Poor %	Good N	Good %	Overprotective N	Overprotective %
10 or older	11	(34)	2	(06)	0	(00)
9 or younger	15	(47)	1	(03)	3	(09)
N = 32		X^2 = 2.9275			$\overline{C}$ = .42	

TABLE XIII

RELATIONSHIP WITH MOTHER AND AGE AT HOME CONFLICT

Boy's age At start of Home conflict	Relationship with Mother: Poor N	Poor %	Good N	Good %	Overprotective N	Overprotective %
10 or older	11	(30)	5	(13)	5	(13)
9 or younger	10	(27)	1	(03)	5	(13)
N = 37		X^2 = 2.0701			$\overline{C}$ = .34	

Background and Delinquent Activities

Table XIV displays virtually no relationship between socioeconomic class and boys' age at first known delinquent behavior; also, no relationship between social class and number of felony convictions is seen (Table XVI). However, social class does appear to be related to offense types, with working-class boys being involved more often in property, and middle-class boys involved in property and drug offenses (Table XV).

TABLE XIV

SOCIOECONOMIC CLASS AND AGE AT DELINQUENCY

Boy's age at first known delinquent behavior	Socioeconomic Class							
	Lower		Working		Middle		Upper	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
0-12	0	(00)	3	(07)	0	(00)	1	(02)
13-14	3	(07)	7	(17)	3	(07)	4	(10)
15+	6	(14)	8	(19)	6	(14)	1	(02)
N = 42	X^2 = 6.7129				$\overline{C}$ = .47			

TABLE XV

SOCIOECONOMIC CLASS AND OFFENSE BEHAVIOR

Offense Types	Socioeconomic Class: Lower N	%	Working N	%	Middle N	%	Upper N	%
Drug	0	(00)	1	(02)	0	(00)	0	(00)
Property	5	(12)	12	(28)	4	(10)	3	(07)
Both	4	(10)	5	(12)	6	(14)	2	(05)

N = 42 X^2 = 3.9414 $\overline{C}$ = .37

TABLE XVI

SOCIOECONOMIC CLASS AND NUMBER CONVICTIONS

Number Of felony Convictions	Socioeconomic Class: Lower N	%	Working N	%	Middle N	%	Upper N	%
0-2	5	(13)	11	(30)	5	(13)	4	(11)
3-4	3	(08)	2	(05)	3	(08)	0	(00)
5+	0	(00)	2	(05)	1	(03)	2	(05)

N = 38 X^2 = 6.7118 $\overline{C}$ = .49

Family structure is evidently not related to age at first known delinquency, or to offense type (Tables XVII and XVIII).

TABLE XVII

FAMILY STRUCTURE AND AGE AT DELINQUENCY

Boy's age at First delinquent behavior	Family Structure: Single-Parent N	%	Natural Parents N	%	Step-Parent(s) N	%
0-12	3	(04)	3	(04)	3	(04)
13-14	8	(12)	8	(12)	9	(13)
15+	11	(16)	13	(19)	10	(15)

N = 68 X^2 = .3674 $\overline{C}$ = .09

TABLE XVIII

FAMILY STRUCTURE AND OFFENSE BEHAVIOR

Offense Types	Family Structure: Single-Parent N	%	Natural Parents N	%	Step-Parent(s) N	%
Drug	2	(03)	0	(00)	2	(03)
Property	11	(16)	16	(24)	11	(16)
Both	9	(13)	9	(16)	8	(12)

N = 68 X^2 = 2.9556 $\overline{C}$ = .25

Although an examination of Table XIX shows that boys of two-parent homes tend to have more felony convictions than do boys of single-parent homes, this tendency is quite weak.

TABLE XIX

FAMILY STRUCTURE AND NUMBER CONVICTIONS

Number Of felony Convictions	Family Structure: Single-Parent N	%	Natural Parents N	%	Step-Parent(s) N	%
0-2	15	(24)	16	(25)	12	(19)
3-4	4	(06)	4	(06)	5	(08)
5+	0	(00)	4	(06)	3	(05)

N = 63 $X^2 = 3.9227$ $\overline{C} = .30$

Mother-son relationship apparently has no bearing upon the age of the boy when he first encountered legal officials (Table XX), or upon the number of felonies committed (Table XXII); however, the data in Table XXI show that a good mother-son relationship is associated with property offenses, while poor relations are more often accompanied by a drug-related offense background.

Father-son relationship is not associated with boy's age at start of legal trouble, or with the number or type of offense(s) committed (Tables XXIII, XXIV, and XXV).

TABLE XX

RELATIONSHIP WITH MOTHER AND AGE AT DELINQUENCY

Boy's age at First delinquent behavior	Relationship with Mother: Poor N	Poor %	Good N	Good %	Overprotective N	Overprotective %
0-12	7	(12)	1	(02)	1	(02)
13-14	12	(21)	3	(05)	5	(09)
15+	14	(25)	6	(11)	7	(12)
N = 56	X^2 = 2.1379				$\overline{C}$ = .24	

TABLE XXI

RELATIONSHIP WITH MOTHER AND OFFENSE BEHAVIOR

Offense Types	Relationship with Mother: Poor N	Poor %	Good N	Good %	Overprotective N	Overprotective %
Drug	3	(05)	0	(00)	0	(00)
Property	17	(30)	9	(16)	7	(12)
Both	13	(23)	1	(02)	6	(11)
N = 56	X^2 = 6.7093				$\overline{C}$ = .40	

TABLE XXII

RELATIONSHIP WITH MOTHER AND NUMBER CONVICTIONS

Number of Felony Convictions	Relationship with Mother: Poor N	Poor %	Good N	Good %	Overprotective N	Overprotective %
0-2	24	(45)	6	(11)	6	(11)
3-4	4	(08)	3	(06)	3	(06)
5+	4	(08)	1	(02)	2	(04)
N = 53	X^2 = 2.5725				$\overline{C}$ = .26	

TABLE XXIII

RELATIONSHIP WITH FATHER AND AGE AT DELINQUENCY

Boy's age at First delinquent behavior	Relationship with Father: Poor N	Poor %	Good N	Good %	Overprotective N	Overprotective %
0-12	6	(13)	0	(00)	1	(02)
13-14	15	(31)	3	(06)	2	(04)
15+	17	(35)	3	(06)	1	(02)
N = 48	X^2 = 1.8323				$\overline{C}$ = .24	

TABLE XXIV

RELATIONSHIP WITH FATHER AND OFFENSE BEHAVIOR

Offense Types	Relationship with Father: Poor N	Poor %	Good N	Good %	Overprotective N	Overprotective %
Drug	1	(02)	0	(00)	1	(02)
Property	22	(46)	4	(08)	3	(06)
Both	14	(29)	2	(04)	1	(02)

N = 48 $X^2 = 4.1404$ $\overline{C} = .35$

TABLE XXV

RELATIONSHIP WITH FATHER AND NUMBER CONVICTIONS

Number Of felony Convictions	Relationship with Father: Poor N	Poor %	Good N	Good %	Overprotective N	Overprotective %
0-2	23	(50)	5	(11)	3	(07)
3-4	7	(15)	1	(02)	1	(02)
5+	6	(13)	0	(00)	0	(00)

N = 46 $X^2 = 2.0957$ $\overline{C} = .26$

Boys' age at the start of home conflict is not found to be related either to age at beginning of delinquency (Table XXVI) or to number of felony convictions (Table XXVIII). There is a slight relationship between age at start of home conflict and offense types, however; according to Table XXVII boys with no conflict at home tend to be more often property offenders, while early domestic conflict is associated with drug-related offense patterns.

TABLE XXVI

AGE AT HOME CONFLICT AND AGE AT DELINQUENCY

Boy's age at First delinquent behavior	Age at Start of Home Conflict					
	None		10 or older		9 or younger	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
0-12	0	(00)	3	(06)	1	(02)
13-14	2	(04)	9	(19)	9	(19)
15+	2	(04)	11	(23)	10	(23)
N = 47	X^2 = 1.2532			$\overline{C}$ = .20		

TABLE XXVII

AGE AT HOME CONFLICT AND OFFENSE BEHAVIOR

Offense Types	Age at Start of Home Conflict: None N	%	10 or older N	%	9 or younger N	%
Drug	0	(00)	2	(04)	2	(04)
Property	4	(08)	12	(25)	10	(21)
Both	0	(00)	9	(19)	9	(19)
N = 48	X^2 = 3.9102				$\overline{C}$ = .34	

TABLE XXVIII

AGE AT HOME CONFLICT AND NUMBER CONVICTIONS

Number Of felony Convictions	Age at Start of Home Conflict: None N	%	10 or older N	%	9 or younger N	%
0-2	2	(05)	16	(38)	11	(26)
3-4	2	(05)	2	(05)	4	(10)
5+	0	(00)	3	(07)	2	(05)
N = 42	X^2 = 4.0257				$\overline{C}$ = .36	

Full-scale IQ score is associated slightly with age at start of legal trouble, in that boys with scores of 100 or above tend to get into trouble at a later age (Table XXIX).

TABLE XXIX

IQ SCORE AND AGE AT DELINQUENCY

Age at First delinquent behavior	Full-Scale IQ Score 60-79 N	%	80-99 N	%	100+ N	%
0-12	0	(00)	6	(12)	2	(04)
13-14	2	(04)	9	(18)	6	(12)
15+	3	(06)	9	(18)	14	(27)
N = 51	X^2 = 4.6604		$\overline{C}$ = .35			

IQ scores are significantly related to offense types; as shown in Table XXX, boys with scores below 100 tend to be property offenders, while those with scores of 100 or above tend to be involved in drug and property violations.

IQ scores are not related to number of felony convictions (Table XXXI).

TABLE XXX

IQ SCORE AND OFFENSE BEHAVIOR

Offense Types	Full-Scale IQ Score 60-79 N	%	80-99 N	%	100+ N	%
Drug	0	(00)	1	(02)	0	(00)
Property	3	(06)	21	(41)	9	(18)
Both	2	(04)	3	(06)	12	(24)

N = 51 X^2 = 10.9992 (p .05) $\overline{C}$ = .52

TABLE XXXI

IQ SCORE AND NUMBER CONVICTIONS

Number Of felony Convictions	Full-Scale IQ Score 60-79 N	%	80-99 N	%	100+ N	%
0-2	2	(04)	15	(32)	15	(32)
3-4	1	(02)	6	(13)	1	(02)
5+	1	(02)	1	(02)	4	(09)

N = 47 X^2 = 4.3202 $\overline{C}$ = .36

Relationships Among Act-Related Factors

Age at first known delinquent behavior is slightly related to offense types, with boys getting into trouble at an early age (12 or younger) tending to be property offenders, and boys who began delinquent activities at a later age (15-16) participating in both property and drug crimes (Table XXXII). Age at first delinquency is apparently not related to number of felony convictions (Table XXXIII). Offense behavior is slightly related to number of felony convictions; there is a tendency for property offenders to have fewer convictions, and property-drug offenders to have more (Table XXXIV).

TABLE XXXII

AGE AT DELINQUENCY AND OFFENSE BEHAVIOR

Offense Types	Age at First Delinquent Behavior: 12 or younger N	%	13-14 N	%	15+ N	%
Drug	0	(00)	2	(03)	2	(03)
Property	8	(12)	15	(23)	14	(21)
Both	1	(01)	7	(11)	17	(26)

N = 66 $X^2 = 7.5267$ $\overline{C} = .39$

TABLE XXXIII

AGE AT DELINQUENCY AND NUMBER CONVICTIONS

Number Of felony Convictions	Age at First Delinquent Behavior					
	12 or younger		13-14		15+	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
0-2	6	(10)	13	(21)	24	(38)
3-4	2	(03)	6	(10)	5	(08)
5+	1	(01)	2	(03)	4	(06)
N = 63	X^2 = 1.4238		$\overline{C}$ = .18			

TABLE XXXIV

OFFENSE BEHAVIOR AND NUMBER CONVICTIONS

Number Of felony Convictions	Offense Types					
	Drug		Property		Both	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
0-2	4	(06)	27	(42)	13	(20)
3-4	0	(00)	8	(13)	5	(08)
5+	0	(00)	2	(03)	5	(08)
N = 64	X^2 = 5.6846		$\overline{C}$ = .36			

Act-Related Factors and Treatment Outcome

An examination of Tables XXXV through XXXVII shows that age at first delinquent behavior is unrelated to length of time at agency, misbehavior at agency, or agency disposition. Offense type is likewise unrelated to length of time at agency (Table XXXVIII), misbehavior at agency (Table XXXIX), and agency disposition (Table XL), although in the last case there is a slight tendency for boys with property-drug offense backgrounds to be released on trial leave more often than would be expected by chance, suggesting that Behm Home may be slightly more successful in treating these types of boys.

TABLE XXXV

AGE AT DELINQUENCY AND TIME AT AGENCY

Months in Residence	Age at First Delinquent Behavior: 12 or younger N	%	13-14 N	%	15+ N	%
2 or less	3	(04)	7	(10)	12	(18)
2-3	3	(04)	3	(04)	3	(04)
3-4	1	(01)	5	(07)	4	(06)
4+	2	(03)	10	(15)	15	(22)

N = 68 $X^2 = 5.0758$ $\overline{C} = .34$

TABLE XXXVI

AGE AT DELINQUENCY AND MISBEHAVIOR AT AGENCY

Type Misbehavior	Age at First Delinquent Behavior: 12 or younger N	%	13-14 N	%	15+ N	%
None	2	(04)	6	(12)	9	(17)
Absentee	0	(00)	7	(13)	8	(15)
"Criminal"	1	(02)	6	(12)	7	(13)
All	0	(00)	3	(06)	3	(06)

N = 52 X^2 = 2.6161 $\overline{C}$ = .28

TABLE XXXVII

AGE AT DELINQUENCY AND AGENCY DISPOSITION

Agency Disposition	Age at First Delinquent Behavior: 12 or younger N	%	13-14 N	%	15+ N	%
Trial leave	4	(06)	15	(22)	22	(32)
Return to Court	5	(07)	10	(15)	12	(18)

N = 68 X^2 = 1.1856 $\overline{C}$ = .19

TABLE XXXVIII

OFFENSE BEHAVIOR AND TIME AT AGENCY

Months in Residence	Offense Types: Drug N	Drug %	Property N	Property %	Both N	Both %
2 or less	2	(03)	14	(20)	7	(10)
2-3	1	(01)	4	(06)	3	(04)
3-4	0	(00)	8	(12)	4	(06)
4+	1	(01)	12	(17)	13	(19)

N = 69 X^2 = 3.9005 $\overline{C}$ = .29

TABLE XXXIX

OFFENSE BEHAVIOR AND MISBEHAVIOR AT AGENCY

Type Misbehavior	Offense Types: Drug N	Drug %	Property N	Property %	Both N	Both %
None	0	(00)	9	(17)	7	(13)
Absentee	1	(02)	10	(19)	6	(12)
"Criminal"	1	(02)	7	(13)	5	(10)
All	2	(04)	2	(04)	2	(04)

N = 52 X^2 = 6.4882 $\overline{C}$ = .42

TABLE XL

OFFENSE BEHAVIOR AND AGENCY DISPOSITION

Agency Disposition	Offense Types: Drug N	Drug %	Property N	Property %	Both N	Both %
Trial leave	1	(01)	21	(30)	18	(26)
Return to Court	3	(04)	17	(25)	9	(13)

N = 69 X^2 = 2.6419 $\overline{C}$ = .28

Number of felony convictions is not related to length of time at agency (Table XLI) or to agency disposition (Table

TABLE XLI

NUMBER CONVICTIONS AND TIME AT AGENCY

Months in Residence	Number of Felony Convictions: 0-2 N	0-2 %	3-4 N	3-4 %	5+ N	5+ %
2 or less	14	(22)	3	(05)	1	(02)
2-3	5	(08)	2	(03)	2	(03)
3-4	7	(11)	2	(03)	0	(00)
4+	17	(27)	6	(10)	4	(06)

N = 63 X^2 = 3.6776 $\overline{C}$ = .30

XLIII). However, Table XLII shows that boys with fewer felonies tend to display less misbehavior while in Behm Home.

TABLE XLII

NUMBER CONVICTIONS AND MISBEHAVIOR AT AGENCY

Type Misbehavior	Number of Felony Convictions 0-2 N	%	3-4 N	%	5+ N	%
None	14	(30)	0	(00)	3	(06)
Absentee	7	(15)	4	(09)	1	(02)
"Criminal"	7	(15)	4	(09)	2	(04)
All	3	(06)	2	(04)	0	(00)

N = 47 X^2 = 7.8896 $\overline{C}$ = .48

TABLE XLIII

NUMBER CONVICTIONS AND AGENCY DISPOSITION

Agency Disposition	Number of Felony Convictions 0-2 N	%	3-4 N	%	5+ N	%
Trial leave	26	(41)	9	(14)	5	(08)
Return to Court	17	(27)	4	(06)	2	(03)

N = 63 X^2 = .5531 $\overline{C}$ = .14

Relationships Among Outcome Variables

Attitude on arrival, as here measured, apparently has no effect upon either the length of time a boy spends at Behm Home (Table XLIV) or agency disposition (Table XLVI). When misbehavior in residence is associated with attitude on arrival (Table XLV), we see that an initially cooperative attitude tends to be followed by less misbehavior; also, boys with an initially cooperative attitude comprise the largest proportion of those who did not misbehave in residence. However, the small number of cases represented in these tables casts doubt upon their validity.

TABLE XLIV

ATTITUDE ON ARRIVAL AND TIME AT AGENCY

Months in Residence	Attitude on Arrival: Uncooperative N	%	Cooperative N	%
2 or less	1	(03)	1	(03)
2-3	1	(03)	1	(03)
3-4	2	(07)	4	(14)
4+	6	(21)	13	(45)
N = 29	X^2 = .4865		$\overline{C}$ = .18	

TABLE XLV

ATTITUDE ON ARRIVAL AND MISBEHAVIOR AT AGENCY

Type Misbehavior	Attitude on Arrival: Uncooperative N	%	Cooperative N	%
None	2	(07)	9	(23)
Absentee	2	(07)	2	(07)
"Criminal"	4	(15)	5	(18)
All	2	(07)	1	(04)
N = 27	X^2 = 3.3786		$\overline{C}$ = .46	

TABLE XLVI

ATTITUDE ON ARRIVAL AND AGENCY DISPOSITION

Agency Disposition	Attitude on Arrival: Uncooperative N	%	Cooperative N	%
Trial leave	8	(28)	15	(52)
Return to Court	2	(07)	4	(14)
N = 29	X^2 = .0094		$\overline{C}$ = .03	

Length of time at agency is significantly related to misbehavior at agency (Table XLVII) and to agency disposition (Table XLVIII). In the case of the former, we see that

TABLE XLVII

TIME AT AGENCY AND MISBEHAVIOR AT AGENCY

Type Misbehavior	Months in Residence: 2 or less N	%	2-3 N	%	3-4 N	%	4+ N	%
None	1	(02)	2	(04)	5	(09)	9	(16)
Absentee	12	(22)	2	(04)	3	(05)	1	(02)
"Criminal"	4	(07)	1	(02)	1	(02)	8	(15)
All	2	(04)	1	(02)	0	(00)	3	(05)

N = 55 X^2 = 20.9258 (p .05) $\overline{C}$ = .61

TABLE XLVIII

TIME AT AGENCY AND AGENCY DISPOSITION

Months in Residence	Agency Disposition: Trial leave N	%	Return to Court N	%
2 or less	3	(04)	21	(29)
2-3	5	(07)	5	(07)
3-4	9	(12)	3	(04)
4-5	13	(18)	1	(01)
5-6	3	(04)	0	(00)
6-7	6	(08)	1	(01)
7+	2	(03)	1	(01)

N = 73 X^2 = 33.1264 (p .001) $\overline{C}$ = .72

longer stays in residence are associated with less misbehavior of all types; in the latter, it appears that the longer the stay, the greater the chances of success (four months seems to be the "peak" period of greatest difference between successful and unsuccessful boys).

Misbehavior at agency is also significantly related to agency disposition. An examination of Table XLIX yields the following results: Boys with no misbehavior tend to go on trial leave; runaways tend to be returned to the Court (since running away twice constitutes grounds for immediate return to the Court); no differences appear with regard to disposition among boys guilty of "criminal" behavior in residence (this is probably because so many types of misbehavior, ranging from drinking beer to murder threats, are included in this category); and, boys who display all kinds of misbehavior tend to be returned to the Court.

TABLE XLIX

MISBEHAVIOR AT AGENCY AND AGENCY DISPOSITION

	Misbehavior in Agency							
Agency Disposition	None		Absentee		"Criminal"		All	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Trial leave	16	(29)	5	(09)	8	(14)	2	(04)
Return to Court	1	(02)	14	(25)	6	(11)	4	(07)
N = 56	X^2 = 17.8645 (p .001)						$\overline{C}$ = .67	

Background Factors and Treatment Outcome

When relationships of family structure to treatment outcome are examined, the following results are seen: Two-parent (particularly step-parent) homes tend to associate with residence periods of four and more months, while boys of single-parent homes tend to be released more often after three months (Table L); boys from single-parent homes seem to misbehave less frequently in residence than would be expected to occur by chance (Table LI); and, although this tendency is weak, it appears that a disproportionately high number of boys from homes with both natural parents are returned to the Court (Table LII).

TABLE L

FAMILY STRUCTURE AND TIME AT AGENCY

Months in Residence	Family Structure: Single-Parent N	%	Natural Parents N	%	Step-Parent(s) N	%
2 or less	6	(09)	6	(09)	6	(09)
2-3	4	(06)	5	(08)	4	(06)
3-4	7	(11)	2	(03)	0	(00)
4+	4	(06)	11	(17)	11	(17)
N = 66	X^2 = 12.6241 (p .05)				$\overline{C}$ = .51	

TABLE LI

FAMILY STRUCTURE AND MISBEHAVIOR AT AGENCY

Type Misbehavior	Family Structure: Single-Parent N	%	Natural Parents N	%	Step-Parent(s) N	%
None	9	(16)	5	(09)	4	(07)
Absentee	6	(11)	6	(11)	5	(09)
"Criminal"	3	(05)	6	(11)	6	(11)
All	1	(02)	2	(04)	2	(04)
N = 55	X^2 = 3.8861		$\overline{C}$ = .33			

TABLE LII

FAMILY STRUCTURE AND AGENCY DISPOSITION

Agency Disposition	Family Structure: Single-Parent N	%	Natural Parents N	%	Step-Parent(s) N	%
Trial leave	14	(19)	12	(17)	14	(19)
Return to Court	9	(13)	14	(19)	9	(13)
N = 72	X^2 = 1.4040		$\overline{C}$ = .20			

Socioeconomic class does not relate to attitude on arrival (Table LIII). However, it seems that higher social class is associated with a longer stay, while lower status

more often is related to shorter stays of residence (Table LIV). With regard to misbehavior, it appears from Table LV that the least misbehavior is displayed by lower-class boys, and that working-class boys are most likely to run away from the Home. Finally, there appear to be no class differentials in agency disposition, with the one exception that working-class boys are more likely to be returned to the Court (Table LVI).

TABLE LIII

SOCIOECONOMIC CLASS AND ATTITUDE ON ARRIVAL

Attitude on Arrival	Socioeconomic Class: Lower N	%	Working N	%	Middle N	%	Upper N	%
Cooperative	2	(11)	4	(21)	6	(32)	3	(16)
Uncooperative	1	(05)	2	(11)	1	(05)	0	(00)
N = 19	X^2 = 3.7200				$\overline{C}$ = .52			

TABLE LIV

SOCIOECONOMIC CLASS AND TIME AT AGENCY

Months in Residence	Socioeconomic Class: Lower N	%	Working N	%	Middle N	%	Upper N	%
2 or less	1	(02)	9	(20)	3	(07)	1	(02)
2-3	3	(07)	3	(07)	0	(00)	1	(02)
3-4	3	(07)	1	(02)	1	(02)	0	(00)
4+	3	(07)	5	(11)	6	(14)	4	(09)

N = 44 X^2 = 14.3127 $\overline{C}$ = .57

TABLE LV

SOCIOECONOMIC CLASS AND MISBEHAVIOR AT AGENCY

Type Misbehavior	Socioeconomic Class: Lower N	%	Working N	%	Middle N	%	Upper N	%
None	5	(14)	4	(12)	1	(03)	2	(06)
Absentee	2	(06)	7	(21)	4	(12)	0	(00)
"Criminal"	1	(03)	2	(06)	3	(09)	1	(03)
All	0	(00)	1	(03)	1	(03)	0	(00)

N = 34 X^2 = 8.8709 $\overline{C}$ = .53

TABLE LVI

SOCIOECONOMIC CLASS AND AGENCY DISPOSITION

Agency Disposition	Socioeconomic Class: Lower N	%	Working N	%	Middle N	%	Upper N	%
Trial leave	7	(16)	8	(18)	6	(13)	4	(09)
Return to Court	3	(07)	11	(24)	4	(09)	2	(04)
N = 45	X^2 = 2.7316				$\overline{C}$ = .33			

Mother-son relationship (at the time of admission) is not related to attitude on arrival, length of time at agency, misbehavior at agency, or agency disposition, as shown in Tables LVII through LX.

TABLE LVII

RELATIONSHIP WITH MOTHER AND ATTITUDE ON ARRIVAL

Attitude on Arrival	Relationship with Mother: Poor N	%	Good N	%	Overprotective N	%
Cooperative	7	(29)	4	(17)	6	(25)
Uncooperative	6	(25)	1	(04)	0	(00)
N = 24	X^2 = 4.6146				$\overline{C}$ = .49	

TABLE LVIII

RELATIONSHIP WITH MOTHER AND TIME AT AGENCY

Months in Residence	Relationship with Mother: Poor N	%	Good N	%	Overprotective N	%
2 or less	11	(19)	4	(07)	4	(07)
2-3	4	(07)	1	(02)	1	(02)
3-4	6	(10)	1	(02)	1	(02)
4+	13	(22)	4	(07)	8	(14)
N = 58	X^2 = 2.2502				$\overline{C}$ = .25	

TABLE LIX

RELATIONSHIP WITH MOTHER AND MISBEHAVIOR AT AGENCY

Type Misbehavior	Relationship with Mother: Poor N	%	Good N	%	Overprotective N	%
None	7	(16)	2	(04)	5	(11)
Absentee	8	(18)	4	(09)	2	(04)
"Criminal"	8	(18)	2	(04)	3	(07)
All	1	(02)	0	(00)	3	(07)
N = 45	X^2 = 6.6757				$\overline{C}$ = .46	

TABLE LX

RELATIONSHIP WITH MOTHER AND AGENCY DISPOSITION

Agency Disposition	Relationship with Mother: Poor N	Poor %	Good N	Good %	Overprotective N	Overprotective %
Trial leave	22	(38)	6	(10)	8	(14)
Return to Court	12	(21)	4	(07)	6	(10)
N = 58	X^2 = .2670				$\overline{C}$ = .10	

Father-son relationship (at the time of admission) is somewhat related to attitude on arrival, in that a good relationship is more likely to be accompanied by an initially cooperative attitude than is a poor one (Table LXI).

TABLE LXI

RELATIONSHIP WITH FATHER AND ATTITUDE ON ARRIVAL

Attitude on Arrival	Relationship with Father: Poor N	Poor %	Good N	Good %	Overprotective N	Overprotective %
Cooperative	8	(40)	3	(15)	1	(05)
Uncooperative	8	(40)	0	(00)	0	(00)
N = 20	X^2 = 3.3334				$\overline{C}$ = .46	

However, father-son relationship is not related to length of time at agency, misbehavior at agency, or agency disposition (Tables LXII, LXIII, and LXIV).

TABLE LXII

RELATIONSHIP WITH FATHER AND TIME AT AGENCY

Months in Residence	Relationship with Father: Poor N	Poor %	Good N	Good %	Overprotective N	Overprotective %
2 or less	4	(08)	10	(20)	2	(04)
2-3	0	(00)	6	(12)	0	(00)
3-4	1	(02)	5	(10)	17	(34)
4+	2	(04)	17	(34)	1	(02)
N = 50	X^2 = 6.7448				$\overline{C}$ = .44	

TABLE LXIII

RELATIONSHIP WITH FATHER AND MISBEHAVIOR AT AGENCY

Type Misbehavior	Relationship with Father: Poor N	Poor %	Good N	Good %	Overprotective N	Overprotective %
None	10	(26)	1	(03)	0	(00)
Absentee	8	(21)	2	(05)	1	(03)
"Criminal"	8	(21)	3	(08)	1	(03)
All	3	(08)	0	(00)	1	(03)
N = 38	X^2 = 4.6169				$\overline{C}$ = .42	

TABLE LXIV

RELATIONSHIP WITH FATHER AND AGENCY DISPOSITION

Agency Disposition	Relationship with Father: Poor N	%	Good N	%	Overprotective N	%
Trial leave	26	(52)	3	(05)	2	(04)
Return to Court	12	(24)	4	(08)	3	(05)
N = 50	X^2 = 2.6901				$\overline{C}$ = .33	

Later age (ten or older) at start of domestic conflict is to a slight degree accompanied by a longer period of residence, as shown in Table LXVI; however, it does not associate with attitude on arrival (Table LXV) or agency

TABLE LXV

AGE AT HOME CONFLICT AND ATTITUDE ON ARRIVAL

Attitude On Arrival	Age at Home Conflict: None N	%	10 or older N	%	9 or younger N	%
Cooperative	2	(09)	8	(37)	4	(18)
Uncooperative	0	(00)	4	(18)	4	(18)
N = 22	X^2 = 1.7912				$\overline{C}$ = .34	

disposition (Table LXVI). Although there is a tendency for earlier home conflict to associate with more misbehavior in residence (Table LXVIII), this tendency is very slight.

TABLE LXVI

AGE AT HOME CONFLICT AND TIME AT AGENCY

Months in Residence	Age at Home Conflict: None N	%	10 or older N	%	9 or younger N	%
2 or less	1	(02)	6	(12)	6	(12)
2-3	0	(00)	2	(04)	4	(08)
3-4	2	(04)	5	(10)	4	(08)
4+	1	(02)	11	(24)	7	(14)
N = 49	X^2 = 3.7762				$\overline{C}$ = .34	

TABLE LXVII

AGE AT HOME CONFLICT AND MISBEHAVIOR AT AGENCY

Type Misbehavior	Age at Home Conflict: None N	%	10 or older N	%	9 or younger N	%
None	1	(03)	8	(20)	4	(10)
Absentee	1	(03)	6	(15)	6	(15)
"Criminal"	1	(03)	5	(13)	4	(10)
All	0	(00)	1	(03)	2	(05)
N = 39	X^2 = 1.5347				$\overline{C}$ = .25	

TABLE LXVIII

AGE AT HOME CONFLICT AND AGENCY DISPOSITION

Agency Disposition	Age at Home Conflict: None N	%	10 or older N	%	9 or younger N	%
Trial leave	3	(06)	17	(35)	13	(26)
Return to Court	1	(02)	7	(14)	8	(16)
N = 49	X^2 = .4853				$\overline{C}$ = .14	

As illustrated in Tables LXIX, LXX, and LXXI, the relationship of full-scale IQ score to treatment outcome is as follows: A residence period of four months is more common for boys with IQ scores of 100 and higher (Table LXIX); no substantial differences between IQ score categories and misbehavior at agency are found (Table LXX); and finally, it appears that boys with scores of 100 and above are less likely, and those with scores of less than 100 are more likely, to be returned to the court for placement in another agency (Table LXXI).

TABLE LXIX

IQ SCORE AND TIME AT AGENCY

Months in Residence	Full-Scale IQ Score 60-79 N	%	80-99 N	%	100-119 N	%
2 or less	2	(04)	9	(17)	7	(13)
2-3	1	(02)	3	(06)	1	(02)
3-4	2	(04)	5	(10)	3	(06)
4+	0	(00)	8	(15)	11	(21)
N = 52	X^2 = 5.7695				$\overline{C}$ = .40	

TABLE LXX

IQ SCORE AND MISBEHAVIOR AT AGENCY

Type Misbehavior	Full-Scale IQ Score 60-79 N	%	80-99 N	%	100-119 N	%
None	2	(05)	6	(14)	7	(16)
Absentee	2	(05)	7	(16)	5	(11)
"Criminal"	1	(02)	5	(11)	5	(11)
All	0	(00)	2	(05)	2	(05)
N = 44	X^2 = 1.1719				$\overline{C}$ = .21	

TABLE LXXI

IQ SCORE AND AGENCY DISPOSITION

Agency Disposition	Full-Scale IQ Score 60-79 N	%	80-99 N	%	100-119 N	%
Trial leave	4	(08)	12	(23)	16	(31)
Return to Court	1	(02)	13	(25)	6	(12)
N = 52	X^2 = 3.8407				$\overline{C}$ = .38	

Because in qualitative analysis a possible relationship between age at admission and treatment outcome was suggested, we decided to investigate this relationship statistically. These data are shown in Tables LXXII, LXXIII, and LXXIV.

TABLE LXXII

AGE AT ADMISSION AND TIME AT AGENCY

Months in Residence	Age at Admission 13 N	%	14 N	%	15 N	%	16 N	%	17+ N	%
2 or less	0	(00)	5	(07)	2	(03)	9	(13)	8	(11)
2-3	1	(01)	1	(01)	5	(07)	2	(03)	1	(01)
3-4	2	(03)	1	(01)	1	(01)	5	(07)	3	(05)
4+	1	(01)	2	(03)	6	(08)	14	(19)	4	(06)
N = 73	X^2 = 18.6061						$\overline{C}$ = .52			

TABLE LXXIII

AGE AT ADMISSION AND MISBEHAVIOR AT AGENCY

Type Misbehavior	Age at Admission 13 N %	14 N %	15 N %	16 N %	17+ N %
None	2 (04)	0 (00)	4 (07)	8 (14)	3 (05)
Absentee	1 (02)	4 (07)	3 (05)	8 (14)	3 (05)
"Criminal"	0 (00)	2 (04)	1 (02)	7 (12)	3 (05)
All	1 (02)	0 (00)	1 (02)	1 (02)	4 (07)
N = 56	X^2 = 13.9066			$\overline{C}$ = .52	

TABLE LXXIV

AGE AT ADMISSION AND AGENCY DISPOSITION

Agency Disposition	Age at Admission 13 N %	14 N %	15 N %	16 N %	17+ N %
Trial leave	2 (03)	3 (05)	11 (15)	17 (23)	8 (11)
Return to Court	2 (03)	6 (08)	3 (02)	13 (18)	8 (11)
N = 73	X^2 = 5.0716			$\overline{C}$ = .34	

According to Table LXXII, half of the boys age seventeen and older stay in the Home for less than two months; the proportion of these boys who stay for two, three, or four months or longer is less than would occur through

chance. For ages fifteen and sixteen, the majority are in residence for longer than two months (of these, over half stay for four months). The results for fourteen-year-olds are much the same as for boys age seventeen, with the majority of both groups staying less than two months. There are only four thirteen-year-olds; all stayed for longer than two months. Regarding misbehavior in agency (Table LXXIII), these tendencies are observed: Boys ages seventeen and older, more often than through chance, commit all types of misbehavior (as a group, these seem to be the least well-behaved); one-third of the sixteen-year-olds do not misbehave, another third runs away, and the rest tend to display "criminal" behavior in residence; fifteen-year-olds appear to be the most well-behaved group (nearly half do not misbehave, and those who do, run away); and fourteen-year-olds tend to run away or to commit "criminal" behavior (all of these participated in some type of misbehavior). In Table LXXIII, dispositions of boys in various age groups are given. The percentages of boys sent on trial leave are: Age seventeen, 50%; age sixteen, 57%; age fifteen, 78%; age fourteen, 33%; and age thirteen, 50%. These data follow a curvilinear pattern, suggesting that boys age fifteen (and to a lesser degree, sixteen) are most amenable to treatment. When the importance of the peer group is considered, it is also possible that, since the majority of residents are of these age groups, the others are less of "peers" and are thus less susceptible to peer pressure and success in the program.

Summary of Findings

In this and in subsequent portions of this paper, the findings and generalities that are discussed are based upon both quantitative and qualitative data analyses, unless otherwise stated. First the interrelationships among the various background factors are examined and interpreted.

Based upon the data, family structure appears to be related to socioeconomic status as follows: In the higher strata the proportion of step-adoptive and natural-parent homes is larger than in the lower strata, where the relative number of single-parent homes is overrepresented. This appears in both phases of data analysis. A higher proportion of overprotective parents (of both sexes) are observed among the upper class than would be expected to occur through chance; with regard to mother-son relationships, the highest frequency of positive (i.e., warm, caring, etc.) relationships is found in middle-class homes. Socioeconomic status is found to be unrelated to age of the boys at the onset of domestic conflict, as well as to full-scale IQ score. These findings are based only upon the quantitative analysis; no comparable data for qualitative comparison were available.

In both analyses, there is a strong relationship between family structure and age at start of domestic conflict; single-parent homes are associated with later conflict (i.e., beginning when the boy was age ten or older); the same holds, but to a lesser degree, for homes with both natural parents; and homes with one or more adoptive or step-parents are

characterized by earlier conflict (prior to the boy's tenth year). This finding is regarded as significant, both statistically and substantively.

In single-parent homes with the father present there is an overrepresentation of positive father-son relationships, and a proportionately higher number of poor relationships (and lesser number of positive relationships) within step-parent homes than would be expected to obtain through chance. Single-parent homes with mother present and step-parent homes are characterized by more poor and fewer overprotective and positive mother-son relationships than would be expected by chance, while the reverse occurs in homes with both natural parents present; this tendency approaches statistical significance at the .05 level. Comparable data were not available for qualitative analysis.

Relatively substantial statistical measures indicate a tendency for boys of single-parent homes to have full-scale IQ scores of less than 100, and for boys of step-parent homes to have scores of 100 and greater; for boys from homes with both natural parents, IQ scores do not differ from those that would result through chance occurrence. This is not substantiated by qualitative analysis, but may nonetheless be of practical importance. Parental relationships are found to be unrelated to IQ scores in both analyses.

There is a tendency for earlier age at the start of home conflict (i.e., less than age ten) to be accompanied by poorer parent-son relationships; among boys who experienced

home conflict at age ten or older (or who experienced no known conflict) there are more who are reportedly on positive terms with parents. These appear in a stronger pattern in the qualitative data and, while regarded as valid generalizations, this writer would hesitate to state any definite conclusions here.

Several seeming contradictions appearing in the preceding discussions should be briefly considered here. For example, it would seem that, since socioeconomic class is related to family structure, and family structure is related to age of start of domestic conflict, it would follow that socioeconomic class should bear some relationship to age at start of domestic conflict. However, such inconsistencies are more apparent than real when we remember that we are dealing with generalities, as opposed to dichotomous empirical realities. That is, only if these variables displayed a one-to-one correspondence with one another should we expect complete congruity among findings. Although there is a tendency for single-parent homes to be more common in the lower class, and for single-parent homes to be characterized by later domestic conflict, it does not follow that later domestic conflict is more common in lower-class homes, for several basic reasons (e.g. single-parent homes are found in all socioeconomic strata and not exclusively in the lower class, later domestic conflict exists in all types of family structures, etc.).

With these qualifications in mind, it can be stated in

summary that family structure, among all of the background variables analyzed here, seems to be the single most valid and reliable indicator of other background factors. A survey of findings reveals that family structure, age at family conflict, and mother-son relationship are interrelated as follows: Single-parent homes tend to contain later domestic conflict but more poor mother-son relationships than one would expect by chance (in general, later domestic conflict is more often accompanied by good or overprotective mother-son relationships); in step-parent homes more early conflict and a higher incidence of poor maternal relationships occur than would be expected by chance; and, in both-natural-parent homes, there is later conflict and a higher proportion of overprotective and good mother-son relationships than can be attributed to chance occurrence. Although these variables correlate more highly with one another than do any other background variables, we see that none of them can account for a sizeable proportion of variance in either of the other two. Therefore, we must conclude that knowledge about any of these background factors provides us with virtually no knowledge about any other.

Now, the bearing of background variables upon those related to delinquent activities is examined.

Socioeconomic status is, to an extent, related to age at first legal encounter: Upper-class boys most frequently were so involved during ages 13-14, middle-class boys at age 15 or older, and among lower-class boys, age 15 or older (no

pattern emerges for working-class boys). Working-class boys tend to participate most often in property crimes, while middle-, upper-, and lower-class youth engage in property and drug offenses with equal frequency. The above are based upon quantitative analysis only. Socioeconomic status is minimally related to the number of felony convictions appearing in the boys' court records, with feloniousness increasing as socioeconomic status becomes higher.

Findings related to family structure and age at start of legal encounters indicate that the former has very little, if any, effects upon the latter. Again, in the quantitative analysis no relationship appears between family structure and offense types. However, based upon the qualitative analysis, it seems that a strong tendency obtains for boys of single- and natural-parent homes to engage only in property offenses, while boys from homes with adoptive and/or step-parents more often are property and drug offenders; it is my opinion that in this case, qualitative data are more accurate. Therefore, this is felt to be the more valid conclusion.

There is a tendency for boys of single-parent homes to have fewer felony convictions in their criminal records than do boys of other family structures, but this tendency is weak both qualitatively and statistically. Furthermore, it may be due to differential court handling of boys from different family structures; that is, boys of single-parent homes may have been removed from society earlier as a result

of their family structure, thus having fewer opportunities to commit further violations.

Mother-son relationship (at the time of the boy's admission) is unrelated to age at first legal encounter, as well as to number of felony convictions; there is a strong possibility (in my opinion) that the lack of relationship is due to inadequate measurement. Mother-son relationship is strongly related to offense types; boys with positive relationships with their mothers are more often property offenders, while those on negative terms with their mothers are equally represented in drug and drug-property offenses. Father-son relationships are found to be unrelated to age at legal trouble, number of felonies, and offense types; data for comparative qualitative analysis were not available.

To reiterate a point made previously, it was observed in qualitative analysis that in <u>all</u> cases where positive parent-son relations were established during treatment, boys completed the program successfully and are not known to have recidivated. Conversely, when positive parent-son relationships were not established, boys either recidivated during trial leave or were taken back to the court. Thus, in terms of end results of treatment (which is our prime focus), the quality of parent-son relations existing at the time of any boy's admission does not appear to be nearly so crucial a factor as the establishment of positive parent-son relations during the boy's residence.

Quantitatively there is no relationship between age at

onset of domestic conflict, and age at first legal encounter; however, a strong tendency for later domestic conflict to accompany later legal encounters was observed in qualitative analysis. Here, the qualitative interpretation is based upon more accurate data (that is, upon reports made by the boys themselves informally and/or in group sessions, some of which did not appear in their files); it is therefore accepted.

There is a tendency for boys with no conflict in their family backgrounds to be property offenders, while those whose early lives (age nine or younger) were characterized by home conflict participate in drug-related offenses. Age at start of home conflict is not related to number of known felonies committed.

Higher full-scale IQ scores are displayed by boys who became involved with legal officials at age 15 or older, while lower scores are associated with earlier legal encounters. A stronger association obtains between IQ scores and offense types, with boys having scores of less than 100 more often involved in drug offenses, while those with scores of 100 and above are more typically involved only in property offenses. No association between IQ scores and number of offenses is found.

Although there is a tendency for early offenders (ages 11-12) to participate only in property offenses, and later offenders (age 15 and older) to participate in both drug and property offenses, this could well be a reflection of early

apprehension placing limitations on opportunities for future diversified delinquent behaviors. Age at first legal encounter is not related to number of felony convictions. And although there is a slight tendency for property offenders to have fewer felony convictions than property-drug offenders, this is too weak to be regarded as significant. It is concluded that these variables, as measured here, bear no relationships to one another; in the following paragraphs, their associations with treatment outcome are assessed.

Age at first legal encounter is found by both qualitative and quantitative analysis to be unrelated to length of time at agency, misbehavior at agency, or to agency disposition. Offense behavior is mildly related to these as follows: Boys with mixed offense backgrounds tend to have longer residence stays than do boys with only property or drug offenses; a slightly larger proportion of boys with drug and property offense backgrounds than those with only property or drug offenses were sent home on trial leave; and boys with only drug offenses tend to exhibit more misbehavior in residence.

Number of felony convictions is not related to length of time at agency, either qualitatively or statistically; neither is it related to agency disposition (although in qualitative analysis there is a slight tendency for boys with more felonious backgrounds to be sent on trial leave more often than the others). There is also a tendency for boys with fewer known felony convictions to display less

misbehavior while in residence at Behm Home.

Based upon these findings, we may conclude that factors related to the boys' delinquent activities have only a minimal effect on their performance in residence or upon their disposition by Behm Home (i.e., their chances of success or failure). Among the strongest of these findings are the following: Boys with only drug offenses are more likely to misbehave while in residence; boys with more felony convictions are more likely to misbehave while in residence; and offense type is related to treatment outcome, with the highest success resulting for boys with mixed property-drug backgrounds, the next highest among property-only offenders, and the lowest success with boys having only drug violations. Before these can be adequately assessed, the relationship of misbehavior to treatment outcome must be examined.

Quantitatively, attitude on arrival is found to be unrelated to the length of time boys spend in residence at Behm Home, as well as to their disposition. However, it seems to be related to the types (if any) of misbehavior displayed by boys while in residence; boys with an initially cooperative attitude display less misbehavior of all types and, according to the statistical analysis, comprise the majority of boys who do not misbehave at all. However, in qualitative analysis it is seen that attitude on arrival is <u>not</u> predictive of future success or misbehavior in the program. Here, quantitative data were derived from reports made by staff members to the court; and in many cases these

reports may overrate the boys' positive initial attitudes.[5] This mention of overrating boys' attitudes on arrival at Behm Home is not made in criticism (to the contrary, I feel that it is commendable); it does help to explain this slight discrepancy between qualitative and quantitative findings with regard to attitude on arrival and misbehavior in residence. It is concluded that boys' attitudes on arrival are not predictive of their chances of misbehaving, succeeding, or failing in the program.

Length of time at agency is highly related to the types and amount of misbehavior shown in residence; the longer the stay, the less the misbehavior. Obviously, since running away twice constitutes grounds for immediate return to the court, and since most such incidents occur during the first two months in residence, we could expect such a relationship to occur among boys who reside at the Home for only a short length of time; however, the relationship is much more substantial than this, and holds true not only for short but for longer residence periods as well. This relationship is highly significant in both analyses.

Again, an even stronger relationship obtains between length of time at agency and agency disposition. That is, the longer the residence period, the greater the chances of

---

[5]For example, during the data-collection staff members assisted the researcher. When asked about this particular item, one staff member, whose reply is paraphrased, responded by asking, "Do you mean their <u>real</u> attitude, or what we tell the court?"

success (and vice-versa). The examination of the data indicates that this may be a curvilinear relationship, with a residence of four or more (but less than five) months being the "peak" period of greatest difference; after four months, the differences between proportions of boys who are successes and failures diminishes as residence period lengthens.

Finally, a strong relationship also obtains between misbehavior at agency and agency disposition. Virtually all boys with no misbehavior are sent home on trial leave; those with absentee behavior (running away and/or skipping school) tend to be returned to the court; no differences are observed with regard to success or failure among boys who exhibit "criminal" behavior in residence; and boys who enact all of the above types of misbehavior are usually returned to the court. This relationship is also highly significant, but must be viewed with two major qualifications in mind: First, most absentee boys were returned to the court for that very reason, and therefore the relationship between absentee behavior and success/failure in the program is not as simple and direct as implied above; and secondly, the category of "criminal" behavior does not differentiate between successful and unsuccessful boys, largely because it includes behaviors ranging from the consumption of beer, to threats of killing staff members with knives. Based upon qualitative analysis, it seems safe to conclude that certain types of "criminal" behavior are connected with failure in the program (e.g., stealing personal items from other boys

or threatening behavior such as that mentioned above), while other types (e.g., fights at school, nonhabitual use of alcohol or marihauna) do not necessarily damage a boy's chances of successful rehabilitation.

In summary, of all factors considered thus far, those related to the treatment itself are by far the most reliable indicators of treatment outcome. The relationships of background variables to treatment outcome are now examined and interpreted.

According to quantitative analysis, boys coming from two-parent homes (particularly step- and adoptive-parent homes) are more likely to stay at the Home for four or more months than are boys from single-parent homes; the latter are more likely to leave during their third month. This finding is statistically significant, and will be discussed shortly. No such results obtained in the qualitative analysis; this is most likely due to the smaller data base used. Therefore, the interpretation based upon quantitative data is accepted.

Among boys from both-natural-parent homes, there is a slightly higher proportion that are taken back to the court; also, boys of other home structures (especially single-parent) are, more often than not, returned home on trial leave. None of these differences are regarded as significant, but they do point to the conclusion that single-parent homes are at least as conducive to successful rehabilitation as are other types of home structure. Although boys from

single-parent homes are more often released after a stay of three months (as mentioned above), this does not seem to lessen their success rate.

Socioeconomic status is not related to attitude on arrival in any systematic fashion, but is apparently related to length of residence. As social class becomes higher, the length of residence increases. Also, there are tendencies for lower-class boys to exhibit the least amount of misbehavior in residence, for working-class boys to run away, and for working-class boys to be returned to the court more often than boys of other socioeconomic backgrounds (no differences with regard to the proportion of successes to failures within any of the other socioeconomic groupings are observed). Findings related to socioeconomic status are based only upon quantitative analysis.

Mother-son relationship seems to have no effect upon length of time at agency, misbehavior at agency, or agency disposition (the reader is reminded that we are referring to the relationship existing at the time of the boy's admission to Behm Home). Based upon quantitative appraisal, father-son relationship is related to attitude on arrival (with positive relations accompanying initially cooperative attitude, and negative relations, uncooperative attitude), but is not systematically related to length of time at agency, misbehavior at agency, or agency disposition.

Age at beginning of home conflict is not shown to be related to attitude on arrival or agency disposition, but is

moderately related to length of time at agency (with later home conflict associated with longer periods of residence) and to misbehavior at agency (with early trouble accompanying, to a slight extent, more misbehavior in residence, especially runaway, and later trouble associated with less misbehavior).

Finally, full-scale IQ score appears to be related to treatment outcome as follows: Boys with higher scores (of 100 and above) tend to have stays of four months and longer; tend to show slightly less misbehavior, especially runaway; and are less likely to be returned to the court. For boys with full-scale IQ scores of less than 100, the reverse holds true in each case. These are mild relationships, and appear in stronger form in the qualitative analysis.

While these findings are regarded as valid, none actually comprise an association strong enough to be considered statistically or substantively significant in terms of successful or unsuccessful rehabilitation. Essentially, what we have here are tendencies that may be regarded as, at most, predisposing factors--but certainly none of these tendencies are strong enough to be regarded as causal or determining factors.

Among the relationships discussed above, only one is regarded as highly significant: Family structure and length of time at agency. One could conclude that the longer residence periods exhibited by boys from two-parent homes would be associated with higher success rates (since longer resi-

dence periods have been previously associated with higher success); however, further study shows that boys from single-parent homes are at least as successful (and possibly moreso) as others. An alternative conclusion follows: The data suggest that boys from single-parent homes are amenable to shorter, but equally-successful lengths of residence.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Research Design and Objectives

This project originated as an evaluative and descriptive appraisal of Behm Home, Inc., its treatment program, and its success rate in dealing with male delinquents. The total sample included 73 boys, which comprise the majority of former Home residents. Data were analyzed qualitatively (based upon case files maintained by Behm Home staff members, observation, and unstructured interviews with twelve resident boys) and quantitatively (based upon statistical analysis of data from the case files of the total sample of boys). Included in the total sample were boys who resided at Behm Home during various times from January 1973 through August 1975.

Specific objectives of this research, as stated earlier (pp. 3-4), are given below:

> Behm Home has been characterized by a success rate that is higher than average. In light of this matter, several questions arise: Why has the program been so successful? Are there any specific, identifiable components of this treatment to which this success may be attributed? What types of juvenile offenders are likely to benefit from this program? And finally, what role, if any, is played by the family in the success or failure of the treatment program?
>
> This thesis investigates these and other related questions. By analyzing the case histories

> of these boys, this study will seek similarities, differences, and patterns in their records; hopefully, these will provide clues as to why Behm Home's treatment is successful in some cases but not in others. Stated otherwise, the analysis should indicate to some extent the types of young offenders that have been successfully treated by Behm Home.
>
> A further research objective is to qualitatively describe the highly-structured social environment of the Home, in order to ascertain to some degree its functions and effects in rehabilitating delinquent youth. These effects and functions are also assessed quantitatively and theoretically.
>
> These research objectives may be summarized as follows: To present an evaluative and descriptive analysis of the Behm Home treatment program; to examine, qualitatively and quantitatively, the results of this program as measured by successful or unsuccessful reentry of its residents into the larger society; and to find whatever specific factors, if any, are predictive of success or failure of the Home boys in becoming nondelinquent.

Summary of Findings

First, the success rate of Behm Home deserves attention.[1] Depending upon the criteria used in its definition, the success rate varies. If based upon the proportion of successes to the total number of boys who entered the program, the ratio is 41/73, or, a success rate of slightly over 56%. If based upon the proportion of nonrecidivist to total graduates of the program, the ratio is 41/44, which comprises a success rate of 93%.

Based upon national averages, we could expect an overall success rate of approximately 30% among offenders younger than twenty years of age; among property offenders of all ages, only about 25% are nonrecidivists (Uniform Crime Reports, p. 41). Of course, different treatment models

yield varying success rates; yet, on an aggregate level, the success rate of Behm Home in dealing with young offenders is impressive.

Having established the fact of Behm Home's success, our next task is to explain why. A survey of background factors as predictors of treatment outcome yields the following results:

The majority (55%) of boys from homes with both natural parents were returned to the court, while 61% of boys from other types of family structure were returned home on trial leave.

With regard to socioeconomic status, the following per-

---

[1]Success, as used here, refers to whether a boy can succeed in the Behm Home program. A successful boy is one who enters the program and is later returned to his community (usually to his parents, but sometimes to a trade school or the military) on a trial leave basis, during which time he is minimally supervised by staff members. Unless he commits further delinquencies that become known to legal authorities, his treatment is regarded by the court and by Behm Home as final and complete.

By failure we mean that at some time after a boy was admitted to the program he was returned to the court by staff members. Failure does not necessarily connote recidivism, but only that a boy refused to cooperate in the Behm program. Unfortunately, we could not test to what extent program failure is followed by recidivism, for no follow-ups are available on boys who are not graduates of the program. Boys who fail in this regard are returned to the court for other placement--usually in one of the state juvenile institutions.

Thus, in present usage, success always means nonrecidivism (at the least, that if recidivism occurs it is unknown to legal authorities)--but failure does not necessarily mean recidivism. The implications of success and failure in terms of social adjustment and their relative degrees (e.g., the ten-time armed robber who "recidivates" by passing one bad check) are too vast to be dealt with here. Also, the follow-ups that would be necessary to undertake such a study are not available.

centages of boys from each class were successful graduates of the program: Upper, 66% (N=6); middle, 60% (N=10); working, 42% (N=19); and lower, 70% (N=10).

Of boys whose full-scale IQ scores fall between 60 and 79, 80% (N=5) were returned home on trial leave; 48% (N=25) of those with scores ranging from 80 to 99 were successful; and among those with scores of 100 and above, 73% (N=22) were successful.

These factors differentiate more accurately between treatment success and failure than do any other background factors; yet, it is clear that they actually account for few differences between boys who succeed and those who do not. When the act-related factors associated with treatment outcome are examined, they are also lacking in this area, as is shown below:

With regard to offense behavior, we find that among drug-only offenders, only one boy out of four was returned home; 55% (N=38) of the property-only offenders, and 66% (N=27) of the mixed property-and-drug offenders, were successful in the program.

We may therefore conclude that chances of success in the program are not predetermined or even substantially affected by family or offense background. The only variables to which treatment outcome is strongly and consistently linked are those involving the treatment model itself. When these are examined, three highly significant relationships are found: (1) The longer a boy's stay in Behm Home, the

less misbehavior displayed; (2) the less misbehavior shown in residence, the greater the liklihood of success; and (3) there appears to be a curvilinear relationship between length of residence and successful treatment outcome (these data are reported in Tables XLVII, XLVIII, and XLIX). The relationship between length of residence and treatment outcome may be illustrated as follows: Among boys who stayed at the Home for two months time or less (N=19), 13% were successful; among those who stayed from two to three months (N=10), 50% were successful; three to four months' residence (N=12), 75% success; four to five months (N=14), 93% success; five to six months (N=3), 100% success; six to seven months (N=7), 86% success; and among those who stayed seven months and longer (N=3), there has been a 67% success rate. After a residence period of five months, the success rate begins to decline slightly; but it does not approach the low point associated with shorter stays of three months and less. It is felt that this curvilinear tendency may be explained by two basic factors: (1) Boys generally do not respond to treatment at the same pace (or at least, we have no reason for believing that all boys progress at the same speed; and (2) it seems that, after investing three or more months' efforts in any boy, staff are understandably reluctant to negate these efforts by returning the boy to the court (had they thought the boy to be untreatable, he would not have stayed in Behm Home for an extended length of time).

Based upon the success rate and social structure of the

program, it seems that boys who are not amenable to this particular treatment tend to self-eliminate themselves from the program. In other words, those who abide by its rules are those who will eventually graduate, while those who do not abide by the rules (by running away or other non-cooperative behavior) cannot succeed in this program. This may, on the surface, sound like a simple truism--i.e., if the program works for boys who are cooperative, and does not work for those who are uncooperative, then what distinguishes it from any other juvenile treatment model? The answer to this question lies in the unique role of the peer group in Behm Home. As mentioned previously, boys who do not at first have motivation to succeed in the program usually acquire this through pressure from resident peers. All other components of the treatment--the counseling, points system, and emphasis upon the family group (which is usually of secondary importance until the trial leave stage)--depend upon the peer group as the primary motivating force.

A further point needing attention has to do with the effects of selection of boys upon the program' success rate. That is, how can we be certain that the high success rate is not a result of a very subtle process of selecting only those boys who would seem likely candidates for the program? I do not believe this is occurring, for this basic reason: As earlier concluded, there is no empirical evidence to support the notion that a boy's attitude on arrival at Behm Home has bearing upon his chances of success

or failure in the program. Thus, it would be difficult (if not impossible) to predict the likely outcome of treatment from the boy's pre-admission attitude and/or demeanor, thus making such a selection process impossible (even if this is the intent of the individual doing the selecting). The only possible exceptions might be cases in which boys express an initial desire to change themselves with the help of this particular program. However, there is no evidence to support the position that Behm Home's success rate is a mere artifact of selection of likely successes--for even if only the promising boys are chosen, predictability of outcome on this basis would be quite low.

Methodology

The use of both qualitative and quantitative data is essential in an undertaking of this nature. Although the use of two approaches becomes quite involved and can result in two contradictory sets of findings, it is beneficial in other ways.

In this particular study, the qualitative approach contributed many insights that, by their very nature, could not have appeared in other sources. For example, there was no way of numerically measuring the staff decision-making process, the social structure of the Home and the functions of various parts of the treatment program, the role of parents in the rehabilitation of their sons, changes in the boys' appearance, demeanor, and even facial expressions over time,

or the dedication and expertise consistently exhibited by staff members. Without such knowledge, we could not explain the curvilinear relationship found between length of residence and treatment outcome, the group cohesion existing among residents, or the essential qualities of interaction observed during group sessions and informal discussions. Furthermore, the strict quantitative approach cannot take into account the different meanings attached to common social situations by the participants (for example, boys sharing the same type of family structure attached different meanings to it). If we recall the cases of Keith and Steve, who were both from households in which only the mother was present, this becomes quite obvious: Keith, who was visibly upset by his father's absence, defined the situation of his family structure in a quite different way from Steve, who was apparently not deeply disturbed by the absence of his father. Furthermore, qualitative analysis contributed the knowledge that, even though the boys came from the same home structure, the relationships they had with their mothers were radically different. In essence, the quantitative approach can reliably measure the form or structure of many social situations--but often we take this one step further, and erroneously assume that because the structure is the same, the specific content (or meaning) is also the same. It is the task of qualitative methods to supply the content of social structures, as experienced by the social actors themselves; by employing such methods we can increase the

validity of our research.

Of course, had the research adhered exclusively to qualitative methods, other difficulties would have arisen. In many cases, a purely qualitative approach would, if used here, have required the consideration of seventy-three different situations--one for each of the boys in the sample. For example, in examining the court records of the boys, it was virtually impossible to include all relevant information. I would feel perfectly confident in stating that no two of the seventy-three boys had exactly the same offense background--a few of the offense records included the following: False bomb threat to the school; twenty-one convictions of unauthorized use of a motor vehicle; burglary of automobiles, churches, private homes, and/or businesses; possession of pornography and a firearm at school; breaking and entering; vandalism; possession or distribution of several types of "controlled dangerous substances;" armed robbery of an ice cream truck; and numerous other entries in the court records. If we become <u>too</u> qualitative in the approach here, we lose all relevant information that could yield insight into types of offenders or offense patterns; thus, we obtain knowledge about the content of the behavior and its origins, but only at the expense of valuable information regarding its structure or emergent patterns. Again, in a project such as this, we must deal with the question of generalizability. We can confidently say very little about <u>all</u> Behm Home boys if our knowledge is based upon only twelve boys' case

histories--even if this knowledge is perfectly accurate. In this instance, we elected to rely upon the quantitative approach for complementary sources of data.

Other than missing values, the only methodological problems encountered in collecting data are those disadvantages touched upon above--the quantitative data tended to become reductionistic at points, while the qualitative data simply refused to be categorized.

Unfortunately, it is rather customary for sociologists to discuss quantitative and qualitative research methods as though their use constitutes an "either-or" decision that must be made. Hopefully, this research can illustrate the essential complementarity of these approaches and the advantages offered by their synthesis and integration. Had the present design utilized only one of these, only tenuous statements could be made about its findings. One of the strongest associations found is that between length of time in residence and treatment outcome. Had such a finding been based only upon twelve cases, we could not know whether it would obtain for the entire sample--but for this limited number of boys, we could explain why such a relationship exists. Had the finding been based exclusively upon the quantitative analysis we could accept it as statistically significant but unable to explain why it occurs. It is evident how these approaches validate and support one another in this instance, as well as in others encountered during the course of research and interpretation.

Limitations of the Study

The most fundamental problems encountered in this research were incomplete data and the lack of standardized data sources. The data presented in this paper are felt to be reasonably valid; however, because of these problems it was impossible to assess and analyze the relevance of several additional variables.

A second limitation concerns the generalizability of findings presented here. These are based upon one treatment program; while the program itself could provide a useful model for other juvenile institutions, similar findings should not be expected to result from analyses of other types of treatment. For example, it is doubtful that length of residence in a state juvenile institution would associate with success rates. Similarly, these findings cannot be generalized to describe female delinquents (even those treated in Behm Home); although similar results could obtain, we have no basis for assuming that this would be the case. In sum, these findings apply only to male delinquents who were treated by Behm Home, and can be said to apply to or be representative of no other group.

A third limitation, not peculiar to this study, addresses itself to the uses and misuses of psychological data in delinquency research in general. As a result of clinical diagnosis, delinquent boys are typically classified as having "low self-concepts," "impulsive tendencies," and/or

"feelings of inadequacy." Other frequently-mentioned labels include "poor interpersonal relationships," "need for social approval and/or acceptance," "poor reasoning and judgment," "poor social awareness," "immature," and "passive," "aggressive," or "passive-aggressive." The underlying assumption in each case seems to be that these labels are indicative of some psychological or psycho-social pathology that is at the root of delinquent behavior. However, how many of these traits can actually differentiate between delinquents and nondelinquents in any type of systematic, meaningful fashion? The inner and social turmoil associated with adolescense in our society is well-known. But however implicitly, the delinquent is psychologically diagnosed and evaluated on the basis of comparison with the "ideal type" adolescent, who is presumably quite self-confident, usually in full control of emotions and impulses, satisfied in interpersonal relationships, not particularly needful of social acceptance, aware of how to behave properly in most social situations, who exhibits adult-level maturity, reasoning, and judgment, and who is neither overly passive nor overly aggressive (and who exists only in the mind of the clinician).[2]

In the final analysis, the only factors that can adequately account for distinguishing nondelinquents from delinquents are not these psychiatric definitions, but

---

[2]For a lengthier and more detailed treatment of these and other relevant issues, the reader is referred to Thomas S. Szasz, Ideology and Insanity: Essays on the Psychiatric Dehumanization of Man.

rather, factors operating in the mind of the defining individual, based upon the latter's knowledge of previous behavior and subsequent labeling of the youth as a "delinquent" or "nondelinquent."

In retrospect, it is easy to search for and find any number of presumably pathological psychosocial characteristics to which delinquent behavior can conveniently be traced and upon which it can subsequently be blamed. The problem arises when one becomes aware that other youth, possessing virtually identical characteristics, do not exhibit the same disliked behavior.

Because of this writer's doubts concerning the legitimacy of psychiatric evaluations in explaining delinquent behavior, such data were not included in either phase of analysis. In a similar vein, there is now little doubt that IQ scores are poor indicators of intelligence (President's Task Force Report on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, pp. 233-258). Furthermore, there is no reason to suppose that they are related to delinquent behavior. However, they are relatively reliable and stable measures; and the possibility of their covariance with other factors investigated here should not be dismissed on a priori assumptions. Therefore, I opted to retain these in the data analysis.

Theoretical Conclusions

Among the variables studied in this paper, the following can meaningfully be expressed in terms of containment theory: Family structure, parent-son relationships, and misbehavior at Behm Home. The theoretical importance of findings based upon each of these is discussed below.

According to containment theory, a home with both natural parents provides the greatest amount of external containment, while other types of two-parent homes supply moderate containment; single-parent homes provide the least containing power. Using treatment success as an indicator of containment, we find that no such relationships hold.[3] In order to theoretically account for the relationship of family structure to treatment outcome, we would need to compare the recidivism rates of program graduates from each of the three types of family structure. Essentially, all that can be done here is to compare the success rates of boys (nongraduates as well as graduates) coming from different family structures; and this approach is insufficient, largely because it attempts to assess the containing functions of the family at a point in time before the family becomes

---

[3]The containment approach is guilty of one bias not uncommon in other writings on delinquency: The assumption that two-parent homes are, because there are two parents present, more containing than single-parent homes. The results of this study provide evidence that such is not necessarily the case (in fact, for this particular group of boys, single-parent homes were found to be slightly more containing).

relevant as a containing agent. And, the family does not begin its function as the primary containing agent until the boy has graduated from the program; hence, early failures in the program cannot as a generalization be attributed to lack of family-provided containment. Because the vast majority of program failures were nongraduates, and their families therefore did not have the opportunity to act as a prime containing agency, no statements supportive or nonsupportive of containment theory can confidently be made here.

Many points discussed above also pertain to theoretical evaluations of the role of parent-son relationships in delinquency rehabilitation. The primary function of family group therapy is to establish positive parent-son relationships, which act as containing agents when the boy returns home. Based upon my observations on the effects of positive parent-son relationships upon success, containment theory is supported in this regard.

Theoretically, misbehavior in residence is viewed as a result of insufficient containment, occurring when a boy has not completely internalized the attitudes and behaviors expected of him at Behm Home; in theoretical terms, we would expect insufficient inner controls to be manifested in unsuccessful treatment. In this case, the data clearly support containment theory, although not all types of misbehavior are equally indicative of lacking inner containment.

In essence, the major problem encountered in the use of this theoretical perspective is its inability to include and

account for many variables investigated, such as socioeconomic status, age of boy at onset of domestic conflict, full-scale IQ score, offense behavior, and boy's age at first encounter with legal officials. It would be meaningless to attempt to define or analyze these in terms of differential containment.

However, findings based upon data that are capable of analysis in these terms do support the containment approach; for this reason (and for the reasons why it was initially chosen), I would hesitate to reject it altogether. An integration of containment with other approaches (not necessarily drawn from theories dealing specifically with deviance) would provide a more comprehensive theoretical framework for analyses of this type. Incorporation of principles of social exchange would provide an improved approach.

Many theories of criminality express themselves in value-laden terms regarding the roles played by parents in the genesis of delinquency; delinquency, like so many other "social ills," is blamed upon the family. Several writers, notably Clark Vincent, have described the valuable "scapegoating function" performed by the family for the larger society; the family, as a social institution on an aggregate level, is relatively powerless, and thus susceptible to taking the blame for many types of social pathology. However, tracing youthful deviance to various types of interactions which may occur within the family (or the peer group, or virtually any other small group of "significant

others") is a totally different matter than attributing it to specific family situations or structures per se. The inclusion and integration of relevant social-psychological approaches, such as the social exchange perspective (as suggested earlier) would be theoretically beneficial (for example, in explaining various aspects of delinquency in terms of perceived costs and rewards resulting from delinquency, investments, and alternative modes of behavior). Also, socioeconomic and related subcultural factors, and their differential effects upon youth of vaious groups, must be taken into account; in this area we could draw from the works of various authors such as Albert Cohen.

In conclusion, the fundamental principles of containment theory appear to be sound, but are characterized by three major weaknesses: (1) A lack of specific, interrelated postulates derived from its major principles and upon which specific predictions may be made; (2) failure to adequately account for several significant variables, such as the quality and content of interactions leading to delinquent behavior, perceived losses and gains as a result of engaging in delinquent behavior, and socioeconomic and subcultural variables; and (3) the difficulty entailed in defining exactly what is meant by "containment" (and the equally difficult task of operationalizing this concept). Of course, some of these problems are not inherent in the concept of containment itself, and would have been soluble had more detailed information been available (for example, had we

known more about boys' friendship patterns and their importance relative to other persons influential in the boys' lives, expressing these in terms of containment could have been meaningful).

Possible Contributions of the Research

This paper has attempted to contribute to existing knowledge on juvenile delinquency, although its generalizability is limited only to those boys actually included in the sample. Its methodological and theoretical contributions have been discussed.

The major contribution of this research to the body of knowledge on delinquency lies in its description of the Behm Home model and its effects upon youth. While its findings do not apply to any group other than that studied, this study touches upon some issues with implications for delinquents and delinquency research in general. For example, it seems that we need to reexamine the role of psychiatric evaluations in the definition, classification, and treatment of delinquents; otherwise, we may find ourselves dealing with value-laden and reductionistic labels instead of with individuals. Until we can discover whatever psychological characteristics, if any, genuinely distinguish delinquents from nondelinquents, we might be skeptical of psychological labels.

A further potential contribution of this study lies in its practical value; hopefully, the findings and/or conclusions of this study will be of use to Behm Home staff members

in selection, treatment, disposition, or other aspects of their program. For example, the strongest relationship found here is that between boys' length of time in residence and their success rates. Basically, this relationship is curvilinear. That is, four to five months' residence is apparently the optimum time of success; as residence period departs from four to five months (in either direction), chances of success decline, although longer stays still remain associated with success. One exception to this generality is that boys from single-parent homes seem to require less time for equally-successful rehabilitation. This finding may serve as a guideline in situations where relevant decisions must be made (of course, this does not imply that any rigid residency requirements be made on this basis). In a similar vein, staff members may wish to utilize the information on the quantity and quality of boys' misbehavior while in residence, or the findings relative to the statistical relationship between age and success. It is hoped that other information included in this report will be of use to Behm Home. However, a word of caution is issued to the reader: Although it has been shown that some factors are more predictive of success in the program than are others, in no case does perfect prediction obtain; as such, none of the factors treated here should be utilized as rigid criteria for selection or disposition of boys.

One final potential contribution of this research is its analysis of interactive dynamics characteristic of Behm

Home and its treatment. For example, while in many aspects it is unfortunate that some boys fail in the program, we must keep in mind that some failures seem to be essential for the success of the program as a whole. Fear of failure, although perhaps exaggerated and unrealistic in some cases, enhances group solidarity and provides motivation for boys to stay in the program. Again, while the role of the family is highly emphasized in treatment, family participation may sometimes be overemphasized to the point where boys become convinced that if their family does not cooperate, this means failure for them in the program. Based upon analysis of Home interaction, it is concluded that the program works because it has managed to integrate resident goals with institutional goals--an accomplishment that is achieved through the points system (which provides boys with status, acceptance, and positive reinforcement), group therapy (which provides emotional support and expression of feelings), and most importantly, the peer group--an accomplishment that few juvenile correctional centers have been able to realize.

Suggestions for Future Research

This is essentially a sound research design. However, subsequent studies on Behm Home could be improved by implementation of the following suggestions.

As previously mentioned, the chief limitation of this project is the problem of incomplete data; in the future

this could be alleviated by the use of a form sheet, allowing for the recording of standardized, systematic, and relevant information for each boy. If possible, such a form should be included in the case files of all residents (even those who remain for only a short time; these are essential for adequate comparisons). Ideally, this form would include such information as: (1) Social, educational, occupational, family, and religious history; (2) delinquent background, including not only court records of known delinquencies, but data on officially unreported delinquencies as well (the latter may well be a better index of "criminality" than the former); (3) family interactive patterns and degree of family cooperation in the program (these often appear in the files, but more often than not, can be extracted only by "reading between the lines"--this is a tedious task, but more importantly, is <u>not</u> a procedure that lends itself to the gathering of data that are reliable or that form a valid basis for comparison of cases); also, some parental impressions and opinions of Behm Home and its impact would provide a useful addition to this information; (4) boys' participation and cooperation in the program, including number of points earned each week, misbehavior while in Behm Home, and related concerns; and (5) aftercare data, including agency disposition, subsequent patterns of interaction with others (at home, school, work, etc.), post-release performance, and general adjustment level.

The writer recognizes that certain administrative and

institutional concerns are involved in the compilation of staff reports and other records. Thus, if failure to report a minor violation to legal officials would keep a "likely candidate" in the program, then it is understandable if staff members do not feel obligated to report such incidents, but opt to give the boy the "benefit of the doubt." To what extent this occurs, if at all, is unknown to this researcher; suffice it to say that the potential for such institutional concerns is there. In any event, it is my opinion that complete, accurate, and systematic files should be maintained if any future analysis is desired, even if this necessitates the maintenance of two separate sets of case files.

Since so much discussion to this point has centered upon the importance of the quality of interpersonal relations, it is felt that satisfaction in interactions with others is a key factor in this program. Therefore, this might be incorporated into subsequent studies of this treatment program. The index of quality of interpersonal relationships might be most simply defined as whether a boy regards interactions with others as satisfactory. Also, boys could report which interpersonal relationships are, relatively, more meaningful to him than others (e.g., whether he values his relationships with parents more than those with friends). The construction of some type of scaled instrument would be useful here. Also, self-reports by the boys, their parents, and staff could be utilized to create an empirical index of the degree of satisfaction (or dis-

satisfaction) derived by each from their interactions and general relationship. Self-reports of resident boys would also shed light upon interactive, control, and rehabilitative processes operating in the Home. These self-reports should remain as unstructured as possible; and, as a final suggestion for future methodology, observational and other qualitative techniques should remain a fundamental part of the research design.

Inasmuch as is possible, the Behm Home boys should be compared (with regard to age, race, socioeconomic status, and offense backgrounds) with a random sample of delinquent males arrested in the surrounding metropolitan area to determine their representativeness of this population.

On the basis of the preceding discussion and suggested modifications of the basic research design, it is felt that the following hypotheses deserve further attention:

(1) Boys are expected to conform to the norms of group for which they hold the most importance and with whom their interactions are most satisfactory.

(2) Boys whose interpersonal relationships are characterized by satisfactory interactions are expected to participate mainly in property offenses, while those with unsatisfactory interactions are expected to involve themselves in drug use and drug offenses.

(3) Residents whose interpersonal relationships with other Home residents are satisfactory are expected to comprise the majority of graduates, while those with unsatisfactory relationships are expected to comprise the majority of unsuccessful cases.

(4) Program graduates whose interpersonal relationships with parents and other significant non-delinquent individuals are satisfactory will

recidivate less frequently than will those with unsatisfactory relationships with nondelinquent persons (or with satisfactory relationships with persons who engage in delinquent activities).

(5) Should interactions with others be rated as unsatisfactory or neutral, the chances of delinquency are expected to decrease as boys perceive this behavior as costly to them, and increase as delinquent behavior is defined as rewarding (or not costly).

(6) For boys with satisfactory interactions with delinquent friends, the chances of delinquency are expected to decrease as boys perceive this behavior as costly to them, and increase as delinquent behavior is defined as rewarding (or not costly).

(7) Boys who exhibit stealing and threat-making behavior in residence are expected to be less successful than are those who do not misbehave at all or whose misbehavior consists of one-time runaway, drug/alcohol use, or minor fights.

(8) With regard to offense types and recidivism, it is expected that the highest recidivism rates will be displayed by drug offenders, intermediate rates by property offenders, and the lowest recidivism rates by mixed property-and-drug offenders.

(9) Original findings reported in this study on treatment and success in the Behm Home program are expected to be confirmed.

Essentially, the above hypotheses attempt to redefine and operationalize outer containment in terms of the satisfaction derived from interpersonal relationships, and inner containment in terms of perceived likely outcomes (i.e., costs and rewards) of present behavior patterns as compared with alternative modes of behavior.

It is my wish that these suggestions will be useful in whatever further studies will be made of Behm Home.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, Robert F., Harry N. Dubin, Saul Pilnick and Adella C. Youtz
1970 Collegefields: From Delinquency to Freedom. Seattle: Special Child Publications, Inc.

Becker, Howard S.
1969 "Becoming A Marihuana User." Pp. 488-499 in D. Cressey and D. Ward (eds.).

Berne, Eric
1964 Games People Play. New York: Grove Press, Inc.

1966 Principles of Group Treatment. Oxford University Press.

Cavan, Ruth Shonle
1962 Juvenile Delinquency. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company.

Cavan, Ruth Shonle (ed.)
1964 Readings in Juvenile Delinquency. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company.

Cloward, Richard A. and Lloyd E. Ohlin
1969 "The Evolution of Delinquent Subcultures." Pp. 654-668 in D. Cressey and D. Ward (eds.).

Cohen, Albert
1966 "The Delinquency Subculture." Pp. 103-118 in R. Giallombardo (ed.).

1969 "A General Theory of Subcultures." Pp. 640-653 in D. Cressey and D. Ward (eds.).

Cressey, Donald R. and David A. Ward (eds.)
1969 Delinquency, Crime, and Social Process. Evanston: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Diana, Lewis
1966 "What Is Probation?" Pp. 399-418 in R. Giallombardo (ed.).

Empey, LaMar T. and Jerome Rabow
1966 "The Provo Experiment in Delinquency Rehabilitation." Pp. 531-550 in R. Giallombardo (ed.).

Empey, LaMar T. and Steven G. Lubeck
1971 The Silverlake Experiment: Testing Delinquency Theory and Community Intervention. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

Fagan, J. and I. L. Shapard
1970 Gestalt Therapy Now. Palo Alto: Science and Behavior Books.

Farrell, Warren
1975 The Liberated Man. New York: Bantam Books.

Federal Bureau of Investigation
1968 Uniform Crime Reports for the United States: 1968. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Giallombardo Rose (ed.)
1966 Juvenile Delinquency: A Book of Readings. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Glasser, William
1969 Reality Therapy: A New Approach to Psychiatry. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Glueck, Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck
1962 Family Environment and Delinquency. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Gold, H. and F. R. Scarpitti (eds.)
1967 Combatting Social Problems: Techniques of Intervention. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Hartung, Frank E.
1969 "A Vocabulary of Motives for Law Violations." Pp. 454-473 in D. Cressey and D. Ward (eds.).

Haskell, Martin R.
1964 "Toward a Reference Group Theory of Juvenile Delinquency." Pp. 123-138 in R. Cavan (ed.).

Haskell, Martin R. and Lewis Yablonsky
1970 Crime and Delinquency. Chicago: Rand-McNally College Publishing Company.

Hyman, Herbert
1955 Survey Design and Analysis. New York: The Free Press.

Hirschi, Travis and Hanan C. Selvin
1967 Delinquency Research: An Appraisal of Analytic Methods. New York: The Free Press.

Hirschi, Travis
1969 Causes of Delinquency. Los Angeles: The University of California Press.

Greenwald, Jerry
1975 Be the Person You Were Meant to Be. New York: Dell Publishing Company, Inc.

James, Muriel and Dorothy Jongeward
1971 Born to Win: Transactional Analysis with Gestalt Experiences. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.

Lofland, John
1971 Analyzing Social Settings. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc.

Leuthard, Joy L.
Unpublished "Transactional Analysis and Reality Therapy in Corrections."

Lusk, Steven H.
Unpublished Meaning and Motive: The Social Construction of Delinquent Identity.

McCorkle, Lloyd W.
1952 "Group Therapy in the Treatment of Offenders." Federal Probation 16 (December): 22-26.

McCorkle, Lloyd W., Albert Elias, and F. Lovell Bixby
1958 The Highfields Story: An Experimental Treatment Project for Youthful Offenders. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Merton, Robert K.
1969 "Social Structure and Anomie." Pp. 254-284 in D. Cressey and D. Ward (eds.).

Miller, Walter B.
1966 "Lower Class Culture as a Generating Milieu of Gang Delinquency." Pp. 137-150 in R. Giallombardo (ed.).

Nye, F. Ivan
1958 Family Relationships and Delinquent Behavior. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Pilnick, Saul
1971 "Guided Group Interaction." Pp. 181-182 in The Encyclopedia of Social Work I. New York: National Association of Social Workers.

Polsky, Howard
1962 Cottage Six. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice
1967 The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Reckless, Walter C. and Simon Dinitz
1972 The Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency: An Experiment. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.

Reckless, Walter C.
1973 The Crime Problem, 5th Ed. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Rosenberg, Morris
1968 The Logic of Survey Analysis. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers.

Sandhu, Harjit S.
1974 Modern Corrections: The Offenders, Therapies and Community Reintegration. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher.

Steiner, Claude
1974 Scripts People Live: Transactional Analysis of Life Scripts. New York: Grove Press, Inc.

Sutherland, Edwin H.
1966 "Theory of Differential Association." Pp. 81-84 in R. Giallombardo (ed.).

Sutherland, Edwin H. and Donald R. Cressey
1969 "Sociological Theory of Criminal Behavior." Pp. 426-432 in D. Cressey and D. Ward (eds.).

Sykes, Gresham M. and David Matza
1972 "Techniques of Neutralization: A Theory of Delinquency." Pp. 129-136 in R. Giallombardo (ed.)

Szasz, Thomas S.
1969 Ideology and Insanity: Essays on the Psychiatric Dehumanization of Man. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday & Company, Inc.

Task Force on Juvenile Delinquency, President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice
1967 Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Vincent, Clark E.
1972 "Family Spongia: The Adaptive Function." Pp. 138-149 in Jack R. DeLora and Joann S. DeLora (eds.), Intimate Life Styles: Marriage and Its Alternatives. Pacific Palisades, California: Goodyear Publishing Company, Inc.

Weeks, H. Ashley
1968 "The Highfields Project." Pp. 517-530 in R. Giallombardo (ed.).

APPENDIX

CODE SHEET--CARD 1

IBM Column	Content
1-3	Identification Number
4	Blank
5	Race 1 white 2 black 3 Indian American 4 other
6-9	Present age (in years and months)
10	Socioeconomic class 1 upper 2 middle 3 working 4 lower
11	Family structure (at time of act leading to placement in Behm Home) 1 both natural parents present 2 mother only 3 father only 4 mother and stepfather 5 father and stepmother 6 adoptive parents
12	Boy's relationship with mother/mother surrogate (at time of delinquent act leading to placement in Behm Home) 1 clear evidence of conflict 2 evidence of parental rejection 3 apathy, disinterest, negativism 4 parent over-protects, domineers boy 5 warmth, affection, protection 6 constant nagging and blame 7 other (no mother/mother surrogate, etc.)
13	Boy's relationship with father/father surrogate (at time of delinquent act leading to placement in Behm Home) (same categories as above)

Card 1--page 2

IBM Column	Content
14-17	Age of boy (in years and months) when trouble, if any, started at home
18	Principal disciplinarian in home (at time of delinquent act leading to placement in Behm Home) 1 father/father surrogate 2 mother/mother surrogate 3 both parents equally
19	Mode of enforcement of discipline (at time of delinquent act leading to placement in Behm Home) 1 physical brutality 2 physical punishment, mild form 3 excessive verbal abuse 4 mild, constructive critique 5 erratic, inconsistent controls 6 removal of privileges 7 physical and verbal abuse 8 authoritarianism 9 other
20	Number of siblings
21	Sibling placement 1 only child 2 oldest child 3 youngest child 4 indistinct placement
22	Relationship to siblings (at time of act leading to placement in Behm Home) 1 jealousy and intense competition 2 lack of effect 3 friendly cooperation
23	Boy's ability to relate to adults (at time of act leading to placement) 1 distrustful and wary 2 slow acceptance of adults 3 readily interacts with adults 4 other (no apparent problems, etc.)

Card 1--page 3

IBM Column	Content
24-25	Psychological characteristics (observations made by clinical diagnosis and/or personality inventories of boy) 01 polite, eager to please 02 gullible 03 low self-concept; feelings of inadequacy 04 manipulative 05 "loner" 06 guarded 07 feels rejected 08 aggressive 09 defiant 10 revengeful 11 relatively mature and well-adjusted 12 needs approval and acceptance 13 apathetic 14 naive 15 passive, withdrawn 16 submissive 17 sensitive 18 depressed 19 overprotected 20 poor interpersonal relationships 21 impulsive 22 inconsistent 23 lack of identity 24 hostile 25 poor perception; lack of reasoning and judgment 26 dull, lethargic 27 28 29 30
26-28	Full-scale IQ score
29-31	Verbal IQ score
32-34	Performance IQ score
35-36	Highest school grade completed (at time of act leading to placement)
37-38	Grade point average (before admission)
39-40	Grade point average (after admission)
41-44	Boy's age (in years and months) at start of learning difficulties, if any

Card 1--page 4

IBM Column	Content
45	Boy's learning difficulties/disabilities in past school history 1 reading 2 dyslexia 3 inability to interact with teachers or peers 4 other 5 none
46	School discipline record (prior to admission at Behm Home) 1 generally uncooperative or apathetic attitude 2 rejection of teacher control 3 intimidation of teacher, threats 4 truancy (official or unofficial) 5 thefts at school 6 fighting at school 7 all or most of the above 8 none
47	School associations 1 member of trouble-making group 2 social isolate, loner 3 legitimately integrated and involved in school activities 4 history of conflict with school peers 5 other
48	School discipline action, if any 1 single formal warning to boy 2 warning to parent or guardian 3 temporary suspension(s) 4 expulsion threatened 5 expulsion 6 expulsion and reinstatement 7 none
49-52	Age at start of school discipline problems, if any
53	Number of years between leaving school and problem behavior (if boy did leave school) 1 one year or less 2 one to two years 3 intermittent dropping out 4 boy stayed in school

Card 1--page 5

IBM Column	Content
54	Employment history (prior to admission) 1 no employment record 2 part-time work 3 full-time employment 4 unknown
55	Religious participation (prior to admission) 1 none 2 infrequent participation (attends church or church-related activities once or twice a year) 3 intermediate participation 4 frequent participation (attends once each month or more often) 5 rebellion against religious principles 6 religious overconformity 7 unknown
56-59	Age at first contact with police (in a context of delinquent behavior)
60-63	Age at first arrest
64-67	Age at first court appearance
68-71	Age at first serious offense behavior
72-73	Past offense behavior (offenses committed before those leading to placement; offenses and/or convictions in boy's past) 00 no previous offenses/convictions 01 excess tickets 02 forgery 03 expulsion from school 04 truancy 05 beyond control 06 sex misbehavior 07 runaway 10 possession of drugs 11 distribution of drugs 12 paraphernalia 13 glue or paint sniffing 21 armed robbery 22 first- or second-degree burglary 23 grand larceny 24 petty larceny 25 possession, buying, or selling stolen property 26 auto theft 27 breaking and entering

Card 1--page 6

IBM Column	Content
72-73	Past offense behavior (cont'd.) 31 homicide or manslaughter 32 assault 33 threat to life 34 rape 41 auto theft and drug offense(s) 42 burglary and auto theft 43 burglary and drug offense 44 45 46
74-75	Present offense behavior (offenses or offense for which boy was placed in Behm Home) (same categories as above)

Card 2--

IBM Column	Content
1-3	Identification number
4	Blank
5	Sociometric situation at time of offense behavior leading to placement 1 single, individual actor 2 one or more persons involved, but boy only one charged 3 others involved and also charged 4 gang behavior 5 unknown
6	Nature of previous interventions (any treatment boy received before coming to Behm Home) 1 none 2 informal participation in public or private youth services 3 juvenile probation
7	Attitude of boy's family upon his arrival at Behm Home 1 cooperative 2 resentful but acceptant 3 belligerent, uncooperative

Card 2--page 7

IBM Column	Content
8	Family participation during boy's stay at Behm Home 1 full, active cooperation 2 resentful participation 3 irregular attendance throughout stay 4 initial cooperation, then dropped out 5 initial resent, then cooperation
9	School participation/training program during stay at Behm Home 1 no school or training participation 2 normal school participation 3 training in skills center 4 school participation and skills center 5 special education
10	Initial attitude toward school or training (boy's attitude on arrival at Behm) 1 strong acceptance and effort 2 mild acceptance 3 mild dissatisfaction 4 resentment and noncooperation 5 other
11	Discipline problems at school (after admission) 1 none 2 warnings received 3 disciplinary measures applied 4 expulsion 5 other
12	Nature of discipline problems at school, if any (after admission) 1 academic nonperformance 2 truancy 3 fighting or bullying peers 4 theft at school 5 beyond control 6 other 7 none
13	Attitude on arrival at Behm Home 1 cooperative 2 resentful acceptance 3 belligerent, uncooperative 4 other
14-15	Length of time at agency (in months and weeks)

Card 2--page 8

IBM Column	Content
16	Boy's attitude progress after one month in Behm Home 1 shows great improvement 2 shows slight improvement 3 no change 4 has regressed
17	Boy's activity involvement after one month at Behm Home 1 actively involved in assignments 2 resentful, but participates 3 refuses to perform
18	Boy's social-emotional involvement with other home charges after one month in Behm Home 1 provides positive leadership 2 cooperative and supportive of others 3 apathetic, little interaction 4 anti-staff organization with the others 5 belligerent, hostile
19	Boy's attitude progress after two months
20	Activity involvement after two months
21	Social-emotional involvement after two months
22	Attitude progress after three months
23	Activity involvement after three months
24	Social-emotional involvement after three months
25	Attitude progress after four months
26	Activity involvement after four months
27	Social-emotional involvement after four months
28	Attitude progress after five months
29	Activity involvement after five months
30	Social-emotional involvement after five months
31	Attitude progress for period immediately preceding release
32	Activity involvement for period immediately preceding release

Card 2--page 9

IBM Column	Content
33	Social-emotional involvement for period immediately preceding release
34	Parents' attitude progress after one month
35	Parents'activity involvement after one month
36	Parents' social-emotional involvement (with their son, other parents, and other boys) after one month
37	Attitude progress after two months
38	Activity involvement after two months
39	Social-emotional involvement after two months
40	Attitude progress after three months
41	Activity involvement after three months
42	Social-emotional involvement after three months
43	Attitude progress after four months
44	Activity involvement after four months
45	Social-emotional involvement after four months
46	Attitude progress after five months
47	Activity involvement after five months
48	Social-emotional involvement after five months
49	Parents' attitude progress for period immediately preceding boy's release
50	Parents' activity involvement for period immediately preceding boy's release
51	Parents' social-emotional involvement for period immediately preceding boy's release
52	Boy's misbehavior while at Behm Home 1 boy ran away, returned voluntarily 2 boy ran away twice 3 skipped school 4 criminal behavior while in home 5 none

Card 2--page 10

IBM Column	Content
53	Agency disposition 1 return home on trial leave 2 open supervision (probation) 3 placement in military service 4 court asked to order return home 5 placement in another institution 6 placement in foster home
54	Post-release performance 1 cessation of delinquent behavior 2 record or knowledge of minor delinquencies not leading to formal charges 3 rearrested, not processed 4 rearrested, new court appearance 5 new conviction, not leading to institutionalization 6 new conviction leading to incarceration
55-56	Further deviant behavior 1 known drug use or drug handling 2 alcohol use to excess 3 new sex misbehavior 4 auto theft 5 indications of incorrigibility at home, but no major problems 6 runaway 7 truancy 8 known gang involvement 9 other 10 none
57	Adjustment and social reintegration 1 adjustment in civilian labor force 2 adjustment to structured environment in the military 3 adjustment to school or skills center 4 problem behavior at place of work 5 military discipline problem 6 school problem 7 unemployed, out of school, drifting 8 family disturbances
58-59	New offense charged, if any (offense categories used previously)
60-61	Length of time since leaving Behm Home, in months and weeks

VITA

Nancy Jane Presnall

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: BEHM HOME, INCORPORATED: A QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF COMMUNITY TREATMENT FOR DELINQUENT BOYS

Major Field: Sociology

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Cherokee, Oklahoma on April 23, 1949, the daughter of Max Lester Presnall and Audrey Fern Behm Presnall.

Education: Graduated from Enid High School, Enid, Oklahoma in May, 1967; received Bachelor of Arts Degree in Sociology from Phillips University, Enid, Oklahoma in May, 1973; completed requirements for the Master of Science Degree at Oklahoma State University in July, 1976.

Professional Experience: Graduate Teaching Assistant, Department of Sociology, Oklahoma State University, from fall 1974 through spring 1976; Graduate Research Assistant, Department of Sociology, Oklahoma State University, spring 1976; Survey Interviewer for Oklahoma Educational Television Authority, summer 1975.

Professional Organizations: Alpha Kappa Delta (The National Sociological Honor Society); Southwest Sociological Association.