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INTRODUCTION

In all societies, provisions are made to care for people whose conditions or behaviors deviate from accepted norms. Such deviant behaviors include: emotional disorders; intellectual impairment; physical anomalies; social maladjustment; or combination of these conditions.

In the United States, public and private custodial facilities are established for people who exhibit deviant behaviors. Each facility is unique in terms of population characteristics, size, location, staff composition, and philosophy. Based upon the specific philosophy embraced, some custodial facilities define themselves as treatment institutions.

A treatment institution is a complex cluster of overlapping systems and subsystems. To effect change in any treatment system, it is useful to have a perspective which provides not only an overview of the parts as they relate to each other and as each part relates to the whole, but also an understanding of the constantly changing elements which impact the parts. Examples of these elements are: client population composition; staff composition; staff attitudes and perceptions; organizational policies and
procedures; institutional philosophy; physical facilities; leadership styles; external resources; and the combination of these and other elements which create the institutional milieu or atmosphere.

One institutional problem is the incorporation of these elements into a functional operation through which a treatment philosophy may be realistically applied. The effectiveness of a treatment institution may be measured by the degree to which the treatment philosophy is implemented, and the subsequent degree to which the clients are impacted. Problems may arise when any of the elements in the system interfere with the implementation of the treatment philosophy.

This study focused on one treatment institution, Buckeye Boys Ranch, Inc., which went through a period of major transition and expansion. The primary thrust over a two-year period was to maintain a strong treatment orientation while changing the overall organizational structure and incorporating new staff and client population simultaneously. The study sought to answer the question, "does prescriptive staff development have a significant measurable impact on staff attitudes and perceptions as measured by paper and pencil tests?"
CHAPTER I

PROBLEM

Problem Background

In 1950, the Boy Choir of Columbus, Ohio was moved to Princeton, New Jersey, leaving the Women's Board of the choir without a project. Reluctant to disband, the women turned their energies to an exhaustive study of the unfilled needs in the Franklin County area. They found there was no local facility for the rehabilitation or treatment of delinquent, emotionally disturbed adolescent boys.

The Women's Board of the Boy Choir of Columbus, Ohio, reorganized into The Women's Juvenile Service Board,¹ and as funds were available, provided money through welfare agencies to send boys from Franklin County to special schools in other states and communities. Since the greatest need was for a treatment rehabilitation center, in 1955 the Women's Board embarked upon a long-range program to establish such a facility.

The Women's Board found and purchased an 80-acre tract of farmland near Grove City, Ohio, about ten miles from downtown Columbus. This tract was named Buckeye Boys Ranch, Inc. The first building was completed in 1961. From its
opening in September, 1961 to the present, the Ranch has steadily grown in four major areas: community resources; physical facilities; number of staff; and client population.

In its early years, the Ranch operated on a house-parent-centered family model. Roles of staff were fairly well defined, having been clarified through twelve years of experience, and the program implementation was generally routine. All full-time staff attended a weekly staff meeting, and immediate inputs and feedback were available to everyone.

In mid-1973 the Ranch was expanded. Even before ground was broken in 1972 for a new building, long-range planning was in process. The client population was projected to double from 26 boys to 50 boys on the main campus, and the number of staff was projected accordingly. The findings of an internal study conducted by the Ranch indicated that some aspects of the existing treatment model were actually detrimental to adolescents predisposed to dependency. A thorough external evaluation of the Ranch, conducted in early 1973 pointed toward the need for substantial change.

As the new building took shape, staff anxiety surfaced. They correctly perceived that the physical change in the Ranch would significantly alter staff roles, and some chose to resign as the opening date neared. Also,
three major concerns were identified:

1. Thirteen of the twenty-six boys already in residence were projected for discharge during June and July of 1973, having successfully completed their respective programs. In addition, the twenty-four beds in the new building had to be filled within four weeks after opening. Consequently, three-fourths of the anticipated doubled client population would be new.

2. During the same four-week period, twelve new child-care staff had to be screened and hired to replace those who had resigned and to accommodate the doubled population. These new employees were to be designated as Youth Leaders, with more diversified roles and considerably expanded responsibilities. The Youth Leader positions provided substantially different services compared with the existing houseparent roles.

3. The six houseparents had to be either reassigned to new positions within the Ranch system or retrained for the role change as Youth Leaders. The newly hired Youth Leaders had to be trained in the specific technical and theoretical aspects of their roles, while also learning from experience with no fully trained staff available as role models. The training was further complicated by the need for Youth Leaders to provide
firm, fair and consistent external controls for the client population, while also exercising considerable restraint from using physical abuse to maintain these controls. This was crucial with new and unseasoned staff, who had to learn to cope with their own feelings under stress before they could effectively begin to cope with the feelings and behaviors of the client population.

Problem Statement

This study concentrated on the Buckeye Boys Ranch system and staff roles over the two-year period from September, 1972, through September, 1974. During this time, the identified concerns included the extensive expansion and transition of the overall treatment program. This study specifically explored staff development and its relationship to changes in staff attitudes and perceptions during the period of expansion and transition, and proposed the general hypothesis,

"Prescriptive staff development has a significant measurable impact on staff attitudes and perceptions, as measured by paper and pencil tests."

Factors related to this hypothesis were age, sex, education, experience, position, location, tenure, and the staff training process itself.
Researcher's Special Interest in the Study

The researcher, as Assistant Director of Buckeye Boys Ranch during the period of transition and expansion, had the responsibility to see that Ranch philosophy was implemented through Ranch staff to clients. During the two-year period of transition and expansion, the researcher designed and implemented prescriptive staff training as an interventive strategy to meet problems of major change. Experimental and empirical data were collected before, during, and after the staff training sequence, in anticipation of this study. The researcher was interested in the relationship between staff training and subsequent outcomes; to look at cost effectiveness; and the development of subsequent training modes.
NOTES

1 In 1972, The Women's Juvenile Service Board, Inc. officially changed their name to the Buckeye Boys Ranch Service Board, Inc.


3 Joseph Scott, et al., "A Six-Month Study of Buckeye Boys Ranch, Inc.: Recommendations For Change," The Ohio State University Program For the Study of Crime and Delinquency, unpublished report requested by and for the Buckeye Boys Ranch Board of Trustees in 1972. The study was completed in May, 1973.

4 Appendix "A" provides representative case histories of six boys who were enrolled as residents in the program at Buckeye Boys Ranch during the transition period. The boys' names have been changed, but the facts about them are real.

5 Appendix "B" describes in detail the facilities and services provided by Buckeye Boys Ranch as of January, 1975.

6 Appendix "C" defines special terminology in use at Buckeye Boys Ranch at the time the study was completed.

7 Appendix "D" outlines the researcher's qualifications and training related to the design and implementation of staff development and associated learning experiences.
CHAPTER II

THEORY

Introductory Statement

The primary theme of this study is reflected in the general hypothesis, "prescriptive staff development has a significant impact on staff attitudes and perceptions as measured by paper and pencil tests." Two basic concepts were perceived by the researcher as relevant to staff attitudes and perceptions: role theory and adult education. These two basic concepts were seen as related parts within the larger concept of social systems. For the purpose of this study, Buckeye Boys Ranch and Boys Village were defined as social systems.¹

Loomis,² defining social systems in terms of constituent parts of a larger whole (elements) and their dynamic functioning continuity (processes), stated,

An element is a unit of analysis employed in explaining interaction from the point of view of a given discipline. At any moment in time the structure of any given social system may be described and analyzed in terms of these elements.

In his social system model, Loomis identified nine elements and six master processes. The elements were: belief, sentiment; objective; position; norm; rank; power; sanction;

After the Loomis model's list, the researcher's analysis continues...

¹ Loomis, defining social systems in terms of constituent parts of a larger whole (elements) and their dynamic functioning continuity (processes), stated.
² Loomis, defining social systems in terms of constituent parts of a larger whole (elements) and their dynamic functioning continuity (processes), stated.
and facility. The processes were: communication; social control; socialization; boundary maintenance; institutionalization; and systemic linkage. Two of these dimensions of Loomis's social systems model were designated as applicable to this study: the status-role (position), as a unit of analysis; and the socialization process, as a dynamic mode of change. The status-role, or position is explored in the section on concepts of role theory, and the socialization process is discussed in the section on adult education theory.

**Concepts of Role Theory**

**Role Definitions**

Loomis described position, or status-role, as, "that which is expected from an actor in a given situation" and he added,

... the status-role combines element and process. Status (or position) represents the element; and role represents the process. The participation of actors in social systems revolves around two reciprocal expectations inherent in interaction, thus acting a role with reference to other individuals.

Sarbin and Allen defined role as, "a patterned sequence of learned actions or deeds performed by a person in an interaction situation." Parsons and Shils noted,

... the concept of role has been defined as a complementary set of expectations and actions to be performed in accordance with these expectations. It includes as part of the expectations the rights to certain types of reaction which the actor is
entitled to expect from others and the obligation to perform certain types of action which the actor believes others are entitled to expect from him.

These role expectations are the conceptual bridge between the social system and role behavior. Units of social systems, such as statuses, positions or offices, are defined in terms of actions and qualities expected of the person who occupies the position at any given time. Role expectation is the central concept in role theory which integrates the individual with the social system. Role expectations refer to a set of thought processes related to performance and qualities which the occupant of the social position is expected to display. Role expectations affect role enactment in that a person enacting a role faces the task of fulfilling, as well as possible, the expectations of the role. Role expectations define the limits or range of tolerated behaviors which are the specifications for adherence to group norms. Norms reflect imperative values, defined by Kolb\(^7\) as,

\[\ldots\] standards shared by members of a social group to which the members are expected to conform, and conformity to which is enforced by positive and negative sanctions.

Role expectations imply role skills, including aptitude, appropriate experience and knowledge base, and specific training. Role skills refer to those characteristics
possessed by an individual which result in effective, convincing role-enactment.

**Role Enactment**

As a focal point in role theory, the self must be taken into account as a factor in determining the quality of role-enactment. The "self" is a cognitive factor and derives from past experiences with other persons and objects. Sarbin and Allen defined the self as, "the experience of identity arising from a person's interbehaving with things, body parts, and other persons," and they continued,

> ... the interrelation of self and role implies that when self-characteristics are congruent with role requirements, role enactment is more effective, proper and appropriate than when role and self are incongruent. Self/role congruence is the degree of overlap or fittingness that exists between requirements of the role and the qualities of the self. Incongruence between self and role creates a state of tension and cognitive strain, which may lead to less efficient performance.8

Other factors which influence the credibility of role enactment include cognitive skills, motor skills, role-specific skills, and role-playing aptitude. Role enactment is perceived as more convincing, proper and appropriate under conditions of self/role congruence; and less convincing, proper and appropriate under conditions of incongruence.

**Multiple Roles**

Every person occupies many positions in the social
system. Each day a person enacts a large number of roles successively, and at least two or more roles simultaneously. The sheer demands which multiple roles make upon an individual's time, effort and skill are likely to be overwhelming. To satisfy adequately the demands of only one or two of an individual's roles requires most of his time and effort. This results in the individual's neglect of the obligations made by other roles which have equally legitimate demands on his time and energy. As a result of having multiple role demands which exceed available resources, the individual cannot possibly do justice to all the roles. From these demands emerge emotional and intellectual feelings about the difficulty of fulfilling role obligations. These feelings become what Sarbin calls "role-strain," and may become more intense when further complicated by role-conflict, defined as,

... the condition in which the individual is currently in two or more positions requiring contradictory role enactments: Inter-Role Conflict, the simultaneous occupancy of two or more positions having incompatible role expectations; or, Intra-Role Conflict, of contradictory expectations held by two or more groups of relevant others regarding the same role.

Most individuals belong to several groups and are exposed to conflicting norms which they may internalize unevenly. Norms are constantly in a process of change, and tend to vary with such factors as age, sex, education, and position.
Concepts of Adult Education

The Socialization Process

Adult education is viewed as global in its application. Within the context of the social systems framework, adult education may be perceived as part of the socialization process. Citing Levy, Loomis described socialization as, "the process through which social and cultural heritage is transmitted." Newcombe identified the "acquisition of social behaviors" as socialization, and viewed it as, "essentially, a learning process." Sarbin combined concepts of socialization and role, and commented,

... the performances that make up a role are the products of learning experiences. Role learning involves the particular kind of learning that occurs in interactional settings; the complexity of the content of the learning; the pervasiveness of the influence of other persons; and the crucial importance of the role relationship itself.

Organizational efforts toward changing or redefining staff roles generally result in stress for the personnel involved. Staff reactions to stress may take such forms as: identification with the old role despite the pressure to change; internal rejection of and subsequent alienation from the role; conformity to the new role expectations; innovation as an attempt to cope with stress; or quitting.
Learning, for adults, is often a reeducative human relations process, incorporating both intellectual and emotional change. Effective change occurs when the individual develops a deeper self-understanding and acceptance of self, and subsequently tends to be more understanding and accepting of others. The learning experience requires that the teacher (trainer; educator; facilitator) provide an environment in which mutual human growth occurs. The training itself should be an active example of what Argyris called "authentic interpersonal relations," emphasizing self-awareness, self-esteem, self-acceptance, and shared learning.

Reeducation in human relations should focus on basic value changes rather than acquisition, since skills invariably follow values. Argyris also stresses that change programs must emphasize the legitimacy of feelings and increase interpersonal competence. This involves risk taking, openness, trust, concern, experimentation, and ownership of individually manifested behavior by taking personal responsibility for personal actions.

Berquist and Phillips made the basic assumption that significant changes take place at three levels: process (methods; performance; technology); structure (institutional norms; policies; procedures); and attitudes (clearly articulated values; self-perceptions; philosophies). Process is
usually given priority attention, but change may be rejected or disqualified if attitude and structure are ignored.

Baubier emphasized the importance of autonomy, which involves decentralized staffing and requires in-service education in group dynamics and human relations skills. Argyris supports the concept of decentralization, and stated,

... for decentralization to work, open superior/subordinate relationships are required, where trust is high, where conformity, fear, dependence are low, where experimentation and risk-taking are prominent. These qualities cannot be issued, ordered, or even delegated ... they are values at the core of society and our way of life.

Harrison wrote that it is not enough to train individuals. Inducing changes in organizational behavior may require working directly with functional organizational units. Tannenbaum, concerned with a more equitable distribution of power and status, remarked,

... patterns of control are tied significantly to the performance of the organization and to the adjustments and satisfactions of members ... workers who exercise some influence over matters of interest to themselves in the work situation receive a sense of self-respect which the "powerless" individual may lack.

This concept was supported by Baum, Bradford, and Dingman, who concurred that the effectiveness of the institution is impacted by the degree of change in the distribution of influence of individual staff members. For example, institutional change can be impeded or impacted by hidden agendas. Hidden agenda are all the conflicting motives, desires, aspirations, and emotional reactions held
by group members, sub-groups, or the group as a whole, which cannot legitimately be included among accepted group tasks. In addition, certain attitudinal "sets" related to institutional folklore impinge on the process of change.

To the extent that a person acts in one way and believes another, s/he is in conflict, and the problems thus generated are more likely to be resolved in favor of the organizational norms and values. According to this point of view, human relations training may produce a desire and readiness for greater concern, openness, authenticity, and flexibility. Whether or not this readiness develops into changed behavior depends on organizational support for change. Human relations laboratory training education seeks to increase the ability of individuals to gain more accurate perceptions of behavior and to more adequately play what Bradford called "the intricate human roles demanded by community life." Baum concluded that specialized human relations training gives staff more equitable levels of influence, despite their hierarchical level or position. Harrison's conclusions included the thought that determinants of organizational behavior are basically situational, and strong barriers may exist in the transfer of attitudes and values from the human relations training laboratory to the organization.

Larson and Gratz, in their study of problem-centered versus training-group learning, arrived at the tentative
conclusions that: problem-solving discussion training had a slight but non-significant advantage over training-group learning in eliciting changes toward open-mindedness; marked improvement in critical thinking ability resulted from both training approaches; and, small group problem-solving accuracy increased significantly only in training groups.

Studt suggests that staff training in an institution is primarily problem-solving by staff groups, and that the process itself lends useful suggestions for formulating subsequent goals and methods of staff growth. Staff training is a structured and deliberate effort to use situations to effect changes in staff attitudes, orientations, and conceptions of roles, to the end that behavior on the job will be changed. Training is one of the key methods by which institutions are able to modify programs in the direction of treatment. Warren stressed that behavioral changes do not truly become a part of a person until s/he has reinforced them through active involvement in the learning process. Gordon believes that participants in any learning situation should evaluate their own needs in addition to the training needs perceived by the teacher.

Chronologically older staff, for example, will respond when appropriate training methods are developed. Results similar to their younger colleagues can be achieved with suitable programming. Belbin and Belbin specify that
problems of guiding older workers into training can be diminished by a combination of individual counseling and group training. Special needs of the middle-aged learner include: long, uninterrupted learning sessions; greater consolidation of the learning before new skills are attempted; accurate responses and rapid feedback during learning; self-structured learning programs and avoidance of competition; and active mental participation through learning by discovery rather than rote memory, during the learning sessions.

Issroff, in planning staff training goals for institutional workers, aimed to foster within staff the necessary skills to learn from each other and to solve their own problems. She was convinced that unless group members were sufficiently at ease with each other and with themselves, they would be neither free to grow nor to learn from group experience.

Richards depicted organizational development as cyclic and described six stages of movement: individual and small group learning; learning experience applied to the job; analysis and revision of administrative and governance structure; establishing goals and priorities for the institution; establishing specific individual goals consistent with the institutional goals; and, evaluation and feedback. The first three stages of movement were seen as applicable to this study, initially concentrating on the most
appropriate approaches to training. Richards concluded,

... the extent to which any institution is able to alter the beliefs and behaviors of current staff members depends upon the impact of the total environment of the institution. The values of the institution as they are expressed through the behavior of its leadership determine the capability of the institution to mount an effective program of staff development.34

**Group Process As a Mode of Change**

The use of group process is a viable training modality. Group behavior and human relations training have the similar core purpose of strengthening individual contributions to the group. The personal worth of each person as s/he relates to others in the group is enhanced as the group becomes sensitive to the needs of its individual members. Group cohesion may result from a sense of mutual security stemming from what Bradford35 calls "the basic social drives." These drives are identified as a sense of belongingness; a sense of achievement; and a sense of recognition.

In effecting group relationships, the individual shares in the setting of group goals which not only affects his own situation but also determines the methods used to reach the goals. This use of consensual decision-making supports the importance of the individual; gives feelings of independence, authority, responsibility, and mutual trust; and encourages personal growth and improvement. Strong groups exert strong influence on members toward conformity, which in turn may satisfy the emotional needs of some members and frustrate
Concurrently, each group is composed of members who are also loyal participants in other groups, and have unique individual interests. Consequently, every group must constantly cope with deviancy tendencies which may represent a source of creative improvement or destructive disruption.

Cartwright recommended that the conflicting interests between the individual and the group be resolved through strengthening both, by qualitative improvements in the nature of the interdependence between integrated individuals and cohesive groups. Bradford recommended the use of human relations training as a primary approach toward this goal.

Characteristics of Child Care Staff

Several studies report staff characteristics are perceived as an important factor in working successfully with children. Robinson's findings suggested that staff education, income, age, and religion influenced the probability of attitudinal change in one group of college students tested. Mordock noted that staff who succeeded in completing an intensive training program in child care possessed a balance between social aggressiveness and inner controls, whereas those who did not were more socially oriented but seemed to lack the restraint and structuring ability needed for child care. Mordock's study of child care staff attitudes also showed that many new child care workers felt that
child rearing was difficult and often unrewarding; that it called for a stern, strict approach (authoritarian control) emphasizing early self-reliance (forcing maturity); and that affection should be withheld for fear it will "spoil" a child (avoiding affection). Similar results were found for the whole group of child care workers, regardless of the amount of experience, when they were compared with the general population on the factors of Authoritarian Control and Forcing Maturity. Mordock speculated that this might be a function of role-expectations and poor self concept.

Child care staff, as a group, have widely varied backgrounds, with extensive spread in age, education, experience, values, and temperament. Many child care positions are occupied by poorly-trained or untrained persons. Katz and Kahn suggested that personality types attracted to membership and careers in closed systems which provide services to people, tend to be dependent, impatient, intolerant of ambiguity, autocratic, and with a limited perspective of time.

The management of behavior-problem adolescents—whether disturbed, delinquent, unruly, or unsocialized—requires staff patience, endurance, and self-restraint. At times, when behaviors emerge in pre-verbal primitive, destructive, or assaultive ways, such regressive acting-out must be contained. Verbal responses from staff may be inadequate, and some form of physical restraint, intervention, or containment becomes necessary. When this occurs, staff must
be able to identify their own feelings and reactions generated by the feelings expressed by the acting-out adolescent, and provide external controls until the adolescent regains self control.

In his assessment of hospitalization versus residential treatment for adolescents, Weintraub noted that there has been an increase in the number of more severely disturbed adolescents in residential treatment centers. However, the same expectations for "healthy" behaviors of the clients are still a significant part of residential treatment. Weintraub views the optimal residential treatment staff as an integrated, interdisciplinary team, providing a therapeutic milieu, with,

... strong expectations and encouragement of adaptive behavior, and discouragement of maladaptive patterns; emphasis on the individual's responsibility for his behavior; provision for support when it is sought; and provision of opportunities for autonomy, such as the patient's active involvement in his own treatment planning.

Weintraub further suggested that as residential treatment centers accept more seriously disturbed adolescents for treatment, each discipline must become part of a totally integrated treatment program. Such a treatment program must include child care workers as well as the medical, psychological, educational, and social specialists. Indeed, since child care workers are with the residents more than any other discipline, they should be given increased authority and a greater share in the decision-making process.
Weintraub concluded that the professionalization of the child care worker is a positive move.\textsuperscript{44}

Staff who are deeply invested in the treatment process may face another dimension of conflict relating to the increasing emergence of client rights.\textsuperscript{45} Effectiveness of residential care depends almost completely on client cooperation and participation in the daily living routine.\textsuperscript{46} In some cases, treatment programs are disqualified by client refusal to cooperate with staff or with the institutional program. Program attractiveness and appeal hinges directly on the implementation capability of the child care worker. Becker\textsuperscript{47} emphasized the value of child care staff, and stated,

\ldots by virtue of his position in the ongoing life of the child, the child care worker seems best suited to maintain the integrity of the child and his development in the face of the myriad demands that may be made by specialists concerned primarily with the child's education, therapy, health, religion, or cultural growth.

Organizations, like persons, can be viewed as organisms whose parts are living and interrelated by communication networks. Gardner\textsuperscript{48} described a self-renewing organization or social system, as one which possesses the capacity to recognize, protect, and encourage creative and innovative individuals—those who possess the traits of openness, independence, flexibility, and the ability to find order in experience. Individual attitudes are supported by the collective attitudes of other workers and their methods of
dealing with groups, and by the extent to which the attitudes are accepted and fostered by supervisory and administrative practices. Any change in attitude in a single staff member cannot be understood without considering the many patterns of influence and interaction that exist in the total framework of the institution and in its relationship to the community.

Studt emphasized that it is necessary to create specific supportive conditions in order to achieve effective and lasting changes in attitudes. These conditions include: modification of value orientations throughout the institution; a structure of incentives which rewards the desired change; and, a coordination of both structural and personal pressures from inside and outside the institution which create motivations on the part of staff to change.

**Implications For Training**

In this chapter, the researcher selected and combined concepts related to planned change within a social system. These concepts incorporated individual needs; organizational expectations; self/role congruency; stress and conflict; goals, values and attitudes; group process; and staff characteristics, as they are collectively related to the adult educative process. The sources cited tend to support the researcher's personal experience that planned change through staff training must reflect strong administrative support,
particularly in the areas of delegated authority and shared decision-making.

In addition, any training program must have clear training goals and procedures, and some form of preparation for the trainer. For human relations building skills, the trainer must concentrate on empathy; genuineness; and unconditional positive regard. Human relations skills include self understanding of personal needs to be a helper; a knowledge of helping skills, such as effective verbal, non-verbal, and self-involving behaviors; and, practice in applying the helping skills by understanding others' communication and establishing helping relationships.

An effective training program must be immediate, valid, and directed to the employee's primary functions. Most change programs intervene in the day-to-day activities where people experience stress, and where they are more likely to consider change. It is important that the trainer recognize the probability of stress reactions, and attempt to deal with staff feelings. Preparation for change in performance occurs when the employee is confronted with information that is different from his self-image but which does not deflate his self-esteem. This information should be descriptive, concrete, directly related to perceived needs, and in an atmosphere of non-defensive trust.

Staff development in any client-serving system is primarily designed to provide training or experiences which
promote or enhance the job performance of the participants. Within this framework, in-service training programs are expected to accomplish predetermined or specific purposes, which are measurable, such as: change in knowledge; changes in values or attitudes; practical application of the new learning; actual changes in job performance or practices; or the long-range effect on the clients impacted by the persons trained.

An effective staff development program often causes staff to reexamine personal life goals and values; to try to improve interpersonal skills; and to enhance the ability to be creative and take risks in the design and execution of programs. The personal development dimension assumes that some staff may experience emotional problems associated with significant personal growth. This requires that the training program provide personal assistance to the individual who is struggling with personal issues, but it is not appropriate to let it evolve into a therapeutic enterprise. A primary component is training in interpersonal skills, using techniques in structured human relations experiences which are non-threatening but effective. The facilitator in such experiences must have a command of and an expertise in conducting such group activities.

Staff development programs must be designed to deal with organizational development issues and the process of change in traditional decision-making procedures. An
institution can make significant program changes only if it can tolerate conflict and make relatively quick decisions. This is complicated by the diversity of personal goals and directions within the institution. One limitation of traditional decision-making is that decisions are frequently made by people who do not have to implement them, and the people who have to carry them out may not be committed to do so.

Involvement of staff in decision-making is crucial to the development of any program. Any changes that affect the role of the worker need to be made in concert with the staff who work directly with the clients to be served. Consensual decision-making, dealing with the conflicts in the process, is most likely to result in a staff feeling of "ownership" and with substantially more active involvement in program implementation.

The planned use of human relations training was perceived by the researcher as having application toward implementation of the Buckeye Boys Ranch treatment philosophy. Toward this end, the concepts of role theory and adult education strongly influenced the researcher's training design. The staff training process was primarily directed toward changes in staff attitudes and staff self-perceptions, as staff roles expanded.

The general hypothesis "prescriptive staff development has a significant impact on staff attitudes and perceptions
as measured by paper/pencil tests," was the dominant theme of this study. Chapter II, Methodology, describes the procedures used to test the general hypothesis. The content and techniques of the actual training process, as designed and implemented by the researcher, are describe in Appendix "F."
NOTES

For clarification, Appendix "E" depicts five systems models: a social system model of Buckeye Boys Ranch as it relates to internal and external forces; the formal Ranch functional structure during three designated periods (September, 1972; September, 1973; and September, 1974); and the formal functional structure of Boys Village, which was basically unchanged during the two year period between September, 1972 and September, 1974.

2 Charles P. Loomis, Social Systems: Essays on Their Persistence and Change, D. Van Nostrand Co. Inc., Princeton, New Jersey, 1967, pp 4-6. Loomis perceives elements which relate to each other as altered by the process of time. They are tools by which the social system may be understood as a dynamic functioning continuity.

3 Ibid, p 5.


9 Ibid, p 538.

10 Ibid, p 540.


14. Chris Argyris, Interpersonal Competence and Organizational Effectiveness, Richard D. Irwin, Inc., The Dorsey Press, Homewood, Illinois, 1962, p 134. Argyris emphasized the need for training in human relationships within the organizational structure, and defined two positional elements which appear to strongly influence the integration of the individual and the organization: the lower one goes down the chain of command, the more the job and work environment control the individual's behavior; the more it becomes important to change the psycho-socio-technical environment (technology, job design, incentive systems, budgeting activities, salary systems, and training activities); and, the higher one goes up the chain of command, the more the individual has control over his work environment and the more important it becomes to change the interpersonal environment (degree of trust, confidence, openness, nonconformity, rivalry, defensiveness) and the policies (for example, services of human growth and commitment, such as decentralization) within the organization. Argyris stresses that the task of the learning experience is to help staff develop a new set of values (attitudes) about effective human relationships that will lead to increasing authentic relationships and interpersonal competence.


32 Judith Issroff, "A Group Training Programme Dealing With the Problems of Senior Staff in Custodial Institutions," Mental Health and Society, Vol. 1, No. 2, 1974, pp 98-109. Issroff stressed the concept of group openness, in which staff could be interpersonally at ease in such a way as to be "imaginatively, behaviorally, and emotionally alive and open to surprise and humor."


34 Ibid, p 305.


40 Ibid, p 228.

42. Alex Weintraub, M.D., "Long-Term Treatment of the Severely Disturbed Adolescent," Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry, Vol. 14, No. 3, 1975, pp 436-450. Weintraub notes that "even the most seriously disturbed adolescents frequently have managed to maintain some area or areas of intact (or at least marginal) functioning. In most cases, removal from home and the provision of structure and treatment in a center are sufficient to enable them to continue to improve their functioning. This leads to increased self-esteem which, in a cyclical manner, leads to still better adaptation."

43. Ibid, pp 436-437.

44. Ibid, p 438.

45. G. Mayer and J. C. Pearson, "Social Control in Treatment of Adolescents in Residential Care—Dilemma," Child Welfare, Vol. 54, No. 4, 1975, pp 246-256. Clients, particularly unsocialized adolescents, often have a strong sense of self-determination, and may choose to run away, refuse therapy, or avoid change. Mayer and Pearson suggest that in such cases, staff interference with the client's behaviors may constitute a violation of the client's rights, even when such intervention is designed as a clear and concrete treatment procedure. A person deprived of his liberty, even willingly, has the right to be treated but not to be coerced. This is extremely difficult for staff to accept, since it may place them in a position of perceived helplessness or loss of control.

46. E. Goffman, Asylums, Doubleday, Garden City, New York, 1961, pp 5-6. Goffman is highly critical of the institutional setting in general, as it relates to the institutional needs. He writes, "... the central feature of total institutions can be described as a breakdown of the barriers ordinarily separating three spheres of life: sleep; play; and work. First, all aspects of life are conducted in the same place and under the same single authority. Second, each phase of the member's daily activity is carried on in the immediate company of a large batch of others, all of whom are treated alike and required to do
the same thing together. Third, all phases of the day's activities are tightly scheduled, with one activity leading at a prearranged time into the next, the whole sequence of activities being imposed from above by a system of explicit formal rulings and a body of officials. Finally, the various enforced activities are brought together into a single rational plan purportedly designed to fulfill the official aims of the institution."


49Elliot Studt and Bernard Russell, op cit., p 23.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Description of the Research Design

In order to test the general hypothesis, "prescriptive staff development has a significant impact on staff attitudes and perceptions, as measured by paper and pencil tests," the researcher selected two private residential treatment institutions: Buckeye Boys Ranch, Inc., and Boys Village, Inc. By February, 1973, potential respondents were designated for the research study: over seventy staff at Buckeye Boys Ranch were projected as respondents for early July, 1973; and, a comparable group of about sixty staff at Boys Village was immediately available.

Boys Village, incorporated in 1946, is located near Smithville, Ohio. Boys Village is similar in size and function to Buckeye Boys Ranch, and was the existing model used by Buckeye Boys Ranch when the Ranch was incorporated in 1961. The two groups of respondents are located approximately one hundred miles apart in comparable but separate settings.
Although the respondents were considered to be roughly comparable, certain differences between them were recognized: size of staff; age of staff; the type of residents accepted for treatment; philosophical orientation; the staff live-in option at Boys Village as opposed to no such live-in option at Buckeye Boys Ranch; and, the fifteen-year age difference between the Boys Village facilities and the Buckeye Boys Ranch facilities.

The pretest/posttest longitudinal comparison group design was selected as appropriate for this study. In this research design, both a program group and a comparison group are given "before" measurements. Then the program group is exposed to an education or training program, and the comparison group is not. Following the training program, both groups are given "after" measurements which are comparable to the initial measurement. The research design used in this study is shown in Figure 1:

Discussion of the Research Design

According to Anderson, the adequacy of any research design is predicated on removing threats to internal or external validity. As data are collected, special care must be taken to rationally consider additional factors which might impact the findings. For example, problems inherent in the use of a comparison group were identified by Miles, who stated,
Figure 1: The Pretest/Posttest Longitudinal Comparison Group Research Design Use in the Study, "Staff Development as an Interventive Strategy For Changing Staff Attitudes and Perceptions in a Residential Treatment Facility."
it is frequently difficult to locate anything like a meaningful control group, let alone establish its equivalence. When the product of a process is change in persons, the criterion problem is ordinarily a major one; numbers are usually small, and often biased through self-selection.

Lord noted that in comparing the performance of a program group and a comparison group, a problem occurs when the groups are initially different at pretest. This may be countered by random assignment. However, it was not administratively feasible to use the random assignment approach for data collection in this study, because of the difficulty in giving groups in the same institution different tests. Therefore, the whole population of each group was selected, as an alternative approach.

Campbell stated that if random assignment is not used, matched sampling is an acceptable option to diminish the bias of variables other than staff training which might affect the dependent variables. The preexisting differences of the respondents made the matched sampling approach impractical, and the equivalence of the groups could not be assumed by matching. Although there was concern about these differences, it was still possible to compare the demographic characteristics of each group. Consequently, statistical "weighting" or handicapping was eventually introduced, to control for the differences.
Limitations of the Research Design

Some limitations which might affect generalizability were identified: the size of each institution was relatively small; the program group was in a period of reorganization, growth, and change, while the comparison group remained relatively stable during the same period; the program group had a somewhat higher staff turnover than the comparison group; and, only half of all staff in each institution took both the pretest and the posttest measurements.

In addition, the researcher, as assistant director of Buckeye Boys Ranch at the time of the study, was in a position of special circumstance which might not apply to other institutional settings and which might affect efforts to replicate this study. The researcher had the responsibility to provide leadership and direction for the Ranch treatment program; was delegated authority for treatment program implementation; was in a position to select staff presumed to have "successful" qualities during the period from June 15, 1970 until the study was completed; and had the primary responsibility and delegated authority for all staff training implementation. Even given these conditions, the change agent must also have both administrative support and the authority to convert training into practice in order to effect and maintain subsequent program change. Under these
circumstances, this specific concept of prescriptive staff development may then be generalized to other institutional settings.

**Hypothesis Tested**

The specific area of concentration in this study was the general hypothesis, "prescriptive staff development has a significant measurable impact on staff attitudes and perceptions, as measured by paper and pencil tests." This hypothesis was restated as,

... there is a significant relationship between staff development and changes in staff attitudes and perceptions, as measured by paper and pencil tests.

Ten variables, shown in Figure 2, were analyzed: seven independent demographic variables (age, sex, education, experience, position, tenure and location); and three dependent variables (staff attitudes, staff self-perception, and staff peer perception). The intervening variable, staff training, was the primary strategy used to effect change.

The pretest and posttest measures of the program group and the comparison group were selected to determine the impact of staff training. The staff training impact was tested by eight null hypotheses, graphically represented in Figure 3. The hypotheses are as follows:

**Hypothesis 1.** There is no significant difference in the demographic characteristics between the program group and the comparison group prior to staff training.
Figure 2: Independent Variables, Age, Sex, Education, Experience, Position, Tenure, and Location, and Dependent Variables, Staff Attitudes, Staff Self-Perception, and Staff Peer-Perception, with the Intervening Variable, Staff Training, Incorporated in the Research Design.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION (independent variable)</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUCKEYE BOYS RANCH</td>
<td>BOYS VILLAGE</td>
<td>BUCKEYE RANCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Demographic Characteristics**

- **HYPOTHESIS 1**: no difference in staff
- **HYPOTHESIS 2**: no difference in staff
- **HYPOTHESIS 3**: no change in attitudes
- **HYPOTHESIS 4**: no change in attitudes
- **HYPOTHESIS 5**: no difference in staff

**Pre-Training Measurements**

- **HYPOTHESIS 6**: no relationship

**Post-Training Measurements**

- **HYPOTHESIS 7**: no relationship
- **HYPOTHESIS 8**: no relationship

**Figure 3.** Relationship of the Hypotheses to the Independent Variables, Demographic Characteristics (age, sex, education, experience, position, and tenure) and the Pretest/Posttest Dependent Variables (authoritarian/acquiescence scores, autocratic/democratic scores, self-esteem scores, peer-esteem scores) by the Variable "location."
Hypothesis 2. There is no significant difference in attitudes and perceptions between the program group and the comparison group prior to staff training.

Hypothesis 3. There is no significant difference between the pre-training measurements and the post-training measurements of the attitudes and perceptions of the program group.

Hypothesis 4. There is no significant difference between the pre-training measurements and the post-training measurements of the attitudes and perceptions of the comparison group.

Hypothesis 5. There is no significant difference in attitudes and perceptions between the program group and the comparison group following staff training.

Hypothesis 6. There is no significant relationship between demographic characteristics; pretest measurements of attitudes and perceptions; and posttest measurements of attitudes and perceptions, when comparing the program group with the comparison group.

Hypothesis 7. There is no significant relationship between demographic characteristics; measures of attitudes and perceptions; and staff training, prior to or following staff training of the program group staff.

Hypothesis 8. There is no significant relationship between demographic characteristics and measures of attitudes and perceptions, when comparing the pretest and posttest measurements of the comparison group staff.

Instrumentation

Attitudes and Self-Perception

In attempting to measure attitudes, there is always the problem of response validity. Campbell, DeSoto and Edwards emphasized that an individual response can be influenced not only by the content of the response item but also by the form of presentation. This influence is called "response set." Response sets seem to operate whenever items
are difficult or ambiguous. In most personality scales the majority of items are keyed in one direction, making them potentially susceptible to serious distortion by this response set. Those items in which significant responses are relatively easy to detect as indicating emotional disturbance or implications for well being, appear to be most likely to elicit the "desirable" response. There is a tendency for persons taking the paper and pencil personality or attitude tests to give socially desirable answers.

Gaier,\textsuperscript{10} in discussing the "fakeability of personality assessments," raised the question of whether response set reflects responses to individual items rather than reaction to content. King and Ross\textsuperscript{11} confirmed their hypothesis that persons taking personality tests which have "transparent" items tend to put their best foot forward. This transparency of the traditional paper and pencil personality or attitude questionnaire has led test developers to consider the forced-choice format. The forced-choice test attempts to mitigate the effects of socially toned responses in that the subject chooses from among at least two or more alternatives that have been equated, to some extent, in terms of social desirability.

Lambley\textsuperscript{12} noted that forced-choice questions create "sets" of acquiescence and social desirability rather than authoritarianism, and found that a counterbalanced format also measures an acquiescent style. Terberg and Peters\textsuperscript{13}
concluded that when constructing an attitude questionnaire for any given item, the researcher need not be concerned with minor mean differences in "rate of endorsement" which are due to the direction of the wording. However, the influence of acquiescence as a response determinant is still a major problem, and the rate of endorsement is clearly affected by the social desirability of the item.

Hedberg,\textsuperscript{14} testing his contention that the forced-choice format is minimally susceptible to faking, provided the same test twice with two different administrative sets. He found that 19% of his subjects changed their responses, suggesting that the forced-choice tests may be altered significantly by response set modification. Hedberg refuted the concept that when a respondent is faced with equally desirable choices in a forced-choice test, s/he will resort to accurate self-description rather than the personally more desirable response, and concluded that this simply makes the choice of a desirable response more difficult for the respondent.\textsuperscript{15}

The use of forced-choice tests in an attempt to diminish the effect of socially desirable responses was also studied by Saltz,\textsuperscript{16} who concluded,

\ldots the results indicate that when all alternative choices are equally appropriate (or equally inappropriate), subjects may select the alternative which has the greatest personal social desirability. This may produce a bias in the form of a constant error throughout the test.
The question remains whether scores can be biased in the desired direction, when the response set for faking is less firmly and explicitly established than with the "best impression" or "social desirability" set. In a simulated testing situation, Bridgeman instructed separate groups of college students to assume they were applying for specific jobs. When scored on the appropriate scale, both groups compared favorably with similar groups already employed in these occupations. Students instructed to apply for an unspecified "job in industry" showed significantly higher means on both scales than a group given vocational guidance instruction, indicating that some part of the bias noted can be introduced by such a general, nonspecific set. However, evidence was presented that the instruction to apply for specific jobs produced responses appropriate to the specified occupation rather than simply inducing a more effective nonspecific set.

Hanley believed that acquiescence may influence individual responses when items are ambiguous or nonspecific. For example, the word "like" can be thought of as "love" or "enjoy" or "wish," depending upon the degree of authoritarian submission within the respondent. When a scale contains a variety of items, each eliciting individual differences in interpretation, the result is to lower the internal consistency of the measure.
Ellis cautioned that, in his estimation, there is little indication that such questionnaires can be used for individual assessment: the questions are often too ambiguous, in that they may be interpreted differently by different individuals; the questions are often artificial, and forced-choice items may not give reasonable alternatives; the administration of the test—the situation, directions, and examiner's personality—may influence the validity; the insight which a respondent has, with regard to his own intangible qualities, is often unclear and biased by his wishes or overprotective reactions, and provides the incentive to overrate or underrate himself; the content is often so miscellaneous that total scores have very different meanings for different persons; and, cultural factors may vary so much from those of another that valid indicators in one group will not hold for a different group.

Despite the concerns related to construction of attitudinal scales, a major factor in test-taking motivation and performance appears to be the individual's self-concept. Lowney discerned that self-reporting is probably more valid than any other form of measure, and concluded that there are three major problems in constructing self-concept instruments,

... first, getting a report from the subject that has the highest probability of being honest; second, enhancing the degree of veracity of which the subject/observer is capable; and, third, preventing the
possibility that one's measure is so general as to have little or no relation to the specific behaviors under study.

Self-rating and attitude scales were used in this study to try to determine if self-perception or personal attitudes were significantly altered, over time, by staff training. The instruments used are described later in this chapter.

The Use of Peer Ratings

The peer-rating approach involves each member of a specified group evaluating one another against identified characteristics. Individual scores on these characteristics are based on the peer assessment, and the reliability of the ratings is determined by the extent to which peer consensus is reached. The degree of the reliability is related to the amount of contact peers have with each other, the number of individuals making the ratings, and the visibility of the rated characteristics as perceived by the group members.

Hollander, Smith, and DeLeon concurred that their individual studies of peer ratings were found to yield significant predictions of various performance criteria. Gordon asserted that peer ratings are relatively independent of the group composition. Peer judgements have been shown to be valid predictors in industry, in education in the military; and in a mental health setting. Webb suggested that peer
judgements are probably superior over other sources of information in predicting performance. The researcher concurred with this concept.

Peer ratings or judgements were used in this study to strengthen the reliability of the instruments used for self-assessment in the same areas, and to assist in the validation of the self-reporting attitude scales used. These instruments are described in the following section.

**Instruments Used In the Study**

The selection of the test/retest instruments was limited to personal attitudes, self-perception, and peer-perception. The researcher selected four testing instruments from existing sources and developed one supplemental instrument for the demographic data. Appendix "G" shows facsimilies of these instruments, and includes source data which reflects the reliability and validity of the instruments. The testing instruments were divided into three categories: demographic data; personal attitude scales; and personality scales, as follows:

1. **Demographic Data.** These data include the institutional setting where the respondent worked (designated by the term "location"); the respondent's age, sex, education, position, and tenure; and the respondent's prior related work experience.
2. **Personal Attitude Scales**
   a. The Levinson and Huffman Autocratic/Democratic Scale, which involves fifteen statements of child-rearing techniques related to parent/child relationships, was presented on a six-position response continuum ranging in degree from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." Sub-scales on this instrument identify Convention-alism; Authoritarian Submission; Extreme Emphasis on Discipline; and a Moralistic Rejection of Impulse Life.
   b. The Bass Authoritarian/Acquiescence Short Form, is composed of twelve forced-choice paired statements. The six forced-choice statements relevant to child behaviors were selected for final tabulation.

3. **The Duncan Personality Integration Scale**
   a. Peer rating: Each staff member writes the name of any three peers from the current personnel list, in each of five categories (ability to express feelings; self-understanding; handling anxiety; forming deep relationships; and, open-mindedness). The respondent rank-orders the names in each category, as first choice, second choice, and third choice, as having the characteristics described in these categories.
b. Self rating: On a six-position response continuum, ranging in degree from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree," each staff member rates him/herself in each of five categories (ability to express feelings; self-understanding; handling anxiety; forming deep relationships; and open-mindedness).

Research Procedures

Test Administration

Data for this research were collected using instruments directly administered by the researcher to staff at Buckeye Boys Ranch and staff at Boys Village. The researcher administered the pretests and posttests, individually and in small groups, giving the same instructions under similar conditions each time. The pretests were administered over a four-week period during the last three weeks in August and the first week in September, 1973, to accommodate the respondents' shifts, days off, vacations, and unavailability. The posttests were administered over a six-week period from the last week in May through the first week in July, 1974, under similar conditions as the pretest.

The total number of potentially available subjects from both institutions, combining pretest and posttest numbers, was 268 staff. However, only 216 subjects actually took the
test: 111 at pretest and 105 at posttest. Of those who took the test, only 70 subjects took both the pretest and the posttest: 36 from Buckeye Boys Ranch; and, 34 from Boys Village, clarified as follows,

1. Buckeye Boys Ranch: of the 75 potential staff for pretest, 63 were available or willing to be tested. Of the 73 potential staff for posttest, 58 were available or willing to be tested. Of all staff tested, 27 took the pretest only; 22 took the posttest only; and 36 took both the pretest and the posttest.

2. Boys Village: of the 57 potential staff for pretest, 48 were available or willing to be tested. Of the 63 potential staff for posttest, 47 were available or willing to be tested. Of all staff tested, 14 took the pretest only; 13 took the posttest only; and 34 took both pretest and posttest.

Table 1 and Table 2 illustrate the number and the composition of staff tested for this study.

Data Analysis

Data which were analyzed were the coded test/retest instruments completed by the respondents: 36 sets from the program group at Buckeye Boys Ranch; and, 34 sets from the comparison group at Boys Village. The pretest only data and the posttest only data were not used, since they
Table 1: Number and Percentage of the Boys Village and Buckeye Boys Ranch Staff Who Were Pretested in 1973 and Posttested in 1974

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>BUCKEYE BOYS RANCH</th>
<th>BOYS VILLAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRETEST</td>
<td>POSTTEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretested Only</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>(36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Staff</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretested and Posttested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttested Only</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Staff Tested</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>(84%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untested Staff</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Staff</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Number of Boys Village and Buckeye Boys Ranch Staff Who Were Pretested in 1973 and Posttested in 1974, Shown by Their Positions Held in the Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENTS' POSITIONS</th>
<th>PRETEST ONLY</th>
<th>PRETEST/POSTTEST</th>
<th>POSTTEST ONLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BBR BV</td>
<td>BBR BV</td>
<td>BBR BV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARAPROFESSIONAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Recreation</td>
<td>20 10</td>
<td>17 12</td>
<td>6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>12 11</td>
<td>6 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinician</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPORTIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service</td>
<td>5 2</td>
<td>7 11</td>
<td>10 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>27 14</td>
<td>36 34</td>
<td>22 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reflected substantial staff turnover and introduced a complex variable which expanded the study beyond the limits established by the researcher. 43

Nominal and Interval scales were used to measure the demographic data. The twelve sets of forced-choice items on the Bass Short Form 44 were set up on a nominal scale. The fifteen statements on the Levinson and Huffman Autocratic/Democratic Scale were structured on a Likert-type continuum, with numerical values preestablished for the six nominal options ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." The additional value of "0" (zero) was assigned to indicate the omission of a response. 45

The self-ratings established by the five-statement Duncan Personality Integration Scale were also structured on the Likert-type six nominal option continuum. The peer-rating on the Duncan Personality Integration Scale was determined by how many times a person was named by his peers in each category.

Techniques used for data handling were: Chi-Square; T-Test; Analysis of Covariance; and Regression Analysis, as follows:

1. Chi-Square. The chi-square is a general test which may be used to determine whether empirically obtained frequencies are significantly different from expected frequencies. Chi-square provides an indication of either independence from or a relationship
between two variables. Small values of chi-square are interpreted as the absence of a relationship. If there does not appear to be a relationship between the variables, any small deviation from expected values is presumed to be due to chance. Large values of chi-square imply the probability that a systematic relationship does exist between variables. The degrees of freedom are determined by the number of rows and columns in the chi-square table. Degrees of freedom are important because chi-square probability value depends on the number of cells in the table. For this study, the chi-square was used to test Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2.

2. T-Test. The t-test is the statistic used in calculating the probability associated with the null hypothesis. This t-test is generally applicable to a normally distributed random variable where the mean is assumed to be known and the population variance is estimated from a sample. In order to make use of the t-distribution a normal population must be assumed, especially if the number of cases is relatively small. The goal of the t-test is to establish whether or not a difference between two samples is significant, i.e., indicative of a true difference between the two populations. For this study, the t-test was used to retest Hypothesis 2, and to test Hypothesis 3,
Hypothesis 4, and Hypothesis 5.

3. **Analysis of Covariance.** For analysis of covariance, metric covariates are inserted into the design to remove extraneous variation from the dependent variable, thereby increasing measurement precision. This is designed to correct for all factors and all covariates when assessing the effect of each given factor and covariate. For most applications, it is necessary to assume that the covariate-by-factor interaction is equal to zero. A test of this assumption is normally run as a prelude to analysis of covariance. In cases in which the tenability of the assumption is in doubt, the Regression subprogram will yield the appropriate test.

In the Regression subprogram, the use of Dummy Variables is most common when a researcher wishes to insert a nominal scale variable into a regression equation. Since the numbers assigned to categories of a nominal scale are not assumed to have an order and unit measurement, they cannot be treated as "scores" as they would be in a conventional regression analysis. A set of Dummy Variables is "created" by treating each category of a nominal variable as a separate variable, and assigning arbitrary scores for all cases depending upon their presence or absence in each of these categories. All cases can be assigned
arbitrary scores of "one" or "zero." The newly created variables are called "dummy variables" because their scores have no meaning other than representing or standing for a particular category in the original variable.

Since the Dummy Variables have arbitrary metric values of 0 and 1, they may be treated as interval variables and inserted into a regression equation. Three separate dichotomous variables may then be reflected in the nominal variable. As an example, the nominal variable, "position," in which the third position, the excluded category, is the reference category.

The example of the Dummy Variable is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VAR010: POSITION</th>
<th>NAMES OF DUMMY VARIABLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Paraprofessional</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Professional</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Supportive</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis of covariance design incorporated the following variables:

1. COVARIATES: metric (interval) independent
   - VAR005 age (actual age)
   - VAR006 education (number of years)
   - VAR010 tenure (number of months)
   - VAR065 experience (number of months)

2. FACTORS: nonmetric, categorical independent
   - VAR001 location (Boys Village, Buckeye Ranch)
   - VAR021 position (paraprofessional, professional, supportive)
   - VAR064 sex (female, male)
3. DEPENDENT VARIABLES

VAR041 pretest autocratic/democratic attitudes
VAR241 posttest autocratic/democratic attitudes
VAR021 pretest authoritarian/acquiescence attitudes
VAR221 posttest authoritarian/acquiescence attitudes
VAR062 pretest self-perception (self-esteem)
VAR262 posttest self-perception (self-esteem)
VAR042 pretest peer-perception (peer-esteem)
VAR242 posttest peer-perception (peer-esteem)

For this study, the analysis of covariance was used to test Hypothesis 6.

4. Multiple Regression. In this study, the regression equation was used to determine if variables were confounded by the interaction of the slopes X and Y. Regression is also used to evaluate the contribution of specific variables, and the groups at the pretest level, by statistically "weighting" or handicapping one group. The regression procedure subsequently adjusts posttest scores, taking preexisting differences into consideration. With this process it becomes possible to analyze the relationship between dependent and independent variables, and to determine which factors appear to predict or explain the variation in the dependent variable. For this study, the regression equation was used to test the assumption of homogeneity for Hypothesis 6, as a preparatory step before the analysis of covariance could be used; and, for Hypothesis 7 and Hypothesis 8.
Summary Statement

Although specific known differences were identified, the program group, Buckeye Boys Ranch, and the comparison group, Boys Village, were presumed by the researcher to be "roughly comparable" at pretest. The longitudinal pretest/posttest research design was selected as the framework within which this study was conducted.

Theoretical concepts were discussed, in the areas of self-reporting paper and pencil tests; response validity; response "sets"; test-item transparency; test bias; and peer rating. The composition and numbers of the population tested was also identified.

Eight null hypotheses were derived from the general hypothesis. These null hypotheses sought to test for differences in demographic characteristics and in the pretest/posttest measurements of attitudes and perceptions, within and between each group, and to determine existing significant relationships which might explain variation in the dependent variables. The chi-square, t-test, covariance, and regression equations, were reviewed and selected as appropriate statistical techniques to test the hypotheses.

The general hypothesis, "there is a significant relationship between staff development and changes in staff attitudes and perceptions," reflects the researcher's focus on the importance of training as an interventive strategy.
A rigorous attempt was made to measure training outcomes, in terms of measurable changes in staff attitudes and perceptions. This aspect of the study is described in chapter IV, "Findings." In addition, Appendix "F" ("Comments on the Use of Staff Development") documents and describes the content and process of the actual training implementation.
NOTES

1S. B. Anderson, S. Ball, and R. T. Murphy (eds.), "Design of Evaluation," Encyclopedia of Educational Evaluation, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 1975, pp 125-127. Anderson discerns multiple factors which might potentially impinge upon or contaminate the validity of any study: world, national or local events which impact respondents; instability or unreliability of measures or sampling; effects of initial measurement on later measurement; variations in data collection procedures from respondent to respondent or occasion to occasion; tendencies for respondents at the extremes of score distributions to score closer to the mean when measures are taken a second time; differing abilities (or other characteristics) of respondents in the experimental (program) group and respondents in the control (comparison) group, or differences that are associated with selection; differing turnover rates for the respondents in the experimental group and the respondents in the control group; and, relationships between the characteristics of the respondent group selected and other factors such as motivation and maturation.

2Ibid, p 126. Specific concerns, which include these questions, were addressed by the researcher; are the respondents in the research study similar in relevant characteristics to the respondents to whom we wish to generalize? Is the setting for the researcher's study artificial or atypical? Are the responses influenced by the Hawthorne Effect (overperformance of the program group), by the John Henry Effect (overperformance of the comparison group), or the Barnum Effect (acceptance of bogus feedback)? Are the responses influenced by reactive effects to self-measurement, such as the "guinea pig" effect (awareness of being tested or observed; or, uncertainty of how the data will be used); role selection (choice of responses perceived as "proper" or "appropriate," or expected in the situation); real changes in the characteristics being measured (initial questions on a test may lead to a change in understanding that improves later test responses); or, response sets (personality-based or instrument-induced tendencies of respondents to respond to irrelevant but consistent ways)? Is it possible that the pretest becomes part of the instructional program and influences the outcome? If research results were based on multiple training procedures, are they relevant to partial training situations?

F. M. Lord, "A Paradox in the Interpretation of Group Comparisons," *Psychological Bulletin*, 1967, pp 304-305. Lord is also concerned that posttest differences at the completion of training could be related to pretest differences rather than the training itself. At pretest, there is no known method (other than analysis of covariance) to adjust the posttest variable for preexisting between-group differences on the pretest variable, unless it is known how the pretest variable affects the posttest variable.


Certain assumptions related to staff characteristics influenced the researcher in the selection of testing instruments and in the design of the staff training program. These assumptions identified perceived qualities of "successful" staff, and were empirically based on the researcher's personal work experience in a variety of child-care institutional settings over an eighteen year span. The assumptions are: a) those institutional staff who appear to have a significant impact on clients generally have specific qualities: the capacity to form and maintain positive relationships with clients and peers; the ability to establish and maintain clearly defined, firm, fair, consistent limits, while permitting the client to retain dignity and integrity; the capacity to interpersonally trust and risk; and the ability to feel and generate enthusiasm; b) institutional staff who seem best able to handle stress and crisis situations usually have a positive self-concept, a sense of humor, the ability to appropriately express intense feelings, a high degree of flexibility and tolerance for ambiguity, and a philosophy which is neither permissive nor punitive; and, c) institutional staff who are open, honest, accepting of and respectful toward clients and peers, are most likely to elicit similar responses from clients and peers.


8 Ibid, p 126.


23 Patrick H. DeLeon, Jean L. DeLeon, and Phillip J. Swihart, "Relation of Accuracy of Self-Perceptions and Peer Ratings," Perceptual Motor Skills, Vol. 29, No. 3, 1969, p 966. The hypothesis of whether individuals who have an accurate self-perception are viewed more positively by their peers, was investigated. Peer ratings were obtained on seven variables of interpersonal relationships: liking; leadership; need for approval; number of friends; someone to whom one discloses; someone who self-discloses; and self-esteem. The results indicated that a male subject who disagreed considerably with most peers was rated as being less of a leader, less liked, having fewer friends, and less disclosed to. It also appeared that for male subjects, individuals who have accurate self-perceptions are rated more positively by their peers.


28 Allen I. Kraut, "Prediction of Managerial Success by Peer and Training-Staff Ratings," Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 60, No. 1, 1975, p 14. Kraut's findings support the concept that peer ratings obtained in a training course are effective predictors of success among high-level business managers, and are highly reliable measures.


31 Bernard Linn, Martin Arostegui, and Robert Zeppa, "Peer and Self-Assessment in the Quest for Evaluative Techniques That Predict Delivery of Quality Care," Veteran's Administration, Washington, D.C., November, 1973, pp 1-7. Paper presented at the annual conference on Research in Medical Education. Ninety eight medical students, using the Physician's Performance Rating Scale, rated themselves and their fellow students in two areas of competency: the knowledge factor (judgement, ability); and the relationship factor (appearance; interpersonal relationships; ability to communicate). The reliability between peer and self ratings was significant, but low. Students generally rated themselves lower than did their peers, especially in interpersonal skills. Peer ratings were highly significantly related to the grade actually attained. The relationship factor was inversely related to grade outcomes.

32 Stuart J. Cohen, "The Effect on One's Own Performance of Evaluating Peers," paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, March 1, 1973. In a study/learning situation of high school males, on a pretest/posttest structure, an experimental group evaluated two peers' pretests while the control group researched new topics. Both groups master 50% more objectives on the posttest than on
the pretest. No significant differences between the gains for the two groups were found. Evaluating a peer's work was as effective as performing additional tasks.


35Glenn E. McClure, Ernest C. Types, and John Dailey, "Research on Criteria of Officer Effectiveness," Air Training Command Research Bulletin, No. 51-8, May, 1951. Findings that there was a higher relationship between peer ratings in officer candidate school and later on-the-job proficiency ratings than between OCS academic or military grades and proficiency ratings.

36E. P. Hollander, "The Validity of Peer Ratings From OCS in Predicting Officer Performance: A Follow-Up of the 1955 Newport Study," Office of Naval Research Technical Report, May, 1964. Hollander found that peer ratings to predict officer performance in the Navy afforded substantial and significant prediction. The third training week peer nomination validity was as high as that resulting from the twelfth training week administration.

37Francis F. Medland, "Research to Identify Potential Non-Commissioned Officer Leaders," Army Personnel Research Office, Research Study No. 64-1, May, 1964. Medland states that peer ratings were more reliable than cadre ratings in either intact or reorganized groups, in predicting potential non-commissioned officers.

38James E. Wahlberg, Wiley R. Borles, and H. A. Boyd, "Peer Ratings as Predictors of Success in Military Aviation," Office of the Chief of Research and Development, Department of the Army, Report No. 1-71, March, 1971. Experimental peer rating forms for aviation warrant officer candidates were compared with the contemporary form already in use, resulting in sufficiently high validity coefficients to anticipate that the use of peer ratings may increase predictive accuracy in a multivariate system.


41 See Appendix "G" for facsimilies of the instruments used, and source data reflecting reliability and validity of the instruments.

42 These data were processed through the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), a resident statistical processing program of the Instructional Research Computer Center at The Ohio State University. This program offers a broad array of statistical operations ranging from one-way frequency tables and associated parametric statistics to complex multivariate analysis.

43 The pretest only and posttest only data might be more appropriately used in a further study of staff norms as a function of institutional change over time.

44 Six sets of forced-choice statements on the Bass Short Form were seen as more relevant in working with children (items 2, 4, 7, 8, 10, and 12), and are the only items which were applied to the cumulative scores for correlation. A score of "1" was assigned for responses deemed to be "Authoritarianism," and a score of "2" was assigned for responses identified as "Acquiescence," with total scores ranging from "6" for "Strong Authoritarianism" to "12" for "Strong Acquiescence."

45 The range of possible total scores on the Levinson and Huffman Scale is from "15" to "90," if all statements were answered, with a high score indicating high democratic values and a low score reflecting high autocratic values. In the case of a non-response (designated as "0"), there is the possibility that the overall score might be slightly lower, since the "0" is not counted in the total. This was not seen as a serious problem in this research, since there were no items omitted by any of the respondents.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Introductory Remarks

The theories and models used for this study have been tested with limited populations in generally unrelated settings. The study itself has slowly emerged from data collected during 1973-1974, at which time the preliminary findings were timely for both Buckeye Boys Ranch and Boys Village.

From the general hypothesis, "there is a significant relationship between staff development and changes in staff attitudes and perceptions as measured by paper and pencil tests," eight null hypotheses were derived. From each of the eight hypotheses, research hypotheses were explicated and tested (see Figure 4). Four sub-hypotheses were derived from hypothesis 7, and four sub-hypotheses were derived from hypothesis 8. Figure 5 shows the relationship of the sub-hypotheses to the independent and dependent variables. The following statistical techniques were used to test the hypotheses:

CHI-SQUARE. Testing for independence, the chi-square was used to determine whether the two groups were comparable,
Figure 4. Relationship of the Hypotheses to the Independent and Dependent Variables, and the Statistical Methodologies Used to Test Each Hypothesis.
### INDEPENDENT VARIABLE "LOCATION"

**PROGRAM GROUP: BUCKEYE BOYS RANCH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLES: Demographic Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>attitudes and perceptions</td>
<td>tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-test scores</td>
<td>position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post-test scores</td>
<td>experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>age</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMPARISON GROUP: BOYS VILLAGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLES: Demographic Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>attitudes and perceptions</td>
<td>tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-test scores</td>
<td>position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post-test scores</td>
<td>experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>age</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUB-HYPOTHESIS 7a:** no relationship
authoritarian/acquiescence scores

**SUB-HYPOTHESIS 7b:** no relationship
autocratic/democratic scores

**SUB-HYPOTHESIS 7c:** no relationship
self-esteem scores

**SUB-HYPOTHESIS 7d:** no relationship
peer esteem scores

**SUB-HYPOTHESIS 8a:** no relationship
authoritarian/acquiescence scores

**SUB-HYPOTHESIS 8b:** no relationship
autocratic/democratic scores

**SUB-HYPOTHESIS 8c:** no relationship
self-esteem scores

**SUB-HYPOTHESIS 8d:** no relationship
peer esteem scores

---

**Figure 5.** Relationship of the Sub-Hypotheses to the Independent and Dependent Variables.
and if the respondents were a representative sample.

**T-TEST.** The t-test was used in testing for significant differences between the two groups, and for differences in the treatment effects.

**ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE.** This statistic was used to correct for the differences noted in both the chi-square and the t-test findings, and to relate the impact of factors in determining the effect of treatment (staff development).

**MULTIPLE REGRESSION.** The regression procedure was used to analyze the relationship between dependent and independent variables, and to determine which factors appeared to predict or explain the variation in the dependent variable. This followed the finding that the effect of treatment was either presumed to be non-significant or could not be accurately measured by the instruments used.

**Significance of Statistical Data**

**CHI-SQUARE: TESTING FOR INDEPENDENCE**

The distribution of frequencies was subjected to the chi-square test to determine whether there was a significant relationship between the demographic characteristics of staff tested at Boys Village and staff tested at Buckeye Boys Ranch. The chi-square was used to test two research hypotheses, with \( P = > .05 \) established as the level of significance:
1) Research Hypothesis 1. There is no significant difference in the demographic characteristics (age, sex, education, experience, position, and tenure) between the program group (Buckeye Boys Ranch) and the comparison group (Boys Village) prior to staff training.

Research Hypothesis 1 was rejected when the demographic data were analyzed by the chi-square test for significance of the degree of association. Although sex, education, experience, and position all appeared to be comparable, two variables were significantly different: for the "age" variable, the chi-square value was 10.93 at 4 degrees of freedom, which was significant at the .027 level; and, for the "tenure" variable, the chi-square value was 15.17 at 4 degrees of freedom, which was significant at the .004 level. Tables 3 through 8 show the crosstabulation chi-square analysis of the six independent variables (age, sex, education, experience, tenure, and position) with the independent variable, "location" (Buckeye Boys Ranch, and Boys Village).

Table 3: Number and Percentage of Responding Staff from Boys Village and Buckey Boys Ranch, Shown by the Respondent's Ages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE OF RESPONDENT</th>
<th>LOCATION OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BUCKEYE BOYS RANCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 29</td>
<td>19 (52.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>8 (22.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>3 (8.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>3 (8.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 69</td>
<td>3 (8.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>36 (52.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI-SQUARE = 10.93  df = 4  P = .03
Table 4: Number and Percentage of Responding Staff From Boys Village and Buckeye Boys Ranch, Shown by the Respondent’s Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX OF RESPONDENT</th>
<th>LOCATION OF RESPONDENTS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BUCKEYE BOYS RANCH</td>
<td>BOYS VILLAGE</td>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10 (27.8%)</td>
<td>15 (44.1%)</td>
<td>25 (35.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26 (72.2%)</td>
<td>19 (55.9%)</td>
<td>45 (54.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>36 (51.4%)</td>
<td>34 (48.6%)</td>
<td>70 (100.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI SQUARE = 1.38  df = 1  P = .24 (ns)

Table 5: Number and Percentage of Responding Staff From Boys Village and Buckeye Boys Ranch, Shown by the Respondent's Educational Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENT'S EDUCATION</th>
<th>LOCATION OF RESPONDENTS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BUCKEYE BOYS RANCH</td>
<td>BOYS VILLAGE</td>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 8 yrs</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>4 (12.1%)</td>
<td>4 (5.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 -12 yrs</td>
<td>8 (22.2%)</td>
<td>9 (27.3%)</td>
<td>17 (24.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 -14 yrs</td>
<td>3 (8.3%)</td>
<td>4 (12.1%)</td>
<td>7 (10.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 -16 yrs</td>
<td>12 (33.3%)</td>
<td>6 (18.2%)</td>
<td>18 (26.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17- 20 yrs</td>
<td>13 (36.1%)</td>
<td>10 (30.3%)</td>
<td>23 (33.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>36 (52.2%)</td>
<td>33 (47.8%)</td>
<td>69 (100.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI SQUARE = 6.47  df = 4  P = .17 (ns)
Table 6: Number and Percentage of Responding Staff from Boys Village and Buckeye Boys Ranch, Shown by the Respondent's Prior Related Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIOR EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>LOCATION OF RESPONDENTS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BUCKEYE BOYS RANCH</td>
<td>BOYS VILLAGE</td>
<td>TOTALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>10 (27.8%)</td>
<td>8 (23.5%)</td>
<td>18 (25.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-36 mo</td>
<td>14 (38.9%)</td>
<td>10 (29.4%)</td>
<td>24 (34.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 - 360 mo</td>
<td>12 (33.3%)</td>
<td>16 (47.1%)</td>
<td>28 (40.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>36 (51.4%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>34 (48.6%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>70 (100.0%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI SQUARE = 1.12  df = 2  P = .60 (ns)

Table 7: Number and Percentage of Responding Staff from Boys Village and Buckeye Boys Ranch, Shown by the Respondent's Tenure with the Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENT'S TENURE</th>
<th>LOCATION OF RESPONDENTS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BUCKEYE BOYS RANCH</td>
<td>BOYS VILLAGE</td>
<td>TOTALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 36 mo</td>
<td>29 (80.6%)</td>
<td>13 (38.2%)</td>
<td>42 (60.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 - 360 mo</td>
<td>7 (19.4%)</td>
<td>21 (61.8%)</td>
<td>28 (40.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>36 (51.4%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>34 (48.6%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>70 (100.0%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI SQUARE = 13.05  df = 1  P = .001
Table 8: Number and Percentage of Responding Staff from Boys Village and Buckeye Boys Ranch, Shown by the Respondent's Position or Role Held at the Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION HELD AT INSTITUTION</th>
<th>LOCATION OF RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>BUCKEYE BOYS RANCH</th>
<th>BOYS VILLAGE</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>paraprofessional</td>
<td></td>
<td>17 (47.3%)</td>
<td>12 (35.2%)</td>
<td>29 (41.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 (33.3%)</td>
<td>11 (32.4%)</td>
<td>23 (32.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supportive</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 (19.4%)</td>
<td>11 (32.4%)</td>
<td>18 (25.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td>36 (51.4%)</td>
<td>34 (48.6%)</td>
<td>70 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI SQUARE = 1.73  df = 2  P = .50 (ns)

2) Research Hypothesis 2. There is no significant difference in attitudes and perceptions (authoritarian/acquiescence scores, autocratic/democratic scores, self-esteem scores, and peer-esteem scores) between the program group (Buckeye Boys Ranch) and the comparison group (Boys Village) prior to staff training.

Research Hypothesis 2 was not rejected when the pre-test attitudes and perceptions data were analyzed by the chi-square test for significance of the degree of association. The chi-square values indicated that the mean scores of the staff members of the two institutions were not significantly different when comparing the pretest authoritarian/acquiescence scores, the self-esteem scores, and the peer-esteem scores. For the pretest autocratic/democratic scores, the chi-square value was 9.46 at 5 degrees of freedom, which was significant at the .10 level. This shows a trend, but is not significant at the P = > .05 level.
established for this study. Tables 9 through 12 show the
crosstabulation chi-square analysis of the four dependent
pretest variables (authoritarian/acquiescence scores, self-
esteem scores, peer-esteem scores, autocratic/democratic
scores) with the independent variable, "location" (Buckeye
Boys Ranch, and Boys Village.

Table 9: Number and Percentage of Responding Staff From
Boys Village and Buckeye Boys Ranch, Shown by the
Respondent's Pretest Authoritarian/Acquiescence
Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHORITARIAN/ACQUIESCENCE</th>
<th>LOCATION OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCORE</td>
<td>BUCKEYE BOYS RANCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pretest)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strong acquiescence</td>
<td>15 (41.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acquiescence</td>
<td>9 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mild</td>
<td>4 (11.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acquiescence</td>
<td>6 (16.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>range</td>
<td>2 (5.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mild</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authoritarian</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strong</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>36 (52.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| CHI-SQUARE = 9.80          | df = 6               | P = .20 (ns) |
Table 10: Number and Percentage of Responding Staff from Boys Village and Buckeye Boys Ranch, Shown by the Respondent's Pretest Self-Esteem Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRETEST SELF-ESTEEM SCORE</th>
<th>LOCATION OF RESPONDENT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BUCKEYE BOYS RANCH</td>
<td>BOYS VILLAGE</td>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very high</td>
<td>7 (19.5%)</td>
<td>7 (21.2%)</td>
<td>14 (20.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>21 (58.3%)</td>
<td>19 (57.6%)</td>
<td>40 (58.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medium</td>
<td>8 (22.2%)</td>
<td>7 (21.2%)</td>
<td>15 (21.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very low</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>36 (52.2%)</td>
<td>33 (47.8%)</td>
<td>69 (100.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI-SQUARE = .01  df = 4  P = .999 (ns)

Table 11: Number and Percentage of Responding Staff from Boys Village Buckeye Boys Ranch, Shown by the Respondent's Pretest Peer-Esteem Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRETEST SELF-ESTEEM SCORE</th>
<th>LOCATION OF RESPONDENTS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BUCKEYE BOYS RANCH</td>
<td>BOYS VILLAGE</td>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st-3rd choice</td>
<td>7 (46.6%)</td>
<td>7 (50.0%)</td>
<td>14 (48.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th-7th choice</td>
<td>4 (26.7%)</td>
<td>3 (21.4%)</td>
<td>7 (24.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th-10th choice</td>
<td>4 (26.7%)</td>
<td>4 (28.6%)</td>
<td>8 (27.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>15 (51.7%)</td>
<td>14 (48.3%)</td>
<td>29 (100.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI-SQUARE = .11  df = 2  P = .999 (ns)
Table 12: Number and Percentage of Responding Staff from Boys Village and Buckeye Boys Ranch, Shown by the Respondent's Pretest Autocratic/Democratic Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTOCRATIC/DEMOCRATIC SCORE (pretest)</th>
<th>LOCATION OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BUCKEYE BOYS RANCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strong democratic</td>
<td>6 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>democratic</td>
<td>16 (44.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mild</td>
<td>12 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mild democratic</td>
<td>2 (5.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autocratic</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strong</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>36 (51.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI SQUARE = 9.46  df = 5  P = .10 (ns)

T-TEST: TESTING FOR DIFFERENCES

The chi-square values for Research Hypothesis 2 showed a trend toward significant difference in the attitudes and perceptions (autocratic/democratic scores) of the staff from Buckeye Boys Ranch and Boys Village, at pretest. Since the researcher was primarily interested in discovering and evaluating differences between treatment effects, the t-test was used to more rigorously retest hypothesis 2. Treatment effects were measured by comparing the program group and
comparison group. In the comparison of group means, the term "treatment" was used to refer to the basis upon which the two groups were differentiated.

The t-test was used to test four research hypotheses, with $P = .05$ established as the level of significance.

1) Research Hypothesis 2. There is no significant difference in attitudes and perceptions (authoritarian/acquiescence scores, autocratic/democratic scores, self-esteem scores, and peer-esteem scores) between the program group (Buckeye Boys Ranch) and the comparison group (Boys Village) prior to staff training.

The t-test comparing the pretest means of the attitudes and perceptions of Buckeye Boys Ranch staff and Boys Village staff partially rejected Research Hypothesis 2. Although the pretest authoritarian/acquiescence means, the pretest self-esteem means, and the pretest peer-esteem means were within the non-significant level, the difference between the means of the pretest autocratic/democratic variable was significant at the .001 two-tailed probability level. The t-test of these means resulted in a t-value of -3.40 at 68 degrees of freedom. The pretest autocratic/democratic mean score for Buckeye Boys Ranch staff was 37.17 compared with the pretest autocratic/democratic mean score of 45.71 for Boys Village staff. This finding, shown on Table 13, allowed rejection of hypothesis 2, "there is no significant difference in attitudes and perceptions between the program group and the comparison group prior to staff training"
(for autocratic/democratic scores). Boys Village staff were significantly more autocratic than Buckeye Boys Ranch staff, at pretest.

Table 13: Differences Between the Pretest Means of the Attitudes and Perceptions of Buckeye Boys Ranch Staff and Boys Village Staff, Using the Pooled Variance Estimate of the T-Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRETEST ATITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>POOLED VARIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BUCKEYE BOYS RANCH</td>
<td>BOYS VILLAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authoritarian/</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>7.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autocratic/democratic</td>
<td>37.17</td>
<td>45.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-esteem</td>
<td>11.44</td>
<td>11.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peer-esteem</td>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>11.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Research Hypothesis 3. There is no significant difference between the pre-training and post-training measures of the attitudes and perceptions (authoritarian/acquiescence scores, and peer-esteem scores) of the program group (Buckeye Boys Ranch).

The t-test comparing the pretest means and the posttest means of the attitudes and perceptions of the Buckeye Boys Ranch staff failed to reject Research Hypothesis 3. The difference between the means of the pretest and the posttest authoritarian/acquiescence scores, and between the means of the pretest and the posttest peer-esteem scores, were not significant.
The posttest autocratic/democratic mean score of 38.94 compared with the pretest autocratic/democratic mean score of 37.17 indicated movement away from the democratic attitudes and toward somewhat more autocratic attitudes. This was supported by the autocratic/democratic t-value of -1.71 at 35 degrees of freedom, which shows a trend toward significance at the .10 two-tailed probability level.

The posttest self-esteem mean score of 10.71 compared with the pretest self-esteem mean score of 11.51 indicated movement toward somewhat higher self-esteem. This was supported by the self-esteem t-value of 1.90 at 34 degrees of freedom, which approaches significance at the .07 two-tailed probability level. This is more graphically shown on Table 14.

Table 14: Differences Between the Pretest Means and the Posttest Means of the Attitudes and Perceptions of Buckeye Boys Ranch Staff, Using the T-Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS</th>
<th>BUCKEYE BOYS RANCH</th>
<th>T VALUE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-TAIL PROBABILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>authoritarian/acquiescence</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autocratic/democratic</td>
<td>37.17</td>
<td>38.94</td>
<td>-1.71</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-esteem</td>
<td>11.51</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peer-esteem</td>
<td>9.41</td>
<td>10.68</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since neither the autocratic/democratic nor the self-esteem mean scores reached the .05 level of significance, the findings failed to reject hypothesis 3, "there is no significant difference between the pre-training and the post-training measures of the attitudes and perceptions of the program group."

3) Research Hypothesis 4. There is no significant difference between the pretest and posttest measures of the attitudes and perceptions (authoritarian/acquiescence scores, autocratic/democratic scores, self-esteem scores, and peer-esteem scores) of the comparison group (Boys Village).

The t-test comparing the pretest means and the posttest means of the attitudes and perceptions of Boys Village staff failed to reject Research Hypothesis 4. Table 15 shows this finding:

Table 15: Differences Between the Pretest Means and the Posttest Means of the Attitudes and Perceptions of Boys Village Staff, Using the T-Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS</th>
<th>BOYS VILLAGE</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-TAIL PROBABILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRETEST</td>
<td>POSTTEST</td>
<td>VALUE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authoritarian/acquiescence</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autocratic/democratic</td>
<td>45.71</td>
<td>44.35</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-esteem</td>
<td>11.06</td>
<td>11.21</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peer-esteem</td>
<td>12.79</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The difference between the means of the pretest and the posttest authoritarian/acquiescence scores, between the means of the pretest and posttest autocratic/democratic scores, between the means of the pretest and posttest self-esteem scores, and between the means of the pretest and posttest peer-esteem scores, were not significant.

Since none of these mean scores reached the .05 level of significance, the findings failed to reject Hypothesis 4, "there is no significant difference between the pretest and posttest measures of the attitudes and perceptions of the comparison group."

4) Research Hypothesis 5. There is no significant difference in the attitudes and perceptions (authoritarian/acquiescence scores, autocratic/democratic scores, self-esteem scores, and peer-esteem scores) between the program group (Buckeye Boys Ranch) and the comparison group (Boys Village) following staff training.

The t-test comparing the posttest means of the attitudes and perceptions of Buckeye Boys Ranch staff and Boys Village staff partially rejected Research Hypothesis 5. Although the difference between the means of the posttest authoritarian/acquiescence scores, between the means of the self-esteem scores, and between the means of the peer-esteem scores, were all within the non-significant level, the difference between the means of the posttest autocratic/democratic scores was significant. This is shown on Table 16.

The posttest autocratic/democratic mean score of 38.94 for Buckeye Boys Ranch staff compared with the posttest
autocratic/democratic mean score of 44.35 for Boys Village staff, indicated that the Ranch staff was significantly more democratic than the Village staff at posttest. This was supported by a t-value of -2.38 at 68 degrees of freedom, which is significant at the .02 two-tailed probability level. This finding allows rejection of Hypothesis 5, "there is no significant difference in attitudes and perceptions between the program group and the comparison group, following staff training," for the autocratic/democratic scale.

Table 16: Difference Between the Posttest Means of the Attitudes and Perceptions of Buckeye Boys Ranch Staff and Boys Village Staff, Using the Pooled Variance Estimate of the T-Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSTTEST ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>POOLED VARIANCE</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-TAIL PROBABILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BUCKEYE BOYS</td>
<td>BOYS VILLAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authoritarian/</td>
<td>BOYS RANCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acquiescence</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>.44 (ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autocratic/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>democratic</td>
<td>38.94</td>
<td>44.35</td>
<td>-2.38</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-esteem</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.36 (ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peer-esteem</td>
<td>8.84</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.68 (ns)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since there were also significant differences in the pretest autocratic/democratic scores, this subsequent (post-test) finding is inconclusive at best.
Overall, there was definite movement of Boys Village staff and Buckeye Boys Ranch staff. This movement may represent the central tendency of test-retest mean scores. Table 17 shows the direction of the movement:

Table 17: Comparison of the Pretest/Posttest Mean Differences of Buckeye Boys Ranch Staff and Boys Village Staff, Showing the Direction of Movement of Attitudes and Perceptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRETEST/POSTTEST ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS</th>
<th>BUCKEYE BOYS RANCH</th>
<th>BOYS VILLAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRETEST MEAN</td>
<td>POSTTEST MEAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authoritarian/acquiescence</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>7.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autocratic/democratic</td>
<td>37.17</td>
<td>38.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-esteem</td>
<td>11.51</td>
<td>10.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peer-esteem</td>
<td>9.41</td>
<td>10.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Buckeye Boys Ranch mean scores indicate some slight movement toward authoritarian and autocratic attitudes, with an accompanying increase in peer-esteem and self-esteem. The Boys Village mean scores indicate some slight movement toward acquiescent and democratic attitudes, with an accompanying decrease in peer-esteem and self-esteem.
COVARIANCE, CONTROLLING DIFFERENCES

1) Assumption of Homogeneity of Regression

Before Hypothesis 6 could be tested, it was necessary to adjust for preexisting differences between the groups. The preliminary test for the assumption of homogeneous regression coefficients was used. This more robust approach to adjusting for differences between groups was used because each of three null hypotheses (Hypotheses 1, 2, and 5), suggesting that there was no difference between the program group and the comparison group, were rejected by either the chi-square or the t-test findings.

Since the groups were not comparable, it was necessary to correct for the differences in order to try to determine any relationship between the dependent and independent variables. The analysis of covariance was used to seek such relationships only after the assumption of homogeneity was tested. Tables 18, 19, and 20 show the composite F-scores testing the assumption of homogeneous regression coefficients.

Of the sixty regressions computed, six (10 percent) indicated some interaction by having F-scores greater than 4.00, with 1 degree of freedom, significant at $p > .05$ level. The X-axis and Y-axis scores of these six regressions were expanded. Five of the six regressions displayed nearly parallel slopes which were interactive but not
Table 18: Composite F-Scores, Testing the Assumption of Homogeneous Regression Coefficient of the Posttest Attitudes and Perceptions of Staff With the Covariates, Age, Education, Tenure, Experience, and Pretest Attitudes and Perceptions of Staff, by the Location of the Respondent's Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>POSTTEST DEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buckeye Boys Ranch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>auth/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys Village</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>auto/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>self-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>peer-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretest auth/acqu</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretest auto/demo</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretest self-esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretest peer-esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19: Composite F-Scores, Testing the Assumption of Homogeneous Regression Coefficients of the Posttest Attitudes and Perceptions of Staff With the Covariates, Age, Education, Tenure, Experience, and Pretest Attitudes and Perceptions of Staff, by the Sex of the Respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>POSTTEST DEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>auth/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>auto/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>self-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>peer-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretest auth/acqu</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretest auto/demo</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretest self-esteem</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretest peer-esteem</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
disordinal. The sixth regression was both interactive and disordinal.

Table 20. Composite F-Scores, Testing the Assumption of Homogeneous Regression Coefficients of the Posttest Attitudes and Perceptions of Staff With the Covariates, Age, Education, Tenure, Experience, and Pretest Attitudes and Perceptions of Staff, by the Position of the Respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>POSTTEST DEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>paraprofessional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>auth/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>auto/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supportive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>self-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>peer-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenure</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretest auth/acqu</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretest auto/demo</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretest self-esteem</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretest peer-esteem</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The six regressions with F-scores over 4.00 were presumed to be interactive. These regressions were as follows:

a) The respondent's age, by posttest peer-esteem scores, by location, with an F-score of 5.52, interacted at age 40.2 years, on the scale at which the youngest respondent was 20 years old and the eldest respondent was 62 years old. The slopes were very close, implying strong similarity between Buckeye Boys Ranch staff posttest peer-
esteem scores and Boys Village staff posttest peer-esteem scores, related to age.

Table 21 shows the expanded regression scores for age by posttest peer-esteem score by location. Figure 6 graphically depicts the slopes of these scores. The interaction was not significant, but the slopes indicate that the older the respondent the higher the peer-esteem, at both institutions.

Table 21: Testing the Assumption of Homogeneity of Regression by Expanding the X-Axis Scores, Age of the Respondents, and the Y-Axis Scores. Posttest Peer-Esteem Scores, to determine the Degree of Interaction Between Boys Village Staff and Buckeye Boys Ranch Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSTTEST PEER ESTEEM SCORE</th>
<th>BOYS VILLAGE (-16.9)(X)</th>
<th>BUCKEYE BOYS RANCH (-16.49)(X)</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.0</td>
<td>16.83</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>16.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-321.2</td>
<td>-329.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>-490.2</td>
<td>-494.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>-662.9</td>
<td>-662.9</td>
<td>interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>-828.2</td>
<td>-824.2</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>-997.2</td>
<td>-989.1</td>
<td>-8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>-1166.2</td>
<td>-1154.0</td>
<td>-12.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) The Respondent's age, by posttest authoritarian/acquiescence scores, by sex, with an F-score of 6.28, did not interact between the ages of 0 to 70 years old. The difference in the slopes was so slight that interaction could not occur during the life span of the respondents.
Figure 6. Testing the Assumption of Homogeneity of Regression of the X-Axis, Respondent's Age in Years, and the Y-Axis, Posttest Peer-Esteem Scores, Showing the Slopes and Interaction of the Institutional Staff.
The slopes were very close, indicating strong similarity between female respondents' posttest authoritarian/acquiescence scores and male respondents' posttest authoritarian/acquiescence scores, related to age. Table 22 shows the expanded regression scores by age, by posttest authoritarian/acquiescence scores, by sex. Figure 7 graphically depicts the slopes of these scores. There was no interaction, and the slopes indicate that the older the respondent the greater the tendency toward authoritarianism, regardless of the respondent's sex.

Table 22. Testing the Assumption of Homogeneity of Regression by Expanding the X-Axis Scores, Age of the Respondents, and the Y-Axis Scores, Posttest Authoritarian/Acquiescence Scores, to Determine the Degree of Interaction Between Female Staff and Male Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>POSTTEST AUTHORITARIAN/ACQUIESCENCE SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X-AXIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>128.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>158.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>188.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>219.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) The Respondent's tenure, by posttest authoritarian/acquiescence scores, by sex, with an F-score of 4.02, interacted at 44.5 months of tenure, on a scale ranging from 0 to 360 months. The slopes were very close, indicating
Figure 7. Testing the Assumption of Homogeneity of Regression of the X-Axis, Respondent's Age in Years, and the Y-Axis, Posttest Authoritarian/Acquiescence Scores, Showing the Slopes of the Male Staff and the Female Staff.
strong similarity between female respondents' posttest authoritarian/acquiescence scores and male respondent's posttest authoritarian/acquiescence scores, related to tenure. Table 23 shows the expanded regression scores for tenure, by posttest authoritarian/acquiescence scores, by sex. Figure 8 graphically depicts the slopes of these scores. The interaction was not significant, but the slopes indicate that the longer the tenure the greater the tendency toward authoritarianism, regardless of the respondent's sex.

Table 23: Testing the Assumption of Homogeneity of Regression by Expanding the X-Axis Scores, Respondent's Tenure, and the Y-Axis Scores, Posttest Authoritarian/Acquiescence Scores, to Determine the Degree of Interaction Between Female Staff and Male Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TENURE</th>
<th>POSTTEST AUTHORITARIAN/ACQUIESCENCE SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X-AXIS FEMALE (0.807) (X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>105.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>153.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>201.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>250.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>298.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) The respondents' pretest authoritarian/acquiescence scores, by posttest authoritarian/acquiescence scores, by sex, with an F-score of 6.41, did not interact within the parameters of the maximum score possible. The slopes were
Figure 8. Testing the Assumption of Homogeneity of Regression of the X-Axis, Respondent's Tenure in Months, and the Y-Axis, Posttest Authoritarian/Acquiescence Scores, Showing the Slopes and Interaction of the Male Staff and the Female Staff.
close, indicating similarity between female respondents' posttest authoritarian/acquiescence scores and male respondents' posttest authoritarian/acquiescence scores, related to male and female respondents' pretest authoritarian/acquiescence scores. Table 24 shows the expanded regression scores for pretest authoritarian/acquiescence scores.

Table 24: Testing the Assumption of Homogeneity of Regression by Expanding the X-Axis Scores, Pretest Authoritarian/Acquiescence Scores, and the Y-Axis Scores, Posttest Authoritarian/Acquiescence Scores, to Determine the Degree of Interaction Between Female Staff and Male Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X-AXIS</th>
<th>POSTTEST AUTHORITARIAN/ACQUIESCENCE SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEMALE (0.487)(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

by posttest authoritarian/acquiescence scores, by sex. Figure 9 graphically depicts the slopes of these scores. There was no actual interaction, but the slopes indicate that there was a slightly greater difference between males and females who have a tendency toward acquiescence at both pretest and posttest than there is between males and females who have a tendency toward authoritarianism at both pretest and posttest.
Figure 9. Testing the Assumption of Homogeneity of Regression of the X-Axis, Pretest Authoritarian/Acquiescence Scores, and the Y-Axis, Posttest Authoritarian/Acquiescence Scores, Showing the Slopes of the Male Staff and the Female Staff.
e) The respondents' experience, by posttest autocratic/democratic scores, by sex, with an F-score of 5.05, interacted at 71.8 months of experience. The slopes were very close, indicating strong similarity between male respondents' posttest autocratic/democratic scores and female respondents' posttest autocratic/democratic scores, related to experience. Table 25 shows the expanded regression scores for experience.

Table 25: Testing the Assumption of Homogeneity of Regression by Expanding the X-Axis Scores, Respondent's Experience, and the Y-Axis Scores, Posttest Autocratic/Democratic Scores, to Determine the Degree of Interaction Between Female Staff and Male Staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSTTEST AUTOCRATIC/DEMOCRATIC SCORES</th>
<th>X-AXIS</th>
<th>FEMALE (6.75)(X)</th>
<th>MALE (6.844)(X)</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>45.55</td>
<td>38.80</td>
<td>-6.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>248.1</td>
<td>244.1</td>
<td>-3.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>450.6</td>
<td>449.4</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>530.3</td>
<td>530.3</td>
<td>interaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>855.6</td>
<td>860.1</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>1260.6</td>
<td>1270.7</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>1665.6</td>
<td>1681.4</td>
<td>15.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>2070.6</td>
<td>2092.0</td>
<td>21.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>2475.6</td>
<td>2502.6</td>
<td>27.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
<td>2880.6</td>
<td>2913.3</td>
<td>32.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

by posttest autocratic/democratic scores, by sex. Figure 10 graphically depicts the slopes of these scores. The interaction was not significant, but the slopes indicate that the more prior related work experience held by the respondent the greater the tendency toward autocracy, regardless of the respondent's sex.
Figure 10. Testing the Assumption of Homogeneity of Regression of the X-Axis, Respondent's Experience in Months, and the Y-Axis, Posttest Autocratic/Democratic Scores, Showing the Slopes and Interaction of the Male Staff and the Female Staff.
f) The respondents' posttest self-esteem scores, by pretest self-esteem scores, by position, with an F-score of 5.12, was a three-way interactive regression intersecting at three points. The slope of the Paraprofessional staff (child care, recreation) posttest self-esteem scores related to their pretest self-esteem scores, was roughly parallel to the slope of the Professional staff (clinician, teacher, administrator) posttest self-esteem scores related to their pretest self-esteem scores. The slopes converged and intersected in the lower right quadrant of the graph, while significantly moving apart in the upper left quadrant.

Concurrently, the slope of the Supportive staff (food service, maintenance, laundry, secretarial, business) posttest self-esteem scores related to their pretest self-esteem scores, was disordinal to the slopes of both the Professional and the Paraprofessional staff, and moved from the upper right quadrant to the lower left quadrant, intersecting the slopes of the Paraprofessional and the Professional staff near the center of the graph where the four quadrants converge.

Table 26 shows the expanded regression scores for pretest self-esteem scores by posttest self-esteem scores, by the respondent's position. Figure 11 graphically depicts the slopes of these scores. The interaction was significant, and indicates that although self-esteem increased for Paraprofessional and Professional staff between pretest
Table 26: Testing the Assumption of Homogeneity of Regression by Expanding the X-Axis Scores, Pretest Self-Esteem Scores, and the Y-Axis Scores, Posttest Self-Esteem Scores, to Determine the Degree of Interaction Between Professional Staff, Paraprofessional Staff, Paraprofessional Staff, and Supportive Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X-AXIS</th>
<th>POSTTEST SELF-ESTEEM SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PARAPROFESSIONAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F1 (-7.14)(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>-199.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>-163.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.65</td>
<td>-147.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-128.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-92.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-56.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-21.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>10.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-5</td>
<td>50.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-10</td>
<td>86.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-15</td>
<td>121.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-20</td>
<td>157.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-25</td>
<td>193.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-30</td>
<td>228.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 11. Testing the Assumption of Homogeneity of Regression of the X-Axis, Pretest Self-Esteem Scores, and the Y-Axis, Posttest Self-Esteem Scores, Showing the Slopes and Interactions of the Paraprofessional Staff, the Professional Staff, and the Supportive Staff.
and posttest, Supportive staff self-esteem decreased during the same period.

With this one exception the apparent interaction of the other five regressions did not appear to affect the covariance test results significantly. Overall, the tenability of the assumption of equal regression slopes is supported, thus permitting the use of the conventional analysis of covariance.

2) Analysis of Covariance

The use of the analysis of covariance design was to control statistically any initial differences in staff attitudes and perceptions which might have been present and which might confound differences between the staff at Buckeye Boys Ranch and the staff at Boys Village. The analysis of covariance was used to test one hypothesis, with the \( p > .05 \) level established as the point of significance.

1) Research Hypothesis 6. There is no significant relationship between demographic characteristics (age, sex, education, experience, position, and tenure) and pretest/posttest measures of attitudes and perceptions (authoritarian/acquiescence scores, autocratic/democratic scores, self-esteem scores, and peer-esteem scores) when comparing the program group (Buckeye Boys Ranch) with the comparison group (Boys Village).

The analysis of covariance failed to reject Research Hypothesis 6, indicating that the treatment did not appear to have any measurable effect. The analysis of covariance was calculated three times, with slightly different
statistical emphasis as shown by the composite F-scores. These F-scores were calculated individually for each of the posttest dependent variables, and are shown on Tables 27 to 29. The analysis of covariance sought the source of variation in each individual posttest dependent variable (authoritarian/acquiescence scores, autocratic/democratic scores, self-esteem scores, and peer-esteem scores) by three main effects (location, sex, and position, with five covariates (age, education, experience, tenure, and the specific appropriate pretest dependent variable). In addition, 2-way interactions (location by sex, location by position, and sex by position) and 3-way interactions (location by sex by position) were analyzed.

The only significant source of variation was that each pretest dependent variable explained its own posttest dependent variable. The F-scores of 7.58, 7.52, and 8.53 were respectively significant at the .008, .009, and .006 levels for the self-esteem pretest/posttest scores. The authoritarian/acquiescence pretest/posttest F-scores of 100.94, 92.68, and 89.08 were each significant at the .001 level. The autocratic/democratic pretest/posttest F-scores of 67.27, 60.88, and 55.09 were each significant at the .001 level. The peer-esteem pretest/posttest F-scores of 26.74, 27.18, and 26.33 were significant at the .001 level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF VARIATION</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SELF-ESTEEM F</th>
<th>sig F</th>
<th>AUTH/ACQUI F</th>
<th>sig F</th>
<th>AUTO/Demo F</th>
<th>sig F</th>
<th>PEER ESTEEM F</th>
<th>sig F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COVARIATES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. age</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>32.48</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>20.97</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. tenure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. pretest score</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. self-esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. auth/acqui</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.94</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. auto/demo</td>
<td></td>
<td>67.27</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. peer esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.74</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAIN EFFECTS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. location</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. position</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPLAINED</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>18.42</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>11.68</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28. Sources of Variation Explained in the Dependent Variables, Posttest Self-Esteem Scores, Posttest Authoritarian/Acquiescence Scores, Posttest Autocratic/Democratic Scores, and Posttest Peer-Esteem Scores, When the Main Effects, Location, Sex, Position, Age, Education, Tenure, Experience, and Pretest Attitudes and Perceptions Scores, the Two-Way Interactions, Location by Sex, Location by Position, and Sex by Position, Are Statistically Controlled For Initial Differences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF VARIATION</th>
<th>DP</th>
<th>POSTTEST SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SELF-ESTEEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F sig F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAIN EFFECTS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.21 0.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. location</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.45 0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.34 0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. position</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.25 0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08 0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.53 0.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. tenure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02 0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.18 0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. pretest score</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.43 0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. self-esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. auth/acqui</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. auto/demo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. peer/esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-WAY INTERACTIONS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.62 0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. location, by sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.34 0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. location, by position</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.21 0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. sex, by position</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.03 0.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-WAY INTERACTIONS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.72 0.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. location, by sex, by position</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.72 0.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPLAINED</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.09 0.394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF VARIATION</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>POSTTEST SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SELF-ESTEEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVARIATES</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. tenure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. pretest score</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. self-esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. auth/acqui</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. auto/demo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. peer esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAIN EFFECTS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. location</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. position</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-WAY INTERACTIONS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. location, by sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. location, by position</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. sex, by position</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-WAY INTERACTIONS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. location, by sex, by position</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPLAINED</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Neither the other covariates nor the main effects explained the variation, and the finding that the individual posttest dependent variable scores were explained by the same pretest dependent variable scores, was not significant. The treatment (staff training) did not appear to have any measurable effect.

At this point, the researcher decided to use the multiple regression statistical technique, in an attempt to analyze the relationship between dependent and independent variables to see which factors explained the variation in the scores of the dependent variable.

REGRESSION, SEEKING PREDICTIVE FACTORS

These regressions were performed on sample data which the researcher was interested in generalizing to a larger population. The overall "goodness of fit" test used statistical inference procedures to test the null hypothesis that the multiple correlation is "zero" in the population from which the sample was drawn. The assumption was made that if the F-score was not significant at the $P = > .05$ level, it indicated that either the null hypothesis was true or there was some fluctuation in the sampling procedure.

The regression equation was used to test two research hypotheses. From each of these research hypotheses, four sub-hypotheses were derived. Twenty-one tables were
prepared to more clearly define the relationship between dependent and independent variables to see which factors predicted or explained the variation in the scores of the dependent variables: Tables 30 to 39 show the significance of the regression scores of the dependent variables and the independent demographic characteristics of Buckeye Boys Ranch staff; Tables 40 to 49 show the significance of the regression scores of the dependent variables and the independent demographic characteristics of Boys Village staff; and Table 50 shows the comparison of both institutions related to the eight sub-hypotheses.

The research hypotheses and the sub-hypotheses are as follows:

1) Research Hypothesis 7. There is no significant relationship between demographic characteristics (age, sex, education, experience, position, and tenure) and measures of attitudes and perceptions (authoritarian/acquiescence scores, autocratic/democratic scores, self-esteem scores, and peer-esteem scores) when comparing the pretest and posttest measures of the program group Buckeye Boys Ranch, following staff training.

Four research sub-hypotheses were derived, comparing each individual pretest/posttest dependent variable with the demographic characteristics of the Buckeye Boys Ranch staff. Regressions were computed twice for each sub-hypothesis: the first regression tested for the independent demographic factors which predicted or explained the step-by-step variation in the pretest scores and the posttest scores of the specific dependent variable; and, the second
regression tested for the independent demographic factors which predicted or explained the cumulative variation in the pretest scores and the posttest scores of the specific dependent variable.

The F-ratios for each individual step were not presumed to be as significant as the cumulative scores, since it was assumed that values obtained could be due to measurement error or sampling fluctuations. Individual demographic factors which appeared to explain at least ten percent or more of the variation in the scores of the dependent variables, were perceived to be approaching significance.

Table 39 shows the Mean Squares and degrees of freedom of the Regression analysis and the Residual analysis, of each of the dependent variables, the final F-scores, and the significance of each F-score. For the Buckeye Boys Ranch staff demographic characteristics, none of these F-scores were significant at the $P = > .05$ level.

a) Research Sub-Hypothesis 7a. There is no significant relationship between demographic characteristics (age, sex, education, experience, position, and tenure) and the pretest/posttest measures (scores) of authoritarian/acquiescence attitudes and perceptions of Buckeye Boys Ranch staff, following staff training.

The independent demographic factors (position, tenure, experience, education, sex, and age) explained 14 percent of the variation in the scores of the dependent variable
(pretest authoritarian/acquiescence scores) for Buckeye Boys Ranch staff. Table 30 shows that the multiple step regression F-scores were not significant.

The cumulative final F-score of 0.74 at 6 df (regression) and 24 df (residual) was not significant. Research Sub-Hypothesis 7a was not rejected, for pretest authoritarian/acquiescence scores.

Table 30: Percentage of the Variation in the Dependent Variable, Pretest Authoritarian/Acquiescence Scores, Explained by the Independent Variables, Position, Tenure, Experience, Education, Sex, and Age, of the Buckeye Boys Ranch Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>F-SCORE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE OF F</th>
<th>EXPLAINED VARIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>position</td>
<td>0.877</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
<td>.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenure</td>
<td>1.270</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
<td>.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
<td>.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
<td>.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
<td>.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The independent demographic factors (education, tenure, experience, sex, and position) explained 7 percent of the variation in the scores of the dependent variable (post-test authoritarian/acquiescence scores) for Buckeye Boys Ranch staff. Table 31 shows that the multiple step regression F-scores were not significant.

The cumulative final F-score of 0.34 at 5 df (regression) and 25 df (residual) was not significant. Research
Sub-Hypothesis 7a was not rejected, for posttest authoritarian/acquiescence scores.

Table 31: Percentage of the Variation in the Dependent Variable, Posttest Authoritarian/Acquiescence Scores, Explained by the Independent Variables, Education, Tenure, Experience, Sex, and Position, of the Buckeye Boys Ranch Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>F-SCORE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE OF F</th>
<th>EXPLAINED VARIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td>1.047</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
<td>.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenure</td>
<td>0.696</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
<td>.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
<td>.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
<td>.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>position</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
<td>.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Research Sub-Hypothesis 7b. There is no significant relationship between demographic characteristics (age, sex, education, experience, position, and tenure) and the pretest/posttest measures (scores) of autocratic/democratic attitudes and perceptions of Buckeye Boys Ranch Staff, following staff training.

The independent demographic factors (education, sex, tenure and experience) explained 23 percent of the variation in the scores of the dependent variable (pretest autocratic/democratic scores) for Buckeye Boys Ranch staff. Table 32 shows that the variable "education," with an F-score of 6.83, was significant, and explained 19 percent of the variation in the dependent variable.

The cumulative final F-score of 1.94 at 4 df (regression) and 26 df (residual) was not significant. Research Sub-Hypothesis 7b was not rejected, for pretest autocratic/democratic scores.
Table 32: Percentage of the Variation in the Dependent Variable, Pretest Autocratic/Democratic Scores, Explained by the Independent Variables, Education, Sex, Tenure, and Experience, of the Buckeye Boys Ranch Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>F-SCORE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE OF F</th>
<th>EXPLAINED VARIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td>6.831</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td>.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
<td>.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenure</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
<td>.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
<td>.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The independent demographic factors (education, sex, tenure, position, experience, and age) explained 18 percent of the variation in the scores of the dependent variable (posttest autocratic/democratic scores) for Buckeye Boys Ranch staff. Table 33 shows that the variable "education" with an F-score of 3.61, was significant, and explained 12 percent of the variation in the dependent variable.

The cumulative final F-score of 0.91 at 6 df (regression) and 24 df (residual) was not significant. Research Sub-Hypothesis 7b was not rejected, for posttest autocratic/democratic scores.

c) Research Sub-Hypothesis 7c. There is no significant relationship between demographic characteristics (age, sex, education, experience, position, and tenure) and the pretest/posttest measures (scores) of self-esteem attitudes and perceptions of Buckeye Boys Ranch staff, following staff training.
Table 33: Percentage of the Variation in the Dependent Variable, Posttest Autocratic/Democratic Scores, Explained by the Independent Variables, Education, Sex, Tenure, Position, Experience, and Age, of the Buckeye Boys Ranch Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>F-SCORE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE OF F</th>
<th>EXPLAINED VARIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td>3.614</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td>.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td>1.337</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
<td>.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenure</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
<td>.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>position</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
<td>.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
<td>.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
<td>.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The independent demographic factors (age, position, experience, and sex) explained 18 percent of the variation in the scores of the dependent variable (pretest self-esteem scores) for Buckeye Boys Ranch Staff. Table 34 shows that the variables "age" and "position" approach significance, but the multiple step regression F-scores were not significant.

The cumulative final F-score of 1.51 at 4 df (regression) and 26 df (residual) was not significant. Research Sub-Hypothesis 7c was not rejected, for pretest self-esteem scores.

The independent demographic factors (sex, education, experience, age, and tenure) explained 4 percent of the variation in the scores of the dependent variable (post-test self-esteem scores) for Buckeye Boys Ranch staff. Table 35 shows that the multiple step regression F-scores were not significant.
Table 34: Percentage of the Variation in the Dependent Variable, Pretest Self-Esteem Scores, Explained by the Independent Variables, Age, Position, Experience, and Sex, of the Buckeye Boys Ranch Staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>F-SCORE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE OF F</th>
<th>EXPLAINED VARIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
<td>.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>position</td>
<td>1.780</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
<td>.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td>0.483</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
<td>.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
<td>.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cumulative final F-score of 0.25 at 5 df (regression) and 24 df (residual) was not significant. Research Sub-Hypothesis 7c was not rejected, for posttest self-esteem scores.

Table 35. Percentage of the Variation in the Dependent Variable, Posttest Self-Esteem Scores, Explained by the Independent Variables, Sex, Education, Experience, Age, and Tenure, of the Buckeye Boys Ranch Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>F-SCORE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE OF F</th>
<th>EXPLAINED VARIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
<td>.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td>0.710</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
<td>.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td>0.322</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
<td>.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
<td>.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenure</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
<td>.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) Research Sub-Hypothesis 7d. There is no significant relationship between demographic characteristics (age, sex, education, experience, position, and tenure) and the pretest/posttest measures (scores) of peer-esteem attitudes and perceptions of Buckeye Boys Ranch staff, following staff training.
The independent demographic factors (tenure, sex, age, experience, and position) explained 21 percent of the variation in the scores of the dependent variable (pretest peer-esteem scores) for Buckeye Boys Ranch staff. Table 36 shows that the variable "tenure," with an F-score of 4.33, was significant, and explained 17 percent of the variation in the dependent variable.

The cumulative final F-score of 0.87 at 5 df (regression) and 16 df (residual) was not significant. Research Sub-Hypothesis 7d was not rejected, for pretest peer-esteem scores.

Table 36: Percentage of the Variation in the Dependent Variable, Pretest Peer-Esteem Scores, Explained by the Independent Variables, Tenure, Sex, Age, Experience, and Position, of the Buckeye Boys Ranch Staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>F-SCORE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE OF F</th>
<th>EXPLAINED VARIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tenure</td>
<td>4.330</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td>.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td>0.572</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
<td>.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>0.369</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
<td>.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
<td>.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>position</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
<td>.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The independent demographic factors (tenure, education, position, age, sex, and experience) explained 42 percent of the variation in the scores of the dependent variable (posttest peer-esteem scores) for Buckeye Boys Ranch staff. Table 37 shows that the variable "tenure," with an F-score
Table 37: Percentage of the Variation in the Dependent Variable, Posttest Peer-Esteem Scores, Explained by the Independent Variables, Tenure, Education, Position, Age, Sex, and Experience, of Buckeye Boys Ranch Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>F-SCORE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE OF F</th>
<th>EXPLAINED VARIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tenure</td>
<td>4.527</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td>.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td>3.296</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td>.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>position</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
<td>.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
<td>.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td>0.684</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
<td>.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
<td>.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of 4.54, was significant, and explained 17 percent of the variation in the dependent variable; and, the variable "education," with an F-score of 3.30, was significant, and explained 11 percent of the variation in the dependent variable.

The cumulative final F-score of 1.66 at 6 df (regression) and 21 df (residual) was not significant. Research Sub-Hypothesis 7d was not rejected, for posttest peer-esteem scores.

Each of the four sub-hypotheses failed to reject Research Hypothesis 7, "there is no significant relationship between demographic characteristics and pretest/posttest measures of attitudes and perceptions of the Buckeye Boys Ranch staff, following staff training." Table 38 provides an overview:
Table 38: Percentage of the Demographic Factors Which Appear to Explain Some of the Variation in the Dependent Variables, Pretest and Posttest Measures of Attitudes and Perceptions of Buckeye Boys Ranch Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS</th>
<th>INDEPENDENT DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS</th>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>TENURE</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUTH/ACQU</td>
<td>PRETEST</td>
<td>.01 .03 .02 .04 .04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POSTTEST</td>
<td>.01 .03 .01 .02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTO/DEMO</td>
<td>PRETEST</td>
<td>.02 .19 .02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POSTTEST</td>
<td>.03 .12 .02 .01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-ESTEEM</td>
<td>PRETEST</td>
<td>.08 .01 .09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POSTTEST</td>
<td>.02 .01 .01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEER-ESTEEM</td>
<td>PRETEST</td>
<td>.02 .02 .17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POSTTEST</td>
<td>.02 .11 .17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 39: Significance of the Regression Cumulative Final F-Scores, of the Relationship Between the Dependent Pretest/Posttest Attitudes and Perceptions Scores and the Independent Demographic Characteristics, to Determine Which Factors Predicted or Explained the Variation in the Scores of the Dependent Variables for Buckeye Boys Ranch Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
<th>REGRESSION</th>
<th>RESIDUAL</th>
<th>FINAL</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE OF F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUTH/ACQU Pretest</td>
<td>1.43 6</td>
<td>1.93 24</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>0.68 5</td>
<td>2.01 25</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTO/DEMO Pretest</td>
<td>174.41 4</td>
<td>89.68 26</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>80.67 6</td>
<td>88.17 24</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-ESTEEM Pretest</td>
<td>8.10 4</td>
<td>5.36 26</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>2.09 5</td>
<td>8.22 24</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEER-ESTEEM Posttest</td>
<td>52.39 5</td>
<td>60.34 16</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>128.13 6</td>
<td>77.15 21</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2) Research Hypothesis 8. There is no significant relationship between demographic characteristics (age, sex, education, experience, position, and tenure) and measures of attitudes and perceptions (authoritarian/acquiescence scores, autocratic/democratic scores, self-esteem scores, and peer-esteem scores) when comparing the pretest and posttest measures of the comparison group (Boys Village).

Four research sub-hypotheses were derived, comparing each individual pretest/posttest dependent variable with the demographic characteristics of the Boys Village staff. Regressions were computed twice for each sub-hypothesis: the first regression tested for the independent demographic factors which predicted or explained the step-by-step variation in the pretest scores and the posttest scores of the specific dependent variable; and, the second regression tested for the independent demographic factors which predicted or explained the cumulative variation in the pretest scores and the posttest scores of the specific dependent variable.

The F-ratios for each individual step were not presumed to be as significant as the cumulative scores, since it was assumed that values obtained could be due to measurement error or sampling fluctuations. Individual demographic factors which appeared to explain at least ten percent or more of the variation in the scores of the dependent variables, were perceived to be approaching significance.
Table 49 shows the Mean Squares and degrees of freedom of the Regression analysis and the Residual analysis, of each of the dependent variables, the final F-scores, and the significance of each F-score. For the Boys Village staff demographic characteristics, four of these F-scores were significant at the P = > .05 level. These are discussed in detail near the end of this chapter.

a) **Research Sub-Hypothesis 8a.** There is no significant relationship between demographic characteristics (age, sex, education, experience, position, and tenure) and the pretest/posttest measures (scores) of authoritarian/acquiescence attitudes and perceptions of Boys Village staff.

The independent demographic factors (education, experience, position, tenure, and sex) explained 43 percent of the variation in the scores of the dependent variable (pretest authoritarian/acquiescence scores) for Boys Village staff. Table 40 shows that the variable "education," with an F-score of 10.66, was significant, and explained 21 percent of the variation in the dependent variable; and, the variable "experience," with an F-score of 4.66, was significant, and explained 20 percent of the variation in the dependent variable.

The cumulative final F-score of 14.32 at 5 df (regression) and 27 df (residual) was significant at the P = > .01 level. Research Sub-Hypothesis 8a was rejected, for pretest authoritarian/acquiescence scores.
Table 40: Percentage of the Variation in the Dependent Variable, Pretest Authoritarian/Acquiescence Scores, Explained by the Independent Variables, Education, Experience, Position, Tenure, and Sex, of the Boys Village Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>F-SCORE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE OF F</th>
<th>EXPLAINED VARIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td>10.664</td>
<td>&gt; .01</td>
<td>.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td>4.664</td>
<td>&gt; .01</td>
<td>.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>position</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
<td>.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenure</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
<td>.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
<td>.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The independent demographic factors (experience, education, tenure, sex, age, and position) explained 43 percent of the variation in the scores of the dependent variable (posttest authoritarian/acquiescence scores) for Boys Village staff. Table 41 shows that the variable "experience," with an F-score of 6.04 was significant, and explained 17 percent of the variation in the dependent variable; and, the variable "education," with an F-score of 7.27, was significant and explained 20 percent of the variation in the dependent variable.

The cumulative final F-score of 3.04 at 6 df (regression) and 26 df (residual) was significant at the P = > .05 level. Research Sub-Hypothesis 8a was rejected, for posttest authoritarian/acquiescence scores.
Table 41: Percentage of the Variation in the Dependent Variable, Posttest Authoritarian/Acquiescence Scores, Explained by the Independent Variables, Experience, Education, Tenure, Sex, Age, and Position, of the Boys Village Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>F-SCORE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE OF F</th>
<th>EXPLAINED VARIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td>6.042</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td>.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td>7.270</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td>.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenure</td>
<td>0.382</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
<td>.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
<td>.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
<td>.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>position</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>&lt; .05 (ns)</td>
<td>.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Research Sub-Hypothesis 8b. There is no significant relationship between demographic characteristics (age, sex, education, experience, position, and tenure) and the pretest/posttest measures (scores) of autocratic/democratic attitudes and perceptions of Boys Village staff.

The independent demographic factors (education, age, experience, position, tenure, and sex) explained 63 percent of the variation in the scores of the dependent variable (pretest autocratic/democratic scores) for Boys Village staff. Table 42 shows that the variable "education," with an F-score of 9.74, was significant, and explained 29 percent of the variation in the dependent variable; and, the variable "age," with an F-score of 5.14, was significant, and explained 16 percent of the variation in the dependent variable.

The cumulative final F-score of 5.10 at 6 df (regression) and 26 df (residual) was significant at the $P = > .01$ level. Research Sub-Hypothesis 8b was rejected, for pretest autocratic/democratic scores.
Table 42: Percentage of the Variation in the Dependent Variable, Pretest Autocratic/Democratic Scores, Explained by the Independent Variables, Education, Age, Experience, Position, Tenure, and Sex, of the Boys Village Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>F-SCORE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE OF F</th>
<th>EXPLAINED VARIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td>9.736</td>
<td>&gt;.01</td>
<td>.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>5.142</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
<td>.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td>0.685</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
<td>.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>position</td>
<td>1.024</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
<td>.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenure</td>
<td>0.643</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
<td>.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
<td>.01%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The independent demographic factors (education, experience, position, age, tenure, and sex) explained 30 percent of the variation in the scores of the dependent variable (posttest autocratic/democratic scores) for Boys Village staff. Table 43 shows the variable "education," with an F-score of 5.85, was significant, and explained 23 percent of the variation in the dependent variable.

The cumulative final F-score of 1.82 at 6 df (regression) and 26 df (residual) was not significant. Research Sub-Hypothesis 8b was not rejected, for posttest autocratic/democratic scores.

c) Research Sub-Hypothesis 8c. There is not significant relationship between demographic characteristics (age, sex, education, experience, position, and tenure) and the pretest/posttest measures (scores) of self-esteem attitudes and perceptions of Boys Village staff.
Table 43: Percentage of Variation in the Dependent Variable, Posttest Autocratic/Democratic Scores, Explained by the Independent Variables, Education, Experience, Position, Age, Tenure, and Sex, of the Boys Village Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>F-SCORE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE OF F</th>
<th>EXPLAINED VARIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td>5.851</td>
<td>&gt;.01</td>
<td>.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
<td>.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>position</td>
<td>0.455</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
<td>.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
<td>.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenure</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
<td>.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
<td>.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The independent demographic factors (education, age, tenure, sex, experience, and position) explained 22 percent of the variation in the scores of the dependent variable (pretest self-esteem scores) for Boys Village staff. Table 44 shows that the multiple step regression F-scores were not significant.

The cumulative final F-score of 1.24 at 6 df (regression) and 25 df (residual) was not significant. Research Sub-Hypothesis 8c was not rejected, for pretest self-esteem scores.

The independent demographic factors (education, tenure, age, sex, position, and experience) explained 11 percent of the variation in the scores of the dependent variable (posttest self-esteem scores) for Boys Village staff. Table 45 shows that the multiple step regression F-scores were not significant.
Table 44: Percentage of Variation in the Dependent Variable, Pretest Self-Esteem Scores, Explained by the Independent Variables, Education, Age, Tenure, Sex, Experience, and Position, of the Boys Village staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>F-SCORE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE OF F</th>
<th>EXPLAINED VARIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td>5.294</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
<td>.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>2.898</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
<td>.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenure</td>
<td>3.656</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
<td>.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td>1.202</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
<td>.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
<td>.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>position</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
<td>.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cumulative final F-score of 0.54 at 6 df (regression) and 26 df (residual) was not significant. Research Sub-Hypothesis 8c was not rejected, for posttest self-esteem scores.

Table 45: Percentage of Variation in the Dependent Variable, Posttest Self-Esteem Scores, Explained by the Independent Variables, Education, Tenure, Age, Sex, Position, and Experience, of the Boys Village Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>F-SCORE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE OF F</th>
<th>EXPLAINED VARIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
<td>.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenure</td>
<td>1.197</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
<td>.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>0.910</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
<td>.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
<td>.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>position</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
<td>.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
<td>.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d) Research Sub-Hypothesis 8d. There is no significant relationship between demographic characteristics (age, sex, education, experience, position, and tenure) and the pretest/posttest measures (scores) of peer-esteem attitudes and perceptions of Boys Village staff.

The independent demographic factors (sex, education, experience, position, age, and tenure) explained 50 percent of the variation in the scores of the dependent variable (pretest peer-esteem scores) for Boys Village staff. Table 46 shows the variable "sex," with an F-score of 5.76, was significant, and explained 25 percent of the variation in the dependent variable; and, the variable "education," with an F-score of 3.55, was significant, and explained 13 percent of the variation in the dependent variable.

Table 46: Percentage of Variation in the Dependent Variable, Pretest Peer-Esteem Scores, Explained by the Independent Variables, Sex, Education, Experience, Position, Age, and Tenure, of the Boys Village Staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
<th>F-SCORE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE OF F</th>
<th>EXPLAINED VARIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td>5.764</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
<td>.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td>3.545</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
<td>.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td>0.577</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
<td>.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>position</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
<td>.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>0.284</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
<td>.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenure</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
<td>.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cumulative Final F-score of 3.00 at 6 df (regression) and 18 df (residual) was significant at the P = > .05 level. Research Sub-Hypothesis 8d was rejected, for pretest peer-esteem scores.
The independent demographic factors (education, sex, age, experience, and tenure) explained 33 percent of the variation in the scores of the dependent variable (posttest peer-esteeem scores) for Boys Village staff. Table 47 shows the variable "education," with an F-score of 2.94, was significant and explained 23 percent of the variation in the dependent variable.

The cumulative final F-score of 2.16 at 5 df (regression) and 23 df (residual) was not significant. Research Sub-Hypothesis 8d was not rejected, for posttest peer-esteeem scores.

Table 47. Percentage of Variation in the Dependent Variable, Posttest Peer-Esteeem Scores, Explained by the Independent Variables, Education, Sex, Age, Experience, and Tenure, of the Boys Village staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
<th>F-SCORE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE OF F</th>
<th>EXPLAINED VARIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td>2.943</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
<td>.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td>1.872</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
<td>.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
<td>.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
<td>.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenure</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
<td>.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three of the sub-hypotheses were rejected, and one sub-hypothesis failed to reject, Research Hypothesis 8, "there is no significant relationship between demographic characteristics and pretest/posttest measures of attitudes and perceptions, of Boys Village staff." Table 48 provides an overview:
Table 48: Percentage of the Demographic Factors Which Appear to explain some of the Variation in the Dependent Variables, Pretest and Posttest Measures of Attitudes and Perceptions of Boys Village Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
<th>ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS</th>
<th>INDEPENDENT DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDUCA-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTO/ACQU</td>
<td>PRETEST</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POSTTEST</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTO/DEMO</td>
<td>PRETEST</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POSTTEST</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-ESTEEM</td>
<td>PRETEST</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POSTTEST</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEER-ESTEEM</td>
<td>PRETEST</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POSTTEST</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 49: Significance of the Regression Cumulative Final F-Scores, of the Relationship Between the Dependent Pretest/Posttest Attitudes and Perceptions Scores and the Independent Demographic Characteristics, to Determine Which Factors Predicted or Explained the Variation in the Scores of the Dependent Variables for Boys Village Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
<th>REGRESSION MEAN</th>
<th>REGRESSION df</th>
<th>RESIDUAL MEAN</th>
<th>RESIDUAL df</th>
<th>FINAL F-SCORE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE OF F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUTH/ACQU</td>
<td>14.32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>&gt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTO/DEMO</td>
<td>369.02</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>72.30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>&gt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>159.74</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>87.73</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-ESTEEM</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEER-ESTEEM</td>
<td>207.37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>69.18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>131.43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60.81</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>&lt;.05 (ns)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eight null research sub-hypotheses were tested, looking at the degree of significance of the relationship between the dependent and independent variables to see which factors explained the variation in the scores of the dependent variables. The following findings emerged:

BUCKEYE BOYS RANCH: The independent variable, "education," was a factor which explained the variance of the scores in three dependent variables: pretest autocratic/democratic scores; posttest autocratic/democratic scores; and posttest peer-esteem scores. The independent variable, "tenure," was a factor which explained the variance of the scores in two dependent variables: pretest peer-esteem scores; and posttest peer-esteem scores.

The four null sub-hypotheses which sought to test Research Hypothesis 7 were not rejected when subjected to the more rigorous regression cumulative final F-score test. Consequently, Research Hypothesis 7, "there is no significant relationship between demographic characteristics and measures of attitudes and perceptions when comparing the pretest and posttest measures of the program group," was not rejected.

BOYS VILLAGE: The independent variable, "age," was a factor which explained the variance of the scores in the dependent variable, pretest autocratic/democratic scores. The independent variable, "sex," was a factor which explained the variance of the scores in the dependent
variable, pretest peer-esteem scores. The independent variable, "education," was a factor which explained the variance of the scores in six dependent variables: pretest authoritarian/acquiescence scores; posttest authoritarian/acquiescence scores; pretest autocratic/democratic scores; posttest autocratic/democratic scores; pretest peer-esteem scores; and posttest peer-esteem scores. The independent variable, "tenure," was a factor which explained the variance of the scores in two dependent variables: pretest authoritarian/acquiescence scores; and posttest authoritarian/acquiescence scores.

Of the four null sub-hypotheses which sought to test Research Hypothesis 8, three were rejected and one was not rejected when subjected to the more rigorous regression cumulative final F-score test. Consequently, Research Hypothesis 8, "There is no significant relationship between demographic characteristics and measures of attitudes and perceptions when comparing the pretest and posttest measures of the comparison group," was rejected.

Table 50 compares the significance of the regression cumulative final F-scores for Buckeye Boys Ranch and Boys Village; shows the percentage of the variation explained for the variance in the dependent variables; and shows the status (rejected, or not rejected) of each sub-hypothesis tested.
Table 50: Comparison of the Independent Demographic Characteristics, Age, Sex, Education, Experience, Tenure, and Position, Explaining the Variation in the Scores of the Dependent Variables, Significant at the $P > .05$ Level; the Overall Percentage of the Variation Explained in Each Sub-Hypothesis; and the Status, Rejected or Not Rejected, of Each Sub-Hypothesis Tested, for Buckeye Boys Ranch and Boys Village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>INDEPENDENT DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>sub-hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>SEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTO/ACQU SCORES</td>
<td>BBR</td>
<td>pre test</td>
<td>post test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BV</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTO/DEMO SCORES</td>
<td>BBR</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BV</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-ESTEEM SCORES</td>
<td>BBR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PER-ESTEEM SCORES</td>
<td>BBR</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BV</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion of the Findings

This study addressed the general hypothesis,

... prescriptive staff development has a significant measurable impact on staff attitudes and perceptions as measured by paper and pencil tests.

This was restated as,

... there is a significant relationship between staff development and changes in staff attitudes and perceptions, as measured by paper and pencil tests.

Eight hypotheses were explicated from the general hypothesis:

a. three hypotheses speculated that there were no significant differences between staff of Buckeye Boys Ranch and staff of Boys Village, in,

1) hypothesis 1, selected demographic characteristics,

2) hypothesis 2, pretest attitudes and perceptions, and,

3) hypothesis 5, posttest attitudes and perceptions.

Hypothesis 1, Hypothesis 2, and Hypothesis 5 were rejected. It was found that Boys Village had significantly older staff, with significantly longer tenure, than did Buckeye Boys Ranch. In addition, Buckeye Boys Ranch staff level of education was enough higher than Boys Village staff, that it approached significance. Also, the Boys Village staff tended to be significantly more autocratic and the Buckeye Boys Ranch staff tended to be significantly more democratic, when compared with each other at both pretest and posttest. The groups retained approximately the same
difference at posttest as they displayed at pretest.

b. Two hypotheses speculated that there would be no change in responses between pretest attitudes and perceptions and posttest attitudes and perceptions, in,

1) **hypothesis 3**, Buckeye Boys Ranch staff, and,

2) **hypothesis 4**, Boys Village staff.

Neither Hypothesis 3 nor Hypothesis 4 were rejected. It was found that although there was slight movement toward increased autocracy, and a modest increase, approaching significance, in self-esteem, the attitudes and perceptions of Buckeye Boys Ranch staff did not significantly change between pretest and posttest, despite the intervening variable of staff training. There was no significant change in the attitudes and perceptions of Boys Village staff, between the pretest and posttest measurements, although there did appear to be slight reciprocal movement in staff of both Buckeye Boys Ranch and Boys Village, as shown on Table 17. The Buckeye Boys Ranch staff moved slightly toward authoritarian and autocratic attitudes, with an accompanying increase in peer-esteem and self-esteem. Concurrently, the Boys Village staff moved slightly toward acquiescent and democratic attitudes, with an accompanying decrease in peer-esteem and self-esteem. This may reflect the central tendency of Mean scores in a test/retest situation.
c. three hypotheses speculated that there would be no significant relationship between demographic characteristics and pretest/posttest attitudes and perceptions, in,

1) **hypothesis 6**, between Buckeye Boys Ranch staff and Boys Village staff,

2) **hypothesis 7**, of Buckeye Boys Ranch staff only, and,

3) **hypothesis 8**, of Boys Village staff only.

Hypothesis 6 was not rejected. Preliminary findings for both groups indicated that the older, more tenured respondents tended to be more authoritarian and more highly esteemed by their peers; and, staff with prior related work experience tended to be more autocratic than staff without prior related work experience. Also, while Paraprofessional and Professional staff self-esteem increased between pretest and posttest, Supportive staff self-esteem decreased between pretest and posttest. However, with the preexisting differences between the Buckeye Boys Ranch staff and the Boys Village staff statistically corrected, there was no significant difference between the pretest and the posttest measurements.

The only significant source of variation in hypothesis 6 was that each pretest dependent variable explained its own posttest dependent variable. Staff training did not appear to have any measurable impact or effect on the Buckeye Boys Ranch staff.
Hypothesis 7 was not rejected. In analyzing the relationship between dependent and independent variables, to see which factors explained the variation in the scores of the dependent variables, two factors emerged for Buckeye Boys Ranch staff:

1) education explained the variation in the pretest and posttest autocratic/democratic scores, and in the posttest peer-esteem scores, and,

2) tenure explained the variation in the pretest and posttest peer-esteem scores.

However, the cumulative effect of these factors failed to reject the null hypothesis 7.

Hypothesis 8 was rejected. In analyzing the relationship between dependent and independent variables, to see which factors explained the variation in the scores of the dependent variables, four factors emerged for Boys Village staff:

1) age explained the variation in the pretest autocratic/democratic scores.

2) sex explained the variation in the pretest peer-esteem scores.

3) education explained the variation in the pretest and posttest authoritarian/acquiescence scores, the pretest and posttest autocratic/democratic scores, and the pretest and posttest peer-esteem scores, and,
4) experience explained the variation in the pretest and posttest authoritarian/acquiescence scores. The cumulative effect of these factors was sufficient to reject the null hypothesis 8.

Despite the statistical finding that the general hypothesis was rejected, the researcher's empirical observation was that a significant change in Buckeye Boys Ranch staff did occur. During the period from September, 1973 through May, 1974, staff who received the training showed dramatic changes in their performance. The values, philosophy, and attitudinal concepts which were presented by the researcher, were increasingly implemented by staff. It is possible that the staff selection process was a factor in that the researcher had hand-picked candidates for employment who supported these values and attitudes as a job expectation.

By the end of May, 1974, most of the staff had assimilated the philosophical, theoretical, and practical aspects of the training. Client service delivery was by then considerably more sophisticated, and overall treatment approaches were increasingly more consistent with client needs.

As an integral dimension of this study, the researcher has documented highlights of the nine-month training which was conducted. Appendix "F," "Some Comments on Staff Development," describes the multiple factors which
influenced the training design, the content of the training, and the techniques used in the training process. Appendix "P" is descriptive and practical, and applies the theoretical concepts of chapter II.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

This study concentrated on anticipated changes in staff attitudes and perceptions presumed to be impacted by staff training during a period of institutional expansion and transition. The study sought to test the general hypothesis, "prescriptive staff development has a significant measurable impact on staff attitudes and perceptions as measured by paper and pencil tests."

The findings, based on the paper and pencil tests, failed to support the general hypothesis that there were statistically significant relationships between staff development and changes in staff attitudes and perceptions as measured by paper and pencil tests.

Conversely, there were empirically observed changes in the Buckeye Boys Ranch staff behaviors. The values, philosophy and attitudinal expectations presented by the researcher during staff training were increasingly practiced by staff in their daily interactions with clients. These empirical observations led the researcher to speculate that specific changes in the actual behavior of staff may not have been effectively measured by the use of attitude scales or paper and pencil tests. The researcher
concluded that there is a need for additional data in the area of attitudinal change as it relates to behavioral change.

This study was conducted in a medium-size institutional setting which underwent extensive change. The researcher attempted to answer the question of whether prescriptive staff development had the anticipated impact. It was felt that this study might yield practical application of the findings in the areas of alternative approaches to staff selection, staff orientation and training, and staff implementation of institutional philosophy.

The researcher, as assistant director of Buckeye Boys Ranch, designed and implemented prescriptive staff training to meet the challenge of a major institutional expansion. The planned use of human relations training was perceived by the researcher as an appropriate process by which to implement the Ranch treatment philosophy. Concepts of Role Theory and Adult Education theory and practices strongly influenced the researcher's training design. Staff training was directed primarily toward changes in staff attitudes and perceptions as staff roles were expanded.

Certain assumptions related to "desirable" staff characteristics influenced the researcher in the selection of test instruments, and in the content of the staff training program. These assumptions identified perceived
qualities of "successful" staff, and were empirically based on the literature reviewed, and the researcher's professional experiences in several child-care institutions over nearly two decades. These assumptions were as follows:

1. Institutional staff who appear to have a significant impact on clients generally have specific qualities:
   a. the capacity to form and maintain positive relationships with clients and peers;
   b. the ability to establish and maintain clearly defined, firm, fair, consistent limits, while permitting the client to retain dignity and integrity in the process;
   c. the capacity to risk and trust interpersonally, with peers and clients;
   d. the ability to feel and generate enthusiasm which is genuine and infectious.

2. Institutional staff who seem best able to handle stress and crisis situations usually have a positive self-concept, a sense of humor, the ability to express feelings appropriately, a high degree of flexibility and tolerance for ambiguity, and a philosophy which is neither permissive nor punitive.

3. Institutional staff who are open, honest, and accepting of and respectful toward clients and peers, are most likely to elicit similar responses from clients and peers.
The researcher, in the role of clinical treatment administrator, had the opportunity to interview and recommend for employment all clinical and child-care staff working at the Buckeye Boys Ranch after June, 1970. This may have biased the composition of the Ranch staff, since they were constantly exposed to the values and philosophies reflected in the perceived qualities of "successful" staff.

For the study, seventy adult respondents, ranging in age from twenty to sixty-five, were administered selected attitude measurement tests. Thirty-six of the respondents were staff at Buckeye Boys Ranch, and thirty-four of the respondents were staff at Boys Village. All the respondents were given a pretest measurement in late summer, 1973, and the same posttest measurement was given nine months later in early summer, 1974. During the nine-month interim between pretest and posttest, the Buckeye Boys Ranch staff was trained by the researcher. The Boys Village staff did not receive the training.

Some differences were known to exist between Buckeye Boys Ranch staff and Boys Village staff, but they were presumed to be roughly comparable at pretest. A longitudinal pretest/posttest research design was selected as the framework within which the study was conducted. Theoretical concepts were researched in the areas of role-theory, adult education, and the multiple aspects of reliability and validity of self-reporting pencil and paper tests.
Eight research hypotheses were derived from the general hypothesis, "there is a significant relationship between staff development and changes in staff attitudes and perceptions as measured by paper and pencil tests." These hypotheses were postulated in the null form. They sought to test for differences in demographic characteristics and in the pretest and posttest measurements of staff attitudes and perceptions. The hypotheses also sought to determine existing significant relationships which might explain variation in the dependent variables.

The chi-square, covariance, and regression equations were selected as appropriate statistical techniques to test the hypotheses. When subjected to these techniques the general hypothesis was not supported. The researcher concluded that the staff training did not have a significant measurable impact on the attitudes and perceptions of the staff, according to the measurements made possible by the instruments used in this study.

Preliminary findings indicated that Boys Village had significantly older, more tenured staff than did Buckeye Boys Ranch; the Buckeye Boys Ranch staff level of education was enough higher than Boys Village staff that it approached significance; the Boys Village staff tended to be significantly more autocratic and Buckeye Boys Ranch staff tended to be significantly more democratic, when compared with each other at both pretest and posttest.
Findings for both groups indicated that the older, more tenured respondents tended to be more authoritarian and more highly esteemed by their peers; and staff with prior related work experience tended to be more autocratic than staff without prior related work experience.

One condition which might have biased the study may need to be further investigated. Originally, Buckeye Boys Ranch used Boys Village as the primary model to emulate. Inquiries might focus on the impact of the institutional administrators' personal treatment philosophies, presumed to be similar because the Ranch Executive Director used the Boys Village Executive Director as his initial role-model; on the similarity of responses of the staff from Boys Village and Buckeye Boys Ranch, suggesting the concept of "treatment thinking" or "universal treatment philosophy"; or on the possibility that if such parallel philosophies were a factor, then either a different facility should be used for comparison or a control group and an experimental group should be selected from within one institution only.

Staff training is an appropriate approach to individual and organizational change according to the literature researched, and staff development is reported as an effective interventive strategy which provides the trainer with potential leverage for planned organizational change. In the process of planning for organizational change, the
trainer should be aware of the reality of both the formal and the informal organizational structure. In addition, the trainer needs administrative support, and the administrator and the trainer must maintain ongoing communication, to insure that administrative support is retained. The trainer also needs to know where the organization is headed, how the movement will be accomplished, what circumstances will enhance or inhibit the movement, and who will be involved, in what way, in the training process.

The process of change in a treatment institution is likely to be more successful if it impacts the treatment philosophy. The treatment philosophy is the dynamic "heart" of the institution, and is reflected in at least five major sequential variables. Each of these variables is predicated upon the preceding variable, and originates with the initially agreed-upon rationale for the institution's existence. These variables are,

1. **The Client Composition.** How many and what kinds of clients will the institution serve?

2. **The Treatment Approach.** What specific treatment modalities, programs, or resources are most suitable to meet the clients' needs, and what "finished product" is desired?

3. **The Staff Composition.** What kinds of people are needed to implement the treatment approach in ways most likely to successfully meet the clients' needs?
4. **The Physical Facility.** What kind of physical environment or life-space is most functional and appropriate to provide the arena within which the staff can most effectively apply the treatment approach to meet clients' needs?

5. **The Organizational Structure.** How many people in what positions or staffing pattern will be most suitable in providing adequate coverage within the physical facility to utilize the staff most efficiently and effectively in implementing the treatment approach to meet clients' needs?

Obviously, all these factors are contingent upon sufficient financial resources for both initial and ongoing expenses.

The client group composition is usually in a constant state of transition, as "treated" clients are discharged and "replacement" clients are admitted to the institution. On occasion, it becomes necessary to modify the treatment approach, to compensate for the changes in the client composition. A strong treatment philosophy can withstand substantial client fluctuation if the staff has the flexibility to adapt to changing conditions. Clients are more likely to be able to handle the stress of change if staff, as role-models, are seen by clients as being able to cope with change. If staff have problems adapting to change, it may be presumed that clients will feel equally inadequate, and their feelings will be reflected in less
functional behaviors. Such client behaviors are likely to elicit reactive behaviors by staff, resulting in even less functional client reactions and potentially establishing a dysfunctional cycle. Thus it may be inferred that there is a significant relationship between staff behaviors and client behaviors, and that they continually impact each other.

This aspect of the change process may then be expanded to ask the question, "if prescriptive staff development has a significant impact on staff behaviors, and if client behaviors are significantly related to staff behaviors, does prescriptive staff development have a significant measurable impact on changes in client behaviors?" This might be further explored in the general hypothesis, "client behaviors will change in accordance with or reaction to changed staff behaviors, and staff behaviors will change in accordance with or in response to changed client behaviors."
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APPENDIX A: REPRESENTATIVE CASE HISTORIES

Data from six case histories were selected from case records as a means of illustrating specific characteristics and backgrounds of boys admitted to the Ranch program. These cases were chosen to be as representative as possible, and although the names, dates and locations have been disguised to protect each boy's identity, the facts and situations are exactly as stated. The case histories are as follows:

Edward, a battered child
Preston, a hysterical, transsexual youth
Dennis, the product of a neurotic mother
James, a rejected child
Bart, a neglected, delinquent youth
Jon, a neurotic, countercultural "Jesus freak."
Edward, A Battered Child

Edward was born in a midwestern state prison hospital. His mother had a long history of mental illness and had been married three times. She was convicted and imprisoned for beating her 18-month old son to death during her seventh month of pregnancy with Edward. Following her release from prison, she was awarded custody of Edward, who was then six months old.

The first known incident of assault against Edward by his mother was when he was hospitalized at the age of two with severe bruises on his head and body and with several teeth knocked out. A few months later he was severely scalded over much of his body. When he was five, both of his legs were broken, and his mother brought him to Ohio for treatment. Over the next two years an arm and nose were broken, and he was burned on his face and body. By the time he was seven he was "horribly scarred" about his mouth and ears, and had numerous scars on almost every area of his scalp and body. Also, when Edward was seven, his mother locked him in a closet for three days while she went on a drinking spree. Edward, suffering from severe malnutrition and shock, was discovered by his uncle and subsequently taken to a clinic for treatment.

At this point he was placed in a foster home. Within two months he began wetting and soiling his bedclothing, set fires inside and outside the house, deliberately destroyed his new birthday bicycle, and "molested" two little girls. These and other incidents soon caused him to be moved to a children's psychiatric hospital, where he exhibited "many behavioral problems" over a three month period.

When he was eight, a second foster home was attempted, and for the first time in his life Edward was placed in school. Soon he began pushing and kicking other children, and was placed on medication to control his aggressive behavior. He also had some cosmetic surgery, was fitted with corrective shoes for his deformed feet, and had extensive dental work done. After a few months he began bedwetting again, and started shoplifting small items. Subsequently he was removed to the county children's home, where he became "increasingly unruly" over the next two years.

When he was ten, Edward was expelled from school for "disruptive behavior" and was committed to the Ohio Youth Commission. After five months of extensive assessment at the Juvenile Diagnostic Center, Edward was recommended as
a candidate for a "psychiatrically-oriented boarding school." Edward was perceived by the Youth Commission diagnosticians as follows,

Edward is bright and charming, but manipulative with adults (using his past history to gain sympathy and support). He has poor contact with reality; runs away under stress; lies frequently about peers and adults; fights without provocation; has little concern for others; is extremely disruptive; still retains his severe bedwetting problem; is hostile and rejecting of the world; and continues to show behaviors that are aggravating, cruel and destructive."

Medically, he has epileptic equivalents of Grand Mal seizures, and shows an abnormal EEG. He is heavily medicated on dilantin to control the seizures. Educationally he is on the borderline of normal intelligence and is functioning between the first and second grade level in school. Clinically, he appears to be in a deep state of depression; overly impulsive; with a severely impoverished self-esteem; and with some schizoid features. He needs specialized care with intensive psychiatric treatment.

Edward was accepted for placement at Buckeye Boys Ranch.

Preston, A Hysteric, Transsexual Youth

Preston, the product of an extremely dysfunctional family system, showed very infantile behaviors in kindergarten by constantly crying and demanding continuous attention. By the time he had reached the third grade he babbled and was withdrawn to the point of near-autism.

Preston's father, an intensely upwardly-striving professional, divorced the boy's mother (also a professional) after eight years of marriage and immediately married his secretary. He had constantly rejected Preston, denying that any of the behaviors were unusual. Three years later Preston's mother remarried and sent his younger brother to live with the maternal grandmother. Over the next four years both the mother and stepfather developed severe drinking problems which severely affected Preston. His behaviors escalated, and by the time he was eleven he was sent to a psychiatric hospital as an outpatient. He was there described as "timid, effete, withdrawn, and underachieving," and for the next year was treated for "borderline schizophrenia."
During this period the relationship between the mother and stepfather became critical, and Preston was blamed as the "problem." He was sent to live with his grandmother, and traded places with his younger brother. During his stay he was severely rejected by his grandmother, who compared him with his brother. When the mother finally divorced the stepfather, Preston's brother went to live with his father and Preston returned home. A few months later the grandmother came to live with Preston's mother. From that point on the boy was raised by his mother, grandmother, and younger sister.

Preston's mother remained inconsistent and rejecting, and his grandmother increasingly infantalized and smothered the boy. At the age of fifteen, Preston was not permitted to leave the yard and was kept under constant surveillance. He was not able to go to public school, and the grandmother slept in the same room with him "so he would not be afraid of the dark." For a year, he was tutored at home, but his behaviors again escalated to the point that he was re-enrolled in the psychiatric hospital for continued outpatient treatment. By this time he had developed "overt homosexual actions" and was seen by the staff at the psychiatric hospital as,

Extremely anxious, avoiding all eye contact with everyone; narcissistic and self preoccupied; very verbal and showing an extremely high intelligence level; rather loose associative powers and impaired thought processes; poor interpersonal relationships; intense internalized anger and hostility; and, an inability to relate to people in a functional way.

When he was sixteen, Preston was labeled as "the central figure causing his mother's divorces" and was suffering acutely from chronic familial rejection. He was so heavily medicated, to control his dysfunctional behavior, that he was literally "out on his feet" during the intake interview.

Preston was accepted for placement at Buckeye Boys Ranch to remove him from a very pathogenic home system.

Dennis, the Product of a Neurotic Mother

Dennis, the youngest of five siblings, was a model child. His father, a construction worker, drank frequently and heavily, and often bullied Dennis and his mother. As each of the older children found the opportunity, they left home and maintained minimal contact with the family. One sister committed suicide.
When Dennis was twelve his father died, leaving the boy and his mother destitute. She was "too nervous" to work and so subsisted on $150.00 per month social security funds. She was alone extremely concerned about Dennis's behavior, and kept a close watch on his every move. Whenever he broke the slightest rule she would predict "you will turn out just like your father," to the degree that Dennis became projectively imprinted with responsibility of "taking father's place."

For two years Dennis rarely misbehaved, and was quite active in the Boy Scouts. When he was fourteen his school work began to deteriorate. He had one fight at school, was late to a few classes, and then suddenly missed 25 school days with unacceptable excuses. A check revealed that his mother was keeping him home so he would not get in any trouble. The school referred him to the County Court of Domestic Relations, and the judge committed Dennis temporarily to the Ohio Youth Commission for a diagnostic study. From this study, the following data emerged,

Dennis is a tall, slender, easy-going, quiet, non-violent youth from a rural community. Although test scores indicate he is in the superior range of intelligence, he is an underachiever at school. He is immature, conforming, passive, sensitive, and non-delinquent, and there are no neurological or medical problems. There is some emotional transience due to the disrupted family situation through the dearth of an alcoholic father and the confused relationship with a dependent, constraining, overprotective mother.

He is relatively healthy, but delayed in the adolescent thrust. He has generalized fears of being ridiculed by peers and adults, and feelings of inadequacy in academic and social situations. His mother is passive and fearful, needs his emotional support, and is unable to tolerate his emergent independence. Dennis is making a marginal adjustment to an unsettled home life, and is reacting to stress.

Dennis and his mother were interviewed at the Ranch, and he adamantly and tearfully rejected the idea of leaving home. The Ranch intake committee recommended immediate placement, despite his protests. During the six days waiting period before a bed became available, Dennis and his mother entered into a "suicide pact" to avoid the separation. They ingested a bottle of aspirin together, and were taken to the hospital for treatment. Dennis was subsequently ordered by the Court to come to the Ranch.
James, A Rejected Child

Jimmy's parents argued constantly and bitterly for as long as he could remember. When he was three his brother was born and shortly afterwards Jimmy began to bite people severely. This behavior continued until he was nearly eight, at which time his sister was born, and his parents separated. They were divorced when he was ten, and his mother remarried when he was twelve.

His natural father and stepfather disliked each other intensely, and Jimmy began to act out their conflict. When he became angry at his stepfather he would run to his father for the support he knew he would receive. For three years this system continued to escalate and Jimmy became more and more uncooperative at home. Finally, he was sent to live with his father for three months, but was left alone and unsupervised most of the time.

When he returned to his mother and stepfather he refused to obey rules, picked on his siblings, and missed over 40 days of school. He was eventually referred to the Juvenile Court and a psychological evaluation was ordered by the judge. The diagnosis was as follows,

Jimmy is confused, unresponsive, unambitious, apathetic, and constricted. He has limited insights into his own problems; becomes disorganized when under stress to conform; lacks self-discipline and self-direction; has some depression and some paranoid tendencies; has a short attention span, feelings of inadequacy, and poor impulse control.

He is unable to relate closely or spontaneously with anyone, although he does have a superficial desire for sociability. He is suspicious of adults and sees the relationship between himself and his stepfather as "hopeless." He says he hates his stepfather but is unable to express these feelings.

He is also experiencing guilt feelings about his resentment toward his parents' divorce and mother's remarriage, and conflict about whether he should live with his father or his mother. Jimmy sees a need for change, and his mother and stepfather want him out of their home as quickly as possible.

Jimmy was accepted and placed at Buckeye Boys Ranch, following an intense intake interview during which both he and his mother expressed considerable ambivalence about their relationship with each other.
Bart, A Neglected, Delinquent Youth

When Bart was three years old his father deserted the family and was never heard from again. Bart's mother tried to hold the family together, and worked in a bar at night. Over the years she began to drink more and more and to fail to supervise her children. Eventually Bart and his three sisters ran wild in the streets.

Bart was first sent to Juvenile Court for destroying property when he was eight years old. He was then placed with his paternal uncle and aunt for three years. By the time he was eleven his aunt and uncle separated, and he was returned to his mother. At twelve he was picked up for theft and vandalism, and at thirteen he was involved in multiple incidents of glue-sniffing, curfew violations, and assaultive threats.

Finally, when Bart was expelled from school for fighting, he was placed in the Detention Home. Subsequently he was sent to a large parochial boy's school over fifteen hundred miles away. In the four months he spent at the school, Bart ran away five times, managing to get all the way home twice. On his fifth runaway he was discharged from the school, and the court returned him to his mother's home.

Over the next two years the family system broke down completely. The mother was chronically intoxicated; the oldest sister entered a disastrous inter-racial marriage; the next oldest sister left home and became a prostitute; and the youngest sister ran away several times and was finally placed in a girl's boarding school. Bart was involved in episodes of drinking; drug abuse; two auto thefts; two burglaries and an escape from the Detention Home. He was eventually committed to the Ohio Youth Commission following his third burglary, and sent to the Juvenile Diagnostic Center for evaluation. The findings were as follows,

Bart is the product of a highly unstable family situation, and needs a caring, structured environment which is flexible and open. Bart is insecure, impulsive, aggressive, and emotionally and culturally deprived. He is so constricted with repressed feelings that he is almost non-functional in many areas. He is able to relate to other people only superficially, and does this through conformity.

He is in the above average range of intelligence. At fifteen, six feet tall and 180 pounds, his goal of becoming a professional football player is not completely unrealistic.
Bart elected to come to Buckeye Boys Ranch.

Jon, A Neurotic, Countercultural "Jesus Freak"

Jon's parents were divorced when he was four years old, and his father moved to the west coast. His mother found a good job and was able to adequately support Jon and his older sister. When Jon was six his mother remarried, and the stepfather was very harsh and rejecting. During the next five years, Jon's mother began to drink furtively and eventually divorced the stepfather. Three years later, when Jon was fourteen, the stepfather died and the mother's secret drinking increased.

Over the next two years the family system was in turmoil. Jon's maternal grandmother discovered she had terminal cancer, but lingered in the hospital for an extended period. Jon's mother and sister were in conflict, and the sister finally left home. Jon's mother's drinking began to affect her work, and she was under considerable pressure from her supervisor. During this two year period Jon ran away from home three times, riding his bicycle to Florida twice.

On his second long-distance runaway, Jon began to experiment with hallucinogens and entered into a countercultural life style. When he returned home he became listless, apathetic, and rarely washed or changed clothing. Eventually he became deeply depressed and was placed in a psychiatric hospital for observation. After two and a half months he was released, with the diagnostic assessment that he was within the normal range of functioning.

Shortly thereafter, on his third runaway, Jon encountered some young people in the Jesus Movement. He underwent an immediate conversion in which he substituted religion for drugs, and changed his name to "Happy." His entire personality was altered, and he became almost manic with exhuberence and joy. He also experienced periodic episodes of intense depression and despair. During these periods he would feel suicidal and physically drive himself to total exhaustion. As this behavior continued he was sent to the Juvenile Diagnostic Center by the Juvenile Court, at the request of the family caseworker. The diagnosis was that, "Jon is tense, nervous, mixed-up, and has severe anxiety due to a fragmented personality. He is deeply neurotic and desperately needs clinical help."

Following his return home, Jon was involved in "harboring a fugitive from the Youth Commission." This was
a boy he had met while at the Diagnostic Center. Jon was placed in the Detention Home for two months. The Court gave Jon the choice of returning to the Ohio Youth Commission or coming to Buckeye Boys Ranch. Jon chose to come to the Ranch.
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SERVICE DESCRIPTION: January, 1975
BUCKEYE BOYS RANCH
SERVICE DESCRIPTION (1975)

I. SERVICE CATEGORY: Services to Children

II. SPECIFIC SERVICE PROGRAM: Code Service Designations

III. SERVICE PROGRAM ACTIVITIES:

The Ranch has the primary responsibility to provide a self-contained setting for boys whose behaviors are not generally appropriate or acceptable to the wider community and who exhibit delinquent, neurotic or pre-psychotic symptoms. It is a specialized treatment institution founded upon mutual respect where these boys may be exposed to an atmosphere of physical and emotional safety through the establishment of reasonable limits structured to prepare them for eventual functional and productive community living.

Basically, services provided by Buckeye Boys Ranch, Inc., in conjunction with the standards established by the Ohio Department of Public Welfare Social Services Manual, are as follows:

A. Comprehensive Protective Services

Section 34.1 To protect adolescent and pre-adolescent boys against experiences seriously detrimental to their well-being, and to ensure that they receive appropriate substitute care (in accordance with the authority delegated to the agency) through residential living in a treatment institution. This includes provision of care in a group facility for boys with special needs; emotionally disturbed; family and/or individual problems; socially maladjusted; learning disabilities; pre-delinquent; some physical problems; to ensure proper care, shelter, meals, clothing, work, health, educational, and recreational experiences; and to provide counseling and other therapeutic services such as psychiatric and psychological evaluation; and other special counseling services as needed.

Section 34.1-4 To work with parents to enable them to accept help and to correct conditions injurious to the child, through counseling related to specific objectives (such as changing dysfunctional or pathogenic family systems).
Section 34.1-5  Work in behalf of or directly with the boys toward reduction of the dysfunctional, pathogenic and/or inhibiting behaviors; and toward improved feelings of self worth and a capacity for non-infringing and self-regulated behaviors.

Methods of Service delivery for implementing Comprehensive Protection Services are as follows:

Section 52.1-1 DIAGNOSIS: by assisting individuals and families to identify their problems and service needs and to make a plan for use of available resources. Ongoing diagnosis and re-assessment of the updated data and new information, in which re-statements of the problem are needed.

Section 52.1-2 EVALUATION: assist consumers to participate in assessing progress and success in achieving personal service objectives; evaluation and re-evaluation of progress and changes made toward the achievement of personal goals and objectives; mutual feedback.

Section 52.1-3 COUNSELING: advise and sustain; encourage and bolster, and support the individuals and the family's efforts to move toward objectives that are mutually-agreed upon.

Section 52.1-4 INFORMATION-GIVING: by presentation of other or alternative life styles and objectives.

Section 52.1-5 SKILLED CASEWORK: with the use of a variety of individualized approaches toward meeting the perceived needs of the individual boy, and a variety of individualized approaches toward meeting the perceived needs of the family system.

Section 52.1-6 SKILLED GROUP WORK: use of inter-family and intra-family groups as modes of changes and growth through family and group dynamics; by utilizing the group and peer relationships to assist in effecting changes and growth in the individual.

Section 52.1-7 SKILLED REHABILITATION COUNSELING: in assisting the individual and the family to come to grips with whatever physical, mental, or emotional factors are inhibiting functioning.

Section 52.1-8 EDUCATION: in support of child development and growth objectives. Provision of
an accredited on-grounds school with certified teachers, for successful experiences, educational services in family life conferences, and in staff development.

Section 52.1-9 PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES: (especially in the area of emotional and educational assessment): toward diagnosis and evaluation of the specific needs of the child and of the family. Also, psychological and/or psychiatric counseling as additional resources for ongoing counseling.

Section 52.1-10 SKILLED WORK EXPERIENCE AND VOCATIONAL COUNSELING: opportunities through the ongoing use of occupational and vocational supervision and counseling.

Section 52.1-11 SHELTERED WORK: work-for-pay experience in support of a defined employment objective individualized for each boy based on his own capacity to handle such work.

Section 52.1-13 COMMUNITY RESOURCES: assist individuals and families to learn more appropriate uses.

B. STRUCTURE: The structure of Buckeye Boys Ranch, Inc. is composed of two inter-related systems: Supportive Services and Treatment Services. Appended is a table of organization depicting the relationships of these systems. The Executive Director of the Ranch is the primary administrator of both systems, but has designed the Assistant Director (in the role of Treatment Director) as Administrator of the Treatment Services; and the Business Manager (in the role of Supportive Services Coordinator) as administrator of Supportive Services. These systems are staffed as follows:

1. SUPPORTIVE SERVICES:

   Administration:  
   (1) Executive Director;  
   (1) Administrator's Secretary  

   Business Personnel:  
   (1) Supportive Services Coordinator;  
   (1) Bookkeeper;  
   (1) Secretary/Receptionist.
1. Food Services: (1) Food Service Supervisor; (4) Food Service Specialists.
3. Laundry Service: (1) Laundry Specialist.

2. TREATMENT SERVICES:

Administration: (1) Treatment Director; (2) Clinical Secretaries; (1) Part-time Consulting Psychiatrist.

a. Hislop House: (1) Clinical Counselor (Assistant Treatment Director; (4) Youth Leaders; (2) Part-time Youth Leader Aides; (6) Graduate Students; (6) Undergraduate Students.

b. Argo House: (1) Clinical Counselor; (3) Youth Leaders; (3) Part-time Youth Leader Aides.

c. Stowell East: (1) Clinical Counselor; (4) Youth Leaders; (3) Part-time Youth Leader Aides.

d. Stowell West: (1) Clinical Counselor; (3) Youth Leaders; (3) Part-time Youth Leader Aides.

e. Hirsch Hall: (1) House Coordinator; (2) Housemothers; (1) Night Man; (1) Part-time Night Relief; (2) Part-time Youth Leaders; (1) Part-time Clinical Counselor.
f. Program Services: (1) Program Coordinator
   1. Student Employment: (1) Program Counselor.
   2. Health Care: (1) Part-time Nurse.
   3. Recreation: (1) Recreation Supervisor;
      (2) Part-time Recreation Aides;
      (2) Summer Recreation Leaders.
   4. Night Security: (1) Night Supervisor;
      (3) Night Youth Leaders.
   5. Vacations: (2) Summer Replacement Youth Leaders.

6. Volunteer Services:

3. EDUCATIONAL SERVICES:

A third system, Educational Services, is under the jurisdiction of the South Western City Schools. The Ranch School staff is assigned to the Ranch through the South Western Director of Special Education. The Treatment Director of the Ranch is designated as liaison to the Ranch Educational Services Administrator. This system is staffed as follows:

   Administration: (1) School Coordinator;
                    (1) School Secretary/IMC Aide.
   1. Teaching Services: (5) Teaching Specialists.
   2. Teaching Aides;
   3. Student Teachers: (1) Art Aide. As determined by School Coordinator.

C. HOUSING: There are four designated Houses on the Ranch grounds, in which the 50 boys live (Hislop, Argo, Stowell East, Stowell West). Hirsch Hall, which houses an additional 10 boys off grounds, is the fifth designated house.
D. **DIAGNOSIS:** In order to aid the Ranch in developing the overall treatment goals and in establishing meaningful house programming, the Interpersonal Maturity Classification System (I-Level) is used as one diagnostic and treatment tool. In the I-Level Classification, the level of the boy's integrating processes are evaluated, examining the way the boy sees himself, the way the boy sees the outside world, and how he puts these together in certain well-defined patterns. Once the level of the boy's integrating ability is determined, he can then be placed into an appropriate treatment grouping with other boys in compatible levels. Guidelines have been developed for implementing treatment programs at each level enabling the Ranch to plan more realistically to meet the individualized needs of the boys in a group living situation.

E. **TREATMENT:** For treatment purposes, the Ranch is divided into four treatment teams. Those treatment teams are: Stowell East; Stowell West; Hislop; and Argo. Boys are assigned to those units on the basis of their I-Level. Each team consists of a Clinical Counselor (Team Coordinator), three or four full-time Youth Leaders, one School Teacher, and (individually) each boy in the house. Each treatment team meets two hours every week. During that time the team reviews the progress of each boy in its unit and updates the treatment plan accordingly. Also, during that time a more intensive staffing of one boy in that unit is held. The in-depth staffing reviews the boy's progress in the Ranch for the previous six months. Where possible, the boy, his parents, and the referring agency are involved in the staffing. The third major area of team responsibility is discussing policies and programs unique in that house.

The team members have the opportunity to recommend and make changes in house programming as long as it is consistent with current Ranch policies. If a policy change is indicated, the treatment team can refer its recommendation for a policy change to the Policy Team for its consideration and final disposition. The teams are also responsible for recommending and approving transfers between houses, between the Ranch proper and Hirsch Hall, and for recommending a boy's discharge. The boy
(consumer) is involved in his own individual planning toward mutually agreed upon goals with his case manager, and (as a group) the boys have substantial inputs into the group-living program.

Case Management refers to those details necessary to the boy's day-to-day living which are somewhat incidental to the counseling or therapy he may be receiving. Items such as clothing, telephone calls, home visits, and resolution of minor day-to-day life needs are included. Youth Leaders are assigned Case Management responsibilities to more quickly meet the day-to-day needs of the boys, as well as to provide qualified Youth Care personnel with challenges and opportunities commensurate with their ability. The Team Leader (Clinical Counselor) assumes responsibility for supervising Case Management duties of the Youth Care Workers on that team.

F. INTAKE: The intake process at the Ranch is designed to insure that the boys admitted to the Ranch can receive the kind of help which will enable them to live a more satisfying life. When an agency contacts the Ranch regarding admitting a boy, we request that they submit a complete social history, a current psychological, psychiatric diagnosis (if indicated), academic background and school transcripts, and any other pertinent data which will assist in determining the appropriateness of the Ranch setting as a placement for that boy. The Clinical staff reviews the basic intake data. If the material reflects that the boy is not a suitable candidate for Ranch placement, the reasons are stated in a letter to the referring agency, and recommendations for alternate placement are made. If the boy appears suitable for Ranch placement a Pre-Admission Intake Interview is scheduled. At that time, the boy, his parents, and the agency representative come to the Ranch for approximately three hours.

After an initial discussion with all parties present, one member of the Clinical team talks with the boy, while another member talks with the parents and agency representative.

The Clinician talking with the family and agency representative discusses their perception of the problem situation, the boy's development, the family interaction patterns, and the history of the
parents. This is done in order to determine the method in which the mutual respect principle has broken down within that family system. This enables the Ranch to keep from inadvertently duplicating the family system which may have contributed to creating or maintaining the boys's problems.

The data from all three interviews is then pulled together and presented to the Clinical team at an intake staffing. Along with the data goes a recommendation to accept or reject, and justification for either decision. Included in that justification are goals and strategies for achieving the kind of treatment program necessary to help the boy improve his social functioning. If the boy is accepted into the Ranch system, the house, counselor, length of stay in the Ranch, and admission data are projected. After reviewing all the data, the Clinical team will affirm or deny the admission of the boy and make any changes in goals and strategies deemed appropriate. Once a decision has been reached, the agency is notified and (if accepted) arrangements are made to admit the boy.

G. ORIENTATION: As part of the intake procedure, an orientation program for the boy is provided. The goal of the orientation program is to enable the boy to know his new environment and the people with whom he will be living and working, as well as to begin setting initial personal goals. This will keep the boy from having a sense of being lost in a never-ending institutionalization. Virtually from the date of admission, he begins the process of working toward eventual discharge.

H. DISCHARGE: The discharge process, as noted, begins the day the boy is admitted. It is augmented by helping the family and the boy prepare to reintegrate; or by helping the boy to deal with the rejection which his family is showing, (if there is a family) and to prepare for moving toward independence and emancipation. The help and cooperation of the agency in this process is essential. Any member of the Ranch staff can recommend a boy's discharge. The boy's treatment team is the first group to consider the discharge. If discharge is recommended, the rationale for the discharge is brought to the Clinical team. The
Clinical team reviews the progress of the boy; the changes in the situation to which he will return; the feasibility of alternate placement plans; and the other items peculiar to that individual boy's situation. After the discharge has been approved, the Counselor then works with the boy, the agency, and the home or alternate placement, around the actual discharge of the boy.

I. **AFTERCARE**: In order to help the family and the referring agency assist in the boy's adjustment after discharge from the Ranch, the Ranch will provide up to 13 weeks aftercare services on an as-needed basis. The need for such services can be determined prior to the boy's discharge, or came as a supplemental request from the boy, the family, or the agency.

J. **STAFF DEVELOPMENT**: In order to assist the Clinical staff in providing the high quality of leadership and clinical expertise needed to accurately assess the boy's needs and to implement and help other staff implement a realistic treatment program, staff development meetings are periodically conducted. Two major areas are covered during these meetings. One has to deal with clarification and refinement of the policies, programs, and procedures for making the existing program even more effective. The second has to deal with enhancing staff ability to use a wider variety of therapeutic approaches as tools to deal with the divergent needs of the boys in residence at the Ranch.

Staff Development is ongoing, and stresses the following knowledge base for all staff in direct service to the consumers:

**Normal and Abnormal Human Behavior**: Including group dynamics; interpersonal behavior; social systems; observation and interpretation; diagnosis; communication systems; limit setting; strategic intervention; concepts of stress, and social functioning.

**Professional Relationships**: Including confidentiality and interpersonal aspects (acceptance; self-awareness; mutual trust; risk-taking; mutual respect; non-infringements; communication modes).
Case Management: Elaborating on interviewing techniques; case studies; report writing; case and data presentation; medical procedures; and communication skills.

Resource Development: Including service programming and utilization of community resources; program implementation.

K. TREATMENT: Clinical Counselors, Youth Leaders and Teaching staff are all involved in counseling and therapy. The Ranch is committed to the idea that no one treatment method is appropriate for all boys. Therefore, it uses a wide variety of methods to enable each boy to reach his goals as follows:

HISLOP HOUSE: For younger boys who are considered unsocialized, or socialized only in the most primitive fashion, the prime mode of therapy is Behavior Modification. Staff on duty have an opportunity to reflect back to the boy immediately the impact of his current behaviors. In addition, the staff is able to provide immediate intervention when the boy loses control of his impulses. Thus, over a period of time, the boy is able to see that people will not allow him to hurt himself or others, and also he will see the impact of his behaviors on others. This will lead to a higher degree of maturity, enabling him to bind his impulses and gain greater control over his behavior. To strengthen this approach, a positive reinforcement system is used.

ARGO HOUSE: The boys in the Argo group use a common sense approach in which the boys relate to each other and staff primarily through exchanging data about the world in which they live, then trying to make changes needed to live more effectively in their world. The boys involved in this milieu are generally more neurotic and anxious, and are more involved in individual therapy as an important part of change. These boys also learn to make use of the group living situation where they come to grips with the facts of their own lives, and learn to deal with others through understanding and how they (and others) have dealt successfully with similar situations in the past.
STOWELL EAST: An Adaptive Behavior program is used with the boys who are primarily older, sub-socialized and aggressive. The boys involved in this treatment method receive positive reinforcement for meeting the mutually-agreed-upon goals in their individual contracts. Immediate feedback is given as they learn to meet the firm external limits necessary to move them toward more mature internal controls.

STOWELL WEST: A combination of Guided Group Interaction and Transactional Analysis is used with boys who have ability for insight into their problems. In T.A. the boys first learn to deal with concepts reflecting the idea of Parent, Adult and Child in each person. Having objectively identified these, the boy may then be able to commit himself to making changes in his own Parent, Adult and Child, often coming to grips with some of his underlying problems and presenting behaviors. In conjunction with this, Guided Group Interaction concepts and dynamics are used, creating an atmosphere of care and concern for each other.

HIRSCH HALL: The older, more sophisticated young men who are perceived to have made optimum gains on the Ranch main campus (but who need further emancipation) are prime candidates for the Hirsch Hall program. The fraternity-like atmosphere in an urban setting provides an important transitional period designed to test each student's capacity to utilize community resources appropriately as he moves toward independence. Both group and individual therapies continue, stressing reality and insight approaches toward self-actualization.

In addition to milieu and group counseling, many boys are able to gain considerable insight and meaning into their own problems through more intensive individual counseling. It should be noted, however, that many boys within the Ranch cannot make use of an individualized therapeutic process. The Clinical staff use a wide variety of individual counseling techniques, depending on the needs of the boy. Wherever possible, the counselor will involve the family from which the
boy came. Family counseling is conducted, using both a conjoint format, where all members of the family are present, and a parent-only session. In the conjoint approach, parent/parent, parent/child and child/child conflicts are brought out into the open, communication patterns are examined, and problem-solving techniques are developed. In therapy sessions where the parents are seen alone, the therapist helps the parents make changes in their parental functioning in order to assist the boy in dealing with his problem. Both techniques are useful in aiding the boy's re-entry into his family system.

A basic therapeutic thrust of the Ranch revolves around the principle of mutual respect. Simply stated, the principle of the mutual respect allows each person to live and develop his own lifestyle as long as that lifestyle does not infringe on the rights of others. When infringements on the rights of others take place, that infringement must be stopped. A variety of limit-setting techniques have been developed for staff to strategically intervene when infringements occur, in ways which do not demean the infringer.

Concurrently, the Ranch school provides a special academic program, both remedial and accelerated, to assist each boy on both a group and independent study program. The end goal is to help each boy reach a point where he can re-enter a public school program with a good chance for a successful experience.

L. COMMUNICATION: An integral part of the task of the Clinical Services System is verbal and written communication with agencies and families around the progress and plans for individual boys. This includes periodic progress reports, details of planned home visits and vacations, special incidents and preparation for the boy's discharge.

IV. PROBLEM DESCRIPTION:

There are a significant number of adolescent boys in the community whose behaviors are not generally appropriate or acceptable to the wider community and who exhibit delinquent, neurotic, or pre-psychotic symptoms. Many of these boys have personality traits which include a poor or distorted self concept; inappropriate or dysfunctional communication; extremes
in behaviors which are often symptomatic of deeper distress; and personal lifestyles which may be counter-cultural, over-compliant or over-compensatory, dependency based, or severely neurotic in content. Other situational characteristics include: academic or school behavioral problems; family conflict involving personality clashes or value-system differences; and personal emotional distress ranging from discomfort to near psychosis. Occasionally these characteristics are also accompanied by some physical disability (for example epilepsy, diabetes, partial blindness, deafness). In many cases, the family system is unable to cope with these behaviors.

The population groups directly affected by the problem are pre-adolescent and adolescent boys. Indirectly or potentially affected are their siblings or peers, who may be induced or coerced into duplicating similar dysfunctional patterns of behavior through extended exposure. The service program is specifically aimed at boys of normal or above average intelligence between the ages of ten and sixteen years old at the time of intake, with profiles which include: no alternative home available (boys who do not have a place to go and whose behaviors are such that they are generally difficult to place); non-criminal or situational delinquencies (school truancy, incorrigibility, runaway); cultural or social maladaptation; severe or profound learning disabilities; counter-cultural value systems; emotional disturbances; manic or hyperkinetic acting-out behavior, withdrawn or depressive tendencies; psychoneurosis; pre-psychosis; battered child syndrome; severe dependency; psycho-physiologic-reactions; controllable medical problems; non-disabling deformities; or endocrinological malfunctions.

V. GOALS OF THE SERVICE PROGRAM:

The overall goals of the service program are to prepare each boy admitted for eventual functional and productive community living; to reduce the incidence of delinquent or dysfunctional behaviors; and to provide him with expanded skills in the social, academic and vocational areas.

In relationship to the program description, this service is designed to assist families or agencies
who are unable to provide the external controls necessary to maintain the boy in the community, through the provisions of a self-contained institutional care setting with a consistent environment of physical and emotional safety; firm and reasonable limits; and mutual respect.

VI. PRIORITY OBJECTIVES:

The three priority objectives to be achieved by this service program are:

A. Learning to establish and maintain mutually respecting, non-infringing relationships with others.

B. Learning self-control and self-regulation.

C. Learning to identify personal needs and to develop appropriate resources as a primary process in achieving independence.

VII. SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES:

The service program seeks to achieve the following specific objectives:

A. To accurately diagnose and effectively carry out prescribed treatment plans designed to meet each boy's personal needs. These plans are directed toward specific goals, involving the use of individualized programs, under the guidance of the boy's Clinical Counselor.

B. To protect each boy against experiences seriously detrimental to his health and well-being.

C. To ensure that each boy receives appropriate care (which includes proper meals, clothing, housing, and medical needs) in a milieu of acceptance and concern.

D. To ensure appropriate interpersonal, educational, vocational and recreational experiences for each boy, designed to enhance his personal growth and independence in the following areas:
1. Learning to accept himself as a worthy person by strengthening his self-awareness and self-esteem.

2. Learning to appropriately express his true feelings in ways which enhance his autonomy and integrity but which do not infringe on the rights of others.

3. Learning and applying concepts of mutual respect, risk-taking, and trust, in personal interactions with peers and adults.

4. Learning to consider alternatives and thoughtful decision-making rather than constantly yielding to immediate impulses, or immediate need gratification.

5. Learning new values and concepts of which stimulate movement toward self-regulation, self-actualization, awareness of personal needs, independence and the capacity to develop personal resources.

VIII. MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS:

Current services which are presently provided have the following measurable components:

**Individual Components for Growth**, which includes self-concept, self-regulation, leisure use of time, decision-making, and impulse control.

**Interpersonal Components for Growth**, which include authority relationships, peer relationships, adult relationships, and the communication system in expression of feelings (joy, affection, anger, fear, grief).

**Cultural Components for Growth**, which include following constructive rules, school progress, work habits, and community adjustments.

One example of the measurability for one of the components for growth is as follows:

Self-Regulation (Basic Steps Toward Positive Change):
A. Behavior is overt and unsocialized. Need for firm and almost constant externally imposed controls and supervision. Use of Critical Incident Reporting Procedure to record observable data and boy's responses to various interventive strategies.

B. Socialization process begins: diminishing overt behaviors (such as aggressive or violent outbursts, chronic withdrawal, running away, hysteria, self-destructive acts, extended depression, etc.); occasional signs of self-control in stress situations.

C. Beginning internalized controls, increasing capacity to handle internal or external stress appropriately.

D. Expanded Internalized Controls, generally able to handle emotional and personal responses to stress in positive ways, diminishing or extinguished overt behaviors.

E. Beginning outreach: initial capacity to not only show personal self-control in stress situations, but to also occasionally help others with their reactions to stress.

F. Expanded outreach; makes consistent efforts to help others deal with their problems in self-control (this is the optimum expectation).

Thus, the Measure of Effectiveness in learning to be self-regulated is on a continuum of observed behaviors. The objective is met when (depending on the initial goals set at the time of intake) the boy reaches level 4, 5, or 6 as his individualized optimum level of functioning.

IX. MEASURES OF OUTPUT OR PRODUCTION:

The unit of service used to measure delivery of this service is one 24-hour period in residence for each boy served. The estimated number of units varies from approximately 180 units (six months) up to 1080 units (30 months), depending on the wide range of needs unique to each boy. The cost of the service, on a unit basis, is as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. Of Unit Service</th>
<th>Description of each service provided, approval by Social Services Manual</th>
<th>Cite Social Service Manual Section and define your unit/service</th>
<th>Estimated Daily Service Cost</th>
<th>Estimated No. of eligibles to be served daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive protective services (Buckeye Boys Ranch, Inc.)</td>
<td>34.1 Protection; provision of care; provision of in-patient services.</td>
<td>$32.73/day</td>
<td>All boys who are admitted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.1-4 Clinical interaction with families of clients.</td>
<td>(24-hour period)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.1-5 Clinical interaction with clients (boys).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive protective services (Hirsch Hall)</td>
<td>34.1 Protection; provision of care; provision of in-patient services</td>
<td>$27.00/day</td>
<td>All boys who are admitted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.1-4 Clinical interaction with families of clients</td>
<td>(24-hour period)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.1-5 Clinical interaction with clients (boys).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
X. RESOURCES:

In Part III (ACTIVITIES), the number and kinds of staff have already been identified. In terms of qualifications, the following expectations are observed:

A. Any staff member employed must generally be 21 years old or more with the ability to establish and maintain firm, fair and consistent limits while assisting in creating an atmosphere of care and concern.

B. Academically and experientially, the present criteria are in effect:

1. Administrative Staff: Master's Degree in Social Work; and at least eight years combined work experiences in human service delivery and administrative duties.

2. Clinical Staff: Master's Degree in Social Work; Clinical Psychology; or other Clinical Master's Degree, and at least two years of prior paid experience working with adolescents.

3. School Staff: Minimum of B.S. in Special Education, and at least two years prior teaching experience in special or remedial education settings.

4. Youth Care Staff: Minimum of high school education, but with emphasis on ability to learn new skills.

5. Supportive Services Staff: No specific academic skills, but must have the specialized skills required for appropriate functioning in their capacity.

In terms of facility resources at the Ranch there are three buildings on 80 acres of open and wooded land, which provides extensive life space, recreational facilities, school, utility, storage, kitchen and dining area, and office space. Personal bedroom space for boys is broken down as follows:
HISLOP HOUSE: Two four-boy dorms; two two-boy rooms; and two one-boy rooms. Capacity: 14 boys.

ARGO HOUSE: Two four-boy dorms; one two-boy rooms; and two one-boy rooms. Capacity: 12 boys.

STOWELL EAST: Two two-boy rooms; eight one-boy rooms. Capacity: 12 boys.

STOWELL WEST: Two two-boy rooms; eight one-boy rooms. Capacity: 12 boys.

HIRSCH HALL: Near The Ohio State University; is a large old home with ample living, kitchen, dining, recreational and office space. One Housemother lives in a basement apartment. For the boys there are four two-boy rooms and one four-boy dorm for a maximum capacity of 12 boys.
January 1, 1975

LETTER OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN
BUCKEYE BOYS RANCH, INC.
And The
REFERRING AGENCY,

I. BASIC STATEMENTS ABOUT BUCKEYE BOYS RANCH:

Buckeye Boys Ranch, Inc., is a charitable, interracial, non-sectarian, and educational organization with central office located at 5665 Hoover Road, Grove City, Ohio. A halfway house, Hirsch Hall, is located at 1846 Summit Street, Columbus, Ohio. Articles of Incorporation were received from the State of Ohio on June 21, 1961. The Ranch is exempted from Federal Income Tax under Section 501(c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code as of August 2, 1965, as per letter of determination from IRS on file at Buckeye Boys Ranch.

Buckeye Boys Ranch is licensed by the Department of Public Welfare, State of Ohio, in order to "provide care and treatment to troubled youth in a residential center and for the operation of a group home off campus."

The Board of Trustees of Buckeye Boys Ranch, Inc., composed of 42 citizens selected from the Franklin County community, is solely responsible for the development and management of all programs operated by the Ranch. The Executive Board consists of the President, President-Elect, Vice President, Treasurer, Recording Secretary and Corresponding Secretary. Committees and task forces consist of Finance Committee, Buckeye Ranchers, Building Committee, Tennis Committee, Nominating Committee, Scientific Advisory Committee, Public Information Committee, Development and Long-Range Building Committee, Personnel Committee and Legal Committee.

Buckeye Boys Ranch is funded through United Way allocations, fee for services, voluntary gifts, sustaining board membership fees, and annual grants from the Franklin County Mental Health and Retardation Board.

Buckeye Boys Ranch is in full compliance with Title IV fair employment practices and State Hearing Right Guarantee.
II. GENERAL STATEMENTS ABOUT THE OVERALL SERVICE PROGRAM OF THE SERVICE PROVIDER:

Buckeye Boys Ranch provides an alternative residential treatment program for delinquent and disturbed adolescent boys, in an atmosphere of care and concern, with appropriate limits established and maintained. The primary goal is to prepare each boy admitted to become a functional and productive citizen, through strengthening his capacity to relate to others; helping him to move appropriately toward independence; and providing him with alternative ways of dealing with stress as he becomes more self-regulated.

The Basic Client Group are boys 10 to 16 years old at intake for the Ranch, and boys 14 to 17 years old at intake for Hirsch Hall. The primary target group is boys residing in Franklin County and surrounding areas in Central Ohio.

III. STATEMENTS ABOUT THE SERVICE PROGRAM(S) OF THE PROVIDER WHICH PROVIDER AND REFERRING AGENCY WISH TO COME TO SOME UNDERSTANDING ABOUT:

There is an increasing demand for out-patient and residential treatment facilities for delinquent and disturbed adolescent youths, as an alternative to confinement in a mental hospital, correctional institution, or dysfunctional or pathogenic family system. Buckeye Boys Ranch, Inc., specializes in treatment, rehabilitation, and growth-inducing experiences for boys whose behaviors reflect social conflicts and emotional distress. In selective cases this may also be accompanied by some physical disability.

The Ranch is committed to appropriately diagnose and effectively carry out prescribed treatment plans designed to meet with boy's personal needs. These plans are directed toward specific goals, involving the use of individualized programs, under the guidance of the boy's clinical counselor.

There are three basic criteria for admission to the Ranch:

1. Each boy must be no younger than ten and no older than sixteen at the time of intake; must be accepting of placement at the Ranch; and must be willing to make some effort to try to develop alternative ways of handling his dysfunctional behaviors.
2. The intake committee must be in accord that the diagnostic assessments of each boy have reasonable implications for effective treatment within the Ranch setting; and; the Ranch program must be flexible enough to not only implement the prescribed treatment modes, but also to meet the interpersonal, physical, intellectual, social, and emotional needs of the boy in growth-inducing ways.

3. The referring agency must have completed all the Ranch basic information data forms, and signed all consent or agreement forms; must have an available copy of the boy's birth certificate and school transcripts; must have the available resources for tuition payments; and must have a realistic aftercare projection for the boy.

While each boy admitted to the Ranch is unique, with characteristics which separate him from everyone else, he also shares some commonalities with most other boys referred. These similarities include: antisocial behaviors; academic or school behavioral problems; family conflict involving personality clashes or value-system differences; and personal emotional distress ranging from mild discomfort to near psychosis. Occasionally these characteristics are also accompanied by some physical disability (for example, epilepsy, diabetes, partial blindness, partial deafness). Other general personality traits include poor or distorted self-concept; inappropriate or dysfunctional communication; extremes in behaviors which are often symptomatic of deeper distress; and personal life-styles which may be counter-cultural, overcompliant or over-compensatory, dependency-based, or severely neurotic in content.

In terms of limitations, certain patterns of behavior or specific characteristics are of concern: chronic fixed alcohol, hallucinogen or hard drug dependency; congenital retardation; severe medical disability; hard-core criminality; profound fixed dependency; sociopathy; personality disorders; or psychoses. Boys with any one of these conditions are usually seen as less likely to be treatable in our open setting. Although candidates with these features are not automatically disqualified, such characteristics are carefully considered by the intake committee.
IV. A STATEMENT OF UNDERSTANDING:

A. Mutual Agreement:

1. This letter is a letter of understanding;

2. This letter is not binding, except as it is carried out through individual purchase of service agreements on a case-by-case basis.

3. Buckeye Boys Ranch agrees to provide specialized residential and group home services on a highly qualitative basis through a purchase of services agreement with the referring agency;

4. Such services will be available on the basis of open bed space at a structured fee charge designed to cover as much of the total costs for services rendered as may be reasonably expected.

B. Financial Agreement:

1. Intake and Admission Fee: A one-time intake and admission fee of $150.00 will be assessed for each child from the referring agency enrolled. This fee is for the intake screening and interview process; administrative and clerical processing; and initial enrollment and orientation.

2. Tuition Fee: Present rates (established January 1, 1975) are as follows:

   a. Buckeye Boys Ranch (Main Campus) .......$27.50/day
   b. Hirsch Hall (Halfway House) .......$20.50/day

The Ranch reserves the right to increase tuition if costs increase significantly. Such increases must have prior approval of the Buckeye Boys Ranch Board of Trustees. The referring agency will be given a minimum of thirty (30) days notice (and more time when possible) in writing, about any planned change in the fee structure affecting children at the Ranch or Hirsch Hall.
It is anticipated that a review of tuition costs will be made during the summer of 1975, and that some fee increase will be considered for the 1976 fiscal year.

C. Enrollment and Program Agreement:

Ranch Clinical and Administrative personnel will work cooperatively with the referring agency personnel to design and implement appropriate treatment plans and programs for each referring agency child accepted and admitted to the Ranch program, and will provide periodic reports reflecting each child's progress.

D. Clothing Agreement:

At the time of admission, the referring agency will see that each child is provided (and brings with him) the following minimum clothing items:

- 7 undershorts
- 7 T-shirts
- 10 pair regular socks
- 2 pair gym socks
- 1 pair gym shorts
- 2 sets pagamas
- 1 pair gym shoes
- 3 dress shirts
- 4 sport shirts
- 2 sweat shirts
- 3 dress trousers
- 4 pair sturdy jeans
- 2 pair dress shoes
- 1 pair swim trunks
- 1 overcoat
- 1 jacket
- 1 pair gloves
- 1 warm hat
- 1 pair work shoes
- 1 sweater
- 1 belt

E. Health Care Agreement:

All medical or dental care fees (not covered by welfare, health insurance, or other standard health-care resources) will be paid by the referring agency. This includes prescriptive medication, hearing or visual aids, corrective garments, and remedial cosmetic surgery.

Any medical, surgical and dental services (provided for the referring agency boys in residence at the Ranch or Hirsch Hall) which costs fifty dollars ($50.00) or more, will require written
authorization by the appropriate referring agency representative prior to having the service done. However, this does not apply if emergency medical or dental services are necessary, and there is either insufficient time or the appropriate referring agency representative is not immediately available for authorization. In such cases, the referring agency will assume full responsibility for the emergency medical or dental expenses.

F. Chronic or Extended Runaways (A.W.O.L.) Agreement:

The Ranch will assume responsibility to assume the cost and to make all arrangements to return children who are on a runaway status (A.W.O.L.) from the Ranch. The referring agency agrees to continue full payment during the period when the boy is A.W.O.L. However, children who are A.W.O.L. for more than 14 straight days will be discharged on the 15th day, unless the referring agency requests (in writing) that the boy's bed be held open. In such cases, the referring agency will continue to pay full tuition in order to maintain the bed. By mutual agreement, the boy can be discharged prior to the 15th day.

G. Transfer or Discharge Agreement:

The Ranch personnel will work cooperatively with the referring agency personnel to design and implement aftercare plans which are (as much as realistically possible) in harmony with the special needs of each child in treatment.

In situations where a transfer from the Ranch to Hirsch Hall (or from Hirsch Hall to the Ranch) is indicated, the referring agency will be advised in writing at least 10 days prior to the move. In some emergency situations, the Ranch will contact the referring agency representative by phone, and will follow this up immediately in writing.

In normal discharge situations, a written projected date will be sent to the referring agency thirty (30) days prior to the anticipated discharge. In emergency or court-related situations, where removal is either urgent or legally determined, the Ranch agrees to try to give as much notice as possible, understanding that each circumstance must be met as it emerges. The Ranch will also make every effort
to give the referring agency as much advance notice as possible (if it appears that a child is moving out of control) so that some alternatives may be explored before an emergency occurs.

Tuition payments will terminate for each child from the referring agency, upon the actual day of discharge from the Ranch.
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These terms emerged during the two year period from 1972 to 1974, and were commonly used at Buckeye Boys Ranch at that time,

Case Manager. One role assigned to selected Youth Leaders and/or student interns, expanding their responsibilities and authority. This role incorporates client advocacy for a small caseload of three to six clients.

Client. (also referred to as "residents," "students," "kids," "boys," "youths," "young men," and "consumers"). Each adolescent or preadolescent youth who is the recipient of direct and indirect services provided by the Ranch staff. On occasion, this term may also apply to or refer to the family of the boy placed at the Ranch.

Clinical Team. The group of professional staff responsible for all client population movement (admissions, transfers, and discharges); for clinical and ethical accountability of treatment approaches with clients; and for the clinical treatment philosophy embraced. The clinical team is composed of the Treatment Director, Consulting Psychiatrist, and five Clinical Therapists. In addition, clinical student interns, school personnel, and program personnel participate as needed or requested.

Clinician (also referred to as "clinical therapist," "coordinator," "team leader," "caseworker," "counselor," "social worker," or "unit leader"). The professional staff person who is responsible for the treatment of all clients in one house or living unit, and who supervises a treatment team of child-care staff.

Coordinator. Each of eight persons responsible for and heading up a specific Unit. These include four clinicians (Hislop Team; Argo Team; Stowell East Team; Stowell West Team); the Hirsch Hall Coordinator; the School Coordinator; the Supportive Services Coordinator (also referred to as the "business manager" or "personnel manager"), and the Program Coordinator.

Discipline Committee. A group composed of the Executive Director; the Treatment Director; and the appropriate Clinician (or designated other staff), who meet on serious negative behaviors, with the client involved, upon the request of the Clinician or Treatment Team.
Policy Committee. A group composed of the eight Co-ordinators, the Treatment Director; and the Executive Director, who initiate, discuss and recommend overall Ranch policy and procedures, subject to final approval of the Executive Director.

Program. A concept, which includes every aspect of structured or non-structured experiences in which staff and clients interact within the Ranch framework: school; unit activities; recreation; work-for-pay; specific treatment approaches; and any form of verbal or nonverbal activity relating to opportunities for physical, emotional, intellectual, social, ethical, or interpersonal self-expression by clients.

Staff. All full-time or part-time paid personnel in roles or positions involved with clients at Buckeye Boys Ranch: youth leaders; night-security leaders; cooks; administrators; housemothers; recreation leaders; maintenance specialists; laundry specialist; secretaries; clinicians; nurse; psychiatrist; and coordinators. On occasion, teachers; teacher aides; and student interns are referred to as "staff," even though they are non-paid or paid through other systems.

Staff Development. All training or experiential situations which provide opportunities for staff change, movement, or growth. This includes seminars, retreats, marathon meetings, team meetings, supervisory conferences and structured human relations training.

Treatment. The process which encompasses all aspects of program, but which is more specifically tailored toward individual goals for appropriate change, mutually-agreed-upon by clients and staff, to enhance the client's overall level of functioning.

Treatment Team. The combined staff assigned to one specific living unit: full-time and part-time youth leaders; the unit coordinator; student interns; and one representative from the Ranch school. The treatment team collaborates to design, implement and review individual and group treatment approaches in conjunction with each client living in the unit; to provide "parenting" for the clients; to provide appropriate programming for the clients; and to maintain a safe, functional, healthy, clean environment.
Unit. Each of eight sub-systems within the larger Ranch organizational structure: school unit; supportive service unit; program unit; and five living units (Hislop house; Argo House; East Stowell; West Stowell; and Hirsch Hall).

Youth Leader. Each full-time or part-time paid personnel who works directly in the living unit with the client population, and who has the primary authority and responsibility for program implementation; housekeeping standards; limit-setting; and direct parenting roles. Also referred to as "child-care," "youth care," and "case manager."
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The researcher has been working professionally in settings for delinquent and disturbed adolescents, over the past eighteen years. In each of these settings the researcher has been directly involved in extensive staff training roles, as follows:

Summit County Juvenile Court Center (Akron, Ohio, 1960-1965) as a Boys Detention Group Leader; Detention Shift Supervisor; Probation Officer; Evening Court Referee.

Ohio Youth Commission (Canton, Ohio; Columbus, Ohio 1965-1970) as a Community Youth Counselor; Assistant Chief of Aftercare Services; and Deputy Superintendent of the Herbert F. Christian Youth Camp.

Buckeye Boys Ranch, Inc. (Grove City, Ohio, 1970-1978), as Assistant Director; Treatment Director; Coordinator.

In addition, the researcher has designed and conducted training programs for the following groups,

Structured Human Relations Training Sessions (2-4 hours)
1. Unitarian Church youth groups (1969), 70, 71, 72, 73
2. Guest lecturer and facilitator, Ohio State University
   a) adult education classes (1970, 71, 72, 73)
   b) social work classes (1971, 72, 74)
   c) communications classes (1972)
3. Cooperative Extension Services, Ohio State University
   a) selected 4-H youth groups (1971, 72, 73, 74, 76)
   b) Cooperative Extension professionals (1972)
4. Greater Columbus Tennis Association (1972, 73)
5. Columbus Area International Program (1972,73,74,75,76)
6. Model Cities Day Care Professionals (1976)
7. Presbyterian Parents workshop (1977,78)

Training Workshops (two to six days each)
1. Little Theatre Off Broadway (1971-72)
2. St. Vincent's Children's Treatment Center (1973)
3. Ohio Association of Child Care Agencies (1974,75)
4. Franklin County Children Services (1973,74,75,76)
Student Training (four to twelve week block placements)
1. Columbus Technical Institute (1973,74,75)
2. Dennison University January Experience (1972,73,75,76)
3. Otterbein College Social Work Trainees (1973)
4. Columbus International Exchange Students (1971,72,73,74)
5. Community Medical Student Rotation (1972,74)

Extended Staff Training Programs (seven to nine months)
1. Urbancrest Head-Start Teacher Training (1971/1972)
2. Buckeye Boys Ranch Staff Training Program (1973/1974)

The researcher is also a part-time faculty member of The Ohio State University School of Social Work, with experience in the following teaching roles,


Instructor, of the course SW503, "Juvenile Delinquency," designed for 50-70 undergraduate students (Spring, 1977; Winter, 1978).

Guest Lecturer, for two hour seminars with undergraduate social work students (quarterly, from 1969 through 1977) and Children's Hospital medical students (bi-monthly, from 1970 through 1976).

Other qualifications which have acquainted the researcher with the theoretical and structural methodology required for this study include involvement in selected graduate courses in educational and psychological testing; statistics courses at the undergraduate and graduate level; written research-oriented papers required for masters and doctoral course-work; and, an extensive, ongoing survey of professional literature in the fields of education, social work, psychology, and juvenile corrections.
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Figure 12: A Social Systems Model of Buckeye Boys Ranch, 1972 to 1974
Figure 13: Buckeye Boys Ranch Functional Structure in September, 1972

* Denotes Members of Clinical Planning Committee
Figure 14: Buckeye Boys Ranch Functional Structure in September, 1973

* Denotes Members of Clinical Planning Committee
Figure 15: Buckeye Boys Ranch Functional Structure in September, 1974
Figure 16: Buckeye Boys Ranch: Detail of Supportive Services Unit, September, 1974
Figure 17: Buckeye Boys Ranch: Detail of Clinical Office Unit, September, 1975
Figure 18: Buckeye Boys Ranch: Detail of Hislop Treatment Team  
September, 1974
Figure 19: Buckeye Boys Ranch: Detail of Argo Treatment Team, September, 1974
Figure 20: Buckeye Boys Ranch: Detail of Stowell East Treatment Team, September, 1974

- EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
- TREATMENT DIRECTOR
- STOWELL EAST COORDINATOR
- STOWELL EAST TREATMENT UNIT
  - 4 FULL-TIME YOUTH LEADERS
  - 2 PART-TIME YOUTH LEADERS
Figure 21: Buckeye Boys Ranch: Detail of Stowell West Treatment Team, September, 1974
Figure 22: Buckeye Boys Ranch: Detail of Program Unit, September, 1974
Figure 23: Buckeye Boys Ranch: Detail of Hirsch Hall Treatment Team, September, 1974
Figure 24: Buckeye Boys Ranch: Detail of Ranch School Unit, September, 1974
Figure 25: Boys Village Functional Structure in September, 1973 and June, 1974
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A. INTRODUCTION: A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE OF GROWTH

1. The Early Years: 1961 to 1965
2. Emerging Expansion: 1965 to 1972
3. At the Brink of Change: June 1972
4. A Time of Trial and Impact: June 1972 to June 1974

B. FIRST STAGE: THE PREPARATION PERIOD

1. Philosophical Considerations of Staff Training
   a. administrative expectations and philosophy
   b. philosophy of Ranch consulting psychiatrist
   c. assistant director's philosophy
   d. institutional norms: the desired milieu
   e. rationale for selection of resident clients
   f. emerging requirements for new staff selection
2. Identification of General Goals of Training
3. Preparation for Change: June 1972 to May, 1973

C. SECOND STAGE: THE ORIENTATION PERIOD

1. June, 1973
2. July, August, 1973
3. September, 1973

D. THIRD STAGE: ADVANCED TRAINING IMPLEMENTATION

1. Step One: Providing the Basic Structure
   a. Formation of autonomous treatment teams
   b. Schedule revision by mutual problem-solving
   c. the I-level classification system as a common language
   d. Formulation of long-range Ranch goals
   e. Use of Relyea Retreat for staff training
   f. Ranch symposium on residential treatment
   g. Marathon meeting to establish consistent policy
2. Step Two: Providing Basic Theory

3. Step Three: Youth leaders as Case Managers

4. Step Four: Program Development

5. Step Five: The Clinician as Coordinator

6. Training Outcomes
A. INTRODUCTION: A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE OF BUCKEYE BOYS RANCH

1. The Early Years: 1961 to 1965

The doors of Buckeye Boys Ranch was opened in September of 1961 with the admission of three boys into Argo House from the Franklin County Children Services. The first youth admitted to the Ranch was a 13 year old with borderline intellectual functioning, severe emotional and physical deprivation and extreme dependency. The second boy, age 14, had only minor official charges of delinquency. However, he was extremely difficult to reach and heavily into the delinquent culture. He was also a non-reader and had experienced many traumatic situations in school due to his angry, explosive behavior. This behavior resulted in his suspension from at least three community schools before being removed, rather permanently, from formal educational programs. The third boy, also 14, was slightly less defiant and delinquent, but at times highly unreasonable and uncooperative.

These three youths typified the initial group of ten boys at Buckeye Boys Ranch. The philosophy of care was that the Ranch could best serve dependent, neglected, and mildly disturbed or delinquent youth. While most of the first group had presenting problems which were seen as suggestive of only mild degrees of disturbances or pre-delinquent traits, it was soon evident that presenting problems were not always valid indicators of behavioral or emotional problem levels on the part of the boys in the program. Some of the boys with "minor" problems as far as known delinquent traits were concerned, turned out to be among those most difficult to treat in the program. Conversely, a few of the boys with more serious known delinquencies tended to function moderately well in the program and added a thread of support to the Ranch program.

The initial full-time staff consisted of the Director, Les Bostic, and a live-in houseparent couple, Vera and Everett Newburn. In addition, part-time relief houseparents, Mr. and Mrs. Donald Preston, were added, and one part-time person was recruited to work some of the evenings in a role which supported the houseparents. However, it was the responsibility of the residential house couple to manage the boys and provide meals on a work schedule which averaged 80 hours per week.

Professionally, Dr. Thomas L. King, M.D., became affiliated with the Ranch upon its inception, as a part-time
psychiatric consultant. He met with the Director at least once each week, and usually with the houseparents as well. He was readily available to respond to the Director about special problems by phone, offering important feedback related to program development and special approaches to the treatment of the Ranch boys. He was also utilized by the Director for individual case consultation, since the Director was serving as case manager for the ten boys in the program. As the primary clinician, special treatment efforts by the Director involved some individual work with the boys on either a "regular appointment" or on an as-needed basis. Since most of the boys were from Franklin County, there was considerable interaction with the families. This occurred on a casework level, handling of specific incidents or situations such as home visits, and for problems arising with other children in the families being counseled.

Soon after the Ranch was opened, two undergraduate students from Capital University were hired to "live-in" in a room in the sleeping area of Argo House. These young men provided recreational leadership and other "big brother" experiences for Ranch boys. This was a generally positive approach and resulted in many close relationships between these college men and Ranch boys.

After one year of "living-in" by the college students, they left the program. The room in which they lived was then used by graduate level social work students, who lived in for periods approximating one school year. Three such graduate level students took on this "part-time" trainee job during the period from 1962 to 1965.

The Ranch program was based on an all-out team effort by all the staff. This was augmented greatly by the consulting psychiatrist and the sometimes creative and generally enthusiastic involvement of students who were placed at the Ranch. There was a "community" attitude on the part of most boys and staff about the program. Due to the lesser degree of complexity, those early years permitted the handling of crises situations in which boys were involved on a "here and now" basis with a minimal delay in decision-making. There was a much higher degree of authoritarianism in these early years. The Director made all of the policy decisions, clinical decisions, and most of the discipline and program changes. These decisions were usually made in consultation with the houseparents, and often with the psychiatrist.

By 1963, it became evident that the use of the community schools without specialized and individualized instruction
was inadequate to meet the special needs of the Ranch boys. This led to the hiring of a teacher as a part-time tutor for selected boys. The teacher met with the boys twice per week. This served as the beginning of the Ranch educational program, which subsequently developed contracts with educational specialists at the Educational Center, operated by Dr. Gerald Pruzan. After this experience, a tutor was hired on an expanded basis, eventually leading to his appointment as the first full-time Ranch teacher. In 1965, the Ranch received accreditation and funding through the State of Ohio, Division of Special Education.

The first Ranch Advisory Board President, Mrs. George I. Nelson, a Ph.D. Clinical Psychologist, provided volunteer counseling services with one family. Although her work was limited to a very brief period of time, it emphasized that specialized services were needed for treatment of boys in residence, and led to the appointment of the first paid psychologist, Dr. George Borelli. Dr. Borelli specialized in role-playing and group process with both staff and boys. During the course of nearly two years, on a one or two visits per week basis, he involved the boys in group therapy during which role playing techniques were introduced. He also served as consultant to the staff and often used role-playing to highlight conflict situations and help work them through. Dr. Borelli left the Ranch due to the loss of special funds which had been set aside for psychological services. He also was interested in pursuing other professional activities which occupied the time he had set aside for the Ranch.

The ladies of the ownership group known as The Women's Juvenile Service Board had been active, since Argo House was officially opened, in raising funds for the second phase of the long-range projected growth and development of the Ranch. Consequently, in 1964, a building committee was established consisting of several of the leaders from the women's group and some members of the Board of Trustees who were knowledgeable about institutional care. The Director of the Ranch was regarded as an expert resource to this committee, often being called upon to present his ideas about the type of facility to be considered for construction. As an outgrowth of these deliberations and considerable study, the building now known as Hislop House was put on the drawing board. The builder, Mr. Parker Garwick, was "hand picked" for the job of constructing the building because of his known reputation for good work and his interest in youth. Soon after the building was constructed, Mr. Garwick was elected as a trustee of the Ranch.

In summary, the first four years of the Ranch were generally uncomplicated for those directly involved. The basic
approach was to deal with situations immediately and with an effort to stay on top of the daily program. There was always the feeling that more services of a specialized nature were needed. As the program grew and boys with greater degrees of emotional problems came to the Ranch, the basic child care pattern established in the first two years were found to be inadequate. The Director became more involved in administration, community ventures, fund raising and public relations, and could not handle situations with the immediacy and consistency that was true initially. The delinquent culture among some of the older boys began to emerge in the form of defiance, anger, resistance, and community infringements. It was a time of stress, as the Ranch prepared for its first major expansion.

2. Emerging Expansion: 1965 to 1972

The opening of Hislop House in 1965 represented a major event in the life of the Ranch, resulting in many adjustments to an expanded operation involving two facilities rather than one. The most notable point of stress was related to the necessity of admitting a group of 12 new boys within a time frame of only four weeks. Many boys were brought in for this initial opening without the normal care in screening or concern about their prime suitability for residential treatment at the Ranch. Somehow, staff managed to get through that period, and to begin a more planned and integrated treatment approach relying upon psychological, psychiatric, social work, and educational skills combined with the never-ending pursuit of improved child care practices.

The first professionally trained social worker, other than the Director, was a volunteer, Mrs. W. Arthur Cullman. Mrs. Cullman became involved because of her interest in the Ranch and a desire to begin to work with a few families of boys at the Ranch. She served in this role for nearly a year and was quite helpful in pre-release family counseling. She phased out of this volunteer role in 1966 soon after the appointment of George Pulliam as the first full-time social worker and Director of the treatment program. With the hiring of Mr. Pulliam, an increased effort was made to individualize treatment at the Ranch, with more emphasis on both individual and group work. Graduate social work students from The Ohio State University were placed for field training experience soon after Mr. Pulliam's arrival. Students have had a positive impact on the total Ranch environment, stressing new ideas and more creative directions.

Dr. Steve Ruma, a Clinical Psychologist, came to the Ranch in 1967. Dr. Ruma was hired through an arrangement
with Children's Hospital whereby funds became available through the PSY Federal Program (Pre-School, School, and Youth Project). He was employed two days per week and was involved in providing necessary diagnostic testing, clinical therapy, and consultation to staff. Many new developments in the treatment program emerged and greater concentration of effort to improve staff communication and increase clinical skills of workers was effected. Dr. Ruma added immeasurably to this, and was always pushing for better performance from everyone associated with the Ranch program. An effort was made to increase personal awareness and self-understanding through "sensitivity training sessions" involving professional staff. This led to quite a bit of discomfort on the part of some staff members, especially as issues were brought up which tended to point out weaknesses in each other. Because of increased anxiety, this particular mode of staff training was abandoned and was replaced by a more traditional "Tuesday night staff meeting" wherein boys under study and evaluation were invited to share in this process. This practice continued until 1973, when the Ranch again doubled in size.

By 1968, the houseparents duty hours were gradually reduced to an average of 56 hours per week, as they worked from 6:00 a.m. until 6:00 p.m. on a 4 on - 2 off shift pattern. This necessitated three sets of houseparents: one set for Argo; one set for Hislop; and one set to swing between each house. Evenings were covered by two part-time workers in each house, and one staff member covered both houses from 11:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. each night. This staffing pattern continued until 1972, with two supplemental summertime staff to assist with work and recreation during non-school periods.

In 1968, Jane Aquino was appointed as the second full-time clinical social worker, to provide more clinical coverage. She assumed primary clinical responsibility for the boys in Argo House, which was under the basic supervision of Nan and Jim Demorest, the full-time houseparents. Vera and Everett Newburn had moved into Hislop House when it opened in 1965, and were the houseparents for the Hislop boys until 1973. George Pulliam continued to work as the primary Hislop Clinician.

Also in 1968, Hirsch Hall, the Ranch halfway house located at 1846 Summit Street in Columbus, was opened. William Balson, the Assistant Director of the Ohio Youth Commission, and then a Ranch Board Member, served as the Chairman of the Search Committee for locating an appropriate facility for this halfway house, and was involved in helping establish the program. Several Board Members, including contractors, architects, real estate developers,
and attorneys were involved with the Ranch Director in this effort. Dr. W. Arthur Cullman, Professor at The Ohio State University, was also engaged in this effort, particularly in terms of seeking a closer affiliation with OSU, and to some extent, in the development of program content. He very much believed in a strong program of helping each boy develop a sense of personal and social responsibility, leading to independent functioning. This provided some of the emphasis for a fairly open program at Hirsch Hall in which students were given considerable latitude in decision-making about many aspects of their life situations. The first Director of Hirsch Hall was Bob Marrah, a professionally trained social worker with extensive experience in child welfare and treatment of delinquent children.

During the first two years, Hirsch Hall was fraught with management problems, especially relating to girls, drinking, and increasing use of hallucinogens and other illegal drugs. The behavior of the residents was largely a product of the youth culture revolution and the facility location on the fringe area of OSU campus. Failure on the part of the boys to observe basic living rules, especially at night time, led to the overhauling of the Hirsch Hall program, including the implementation of more structured supervision. A night attendant was hired on a seven night per week basis to provide greater assurance that boys would be more apt to observe night rules. Additionally, a relief housemother was seen as a more necessary ingredient because the boys themselves and the "live-in" counselors (OSU students) seemed to have the greatest amount of trouble during the two days off per week of the regular housemother. The Ranch psychiatrist, psychologist, Assistant Director, and the Executive Director spent considerable time and effort in providing consultation for Bob Marrah, the live-in counselors, and housemother at Hirsch Hall.

In late 1969, Mr. Pulliam resigned to move to Texas, and Jane Aquino assumed almost total responsibility for clinical supervision of the 26 boys in residence on the Ranch campus. She was assisted, in part, by Rev. Harold Davidson, the Ranch Chaplain who has served on a volunteer basis for several years. As the '60's ended, the PSY project funds, later renamed the Children and Youth Project Fund, were cut from the Children's Hospital budget by the federal government. This necessitated a new funding approach for psychological services at the Ranch. This new funding source was found through the beginning of what is now called the Comprehensive Mental Health and Retardation Act, which established the Franklin County Mental Health and Retardation Board (648 Board). However, Dr. Steve Ruma had already decided to leave his position at Children's Hospital, and at the Ranch, for a
post with the National Training Laboratories in Washington, D.C. Consequently, for a period of approximately 18 months, the Ranch was without a psychologist. Dr. Thomas King's time as Consulting Psychiatrist was expanded to approximately half-time. This allowed concentration on providing psychiatric therapy for youths regarded as more highly troubled and in need of such specialized intervention.

A major event also occurred in 1969. Dr. Donald Dunn, Ranch Board President and owner of a tennis court surface called "Dynaturf," and the Columbus Indoor Tennis Club, decided, with the Ranch Director, to build a tennis court on the Ranch campus. Brainstorming, dreaming, and considering the future of the Ranch, led Mr. Dunn to almost single-handedly introduce a major professional tournament for the Ranch campus. Mr. Dunn and the Ranch Director were concerned about some of the pitfalls of such a project, but felt that in the long run the advantages of good public relations, potential for fund-raising, and the opportunity for the boys to be involved with professional tennis players was worth the risk of this event.

Tom Dudgeon was hired at about this same time, as the first Ranch public relations and development person. His role with the Ranch was to begin to develop the potential for increased and improved fund-raising from Ranch friends as well as the development of a new support base for the Ranch. He had helped develop and promote a well known tennis tournament in Cleveland which later led to Cleveland being able to host the American zone of the Davis Cup; and for Mr. Robert Malaga, promoter of the Cleveland tournament, to become the Executive Secretary of the United States Lawn Tennis Association. Due to Mr. Dudgeon's contacts, and Don Dunn's commitment to the Ranch, they were able to skillfully put together a package for a tournament to be called the Buckeye Tennis Championships. In 1970, eight of the top USLTA players competed in the inaugural tournament which consisted of a three-day doubles and singles event with a $12,000 purse. Players such as Stan Smith, Bobby Lutz, Arthur Ashe, Charlie Passarell, Clark Graebner, and Tom Gorman, were involved in this tournament which was televised by WLW-C on the final day. The public relations and communication potential of this tournament was substantial. It appeared to have projected the name of the Ranch firmly in the community, and was to become a major sporting and social event in the Columbus summer season.

In 1970, Richard Gebhardt was appointed as Assistant Director, to replace George Pulliam. Dick, a professionally trained social worker with clinical and administrative
experience, took over Hislop House clinical responsibilities; coordinated the intake and admission of boys; screened child care candidates; and supervised Jane Aquino and Bob Marrah. During his first two years at the Ranch, Dick expanded the number of graduate and undergraduate students placed at the Ranch and became involved as a Board Member of the Columbus Area International Program. This resulted in the placement of social work and recreation specialists from other countries into the Ranch system for four-month periods. These specialists included: Gilles Cordonier, France, 1971; Bassam Haddad, Jordan, 1972; Kurt Kletzer, Austria, 1973; and Ingrid Hunsche, Germany, 1974. The concept of the Ranch as a learning laboratory was constantly stressed, and Dick and Dr. King were also able to include two medical students in a community medical rotation placement at the Ranch.

One innovation, which lasted two years, was the concept of day care. From 1971 to 1973, during the school year only, up to six additional boys were served Monday through Friday from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. This put considerable stress on the system, especially the Ranch school, which by this time had expanded to two teachers from South-Western City School System. Both teachers, David Abbott and Fred Ruoff, eventually left the Ranch for administrative positions in the South-Western School System. In 1978, Dr. Abbott was appointed as Superintendent of Schools of the Maumee School System.

In 1971, Sumner Clarren, a Ph.D. candidate at The Ohio State University was hired as the Ranch psychologist. His role, similar to that of Steve Ruma, was related to providing some diagnostic testing, with a heavy concentration on staff development and some individual therapy. Sumner was quite interested in developing community resources and worked in that arena to some extent in collaboration with the 648 Board. After approximately one year, he left the Ranch for a position in Cincinnati to assist in community and human relations training for the Cincinnati Police Department.

During the period of 1971-1972, when the demands of administration put considerable pressure on the Executive Director, the Clinical Planning Committee (CPC) was formed. This group chaired by Dick Gebhardt was composed of Tom King, Jane Aquino, Bob Marrah, and Sumner Clarren, and cohesed around the clinical treatment thrust. The goals established by this committee were designed to fulfill the Executive Director's primary mandate for improved services to the boys. In addition, the CPC members, led by the Executive Director, became the Ranch Policy Committee, and were very active in providing inputs to the Executive Director for his consideration. The Clinical Planning
Committee also took responsibility for expanded staff training and program development.

Under the direction of the Executive Director, the CPC planned for and implemented the first major Ranch-sponsored all-day institute. This program, titled "Meeting the needs of Children through education--today and tomorrow," was held at the Ramada Inn South in Grove City, on Friday, March 10, 1972. The principal speakers were Dr. Virginia Axline, play therapist and author of "Dibs: in Search of Self" and "Play Therapy"; and Dr. W. Hugh Missildine, Child Psychiatrist and author of "Your Inner Child of the Past." Originally limited to the first 100 participants, the registration was expanded to nearly 150 teachers, social workers, counselors, nurses, psychologists, and sociologists. Ranch staff and selected professionals from the community were chosen as discussion leaders. This institute supported the Ranch reputation of strong child advocacy within the professional community.

Early in 1972, the Ranch staff became aware that a new building was planned. Mrs. Florence Stowell, a friend of one of the members of the Women's Juvenile Service Board, endowed the Ranch in excess of $500,000.00 for a building. This building, Stowell Hall, became a reality when construction was started in June, 1972. At this point, intensive planning emerged, beginning the first stage of a two-year massive impact on the Ranch.

3. At the Brink of Change: June, 1972

The Ranch of June, 1972, was relatively peaceful; staff and client population were generally stabilized; the existing houseparent model provided a comfortable structure of effective parenting; the clinical/client ratio was the strongest in the history of the Ranch; the addition of a creative, dynamic recreation leader, Anthony West, enhanced programming considerably; the tennis tournament was growing, but had not reached the all-consuming intensity it would generate in subsequent years; and there were few major issues with which to contend.

As the excavation for Stowell Hall began, so too began the need for expansion planning. The Assistant Director was given the responsibility and authority to take a strong leadership role for the direction of the treatment program. The philosophy embraced by the Assistant Director was best stated by John Gardner, who stated:

the true task is to design institutions capable of continuous change, renewal, and responsiveness—that develop human resources to the fullest; that remove obstacles to individual fulfillment; that emphasize education, lifelong learning, and self-discovery. Our problem is not to find better values, but rather to be faithful to those we profess—and to make those values live in our institutions.

This philosophy was supported by the Executive Director and the Clinical Planning Committee as a guideline for long-range planning for change.

4. A time of Trial and Impact: June, 1972 to June, 1974

Buckeye Boys Ranch experienced a period of significant change from June, 1972 through June, 1974. During this two-year period, the organizational structure was substantially modified: the Ranch staff and population doubled in size; the traditional houseparent roles were replaced by a clinical treatment team model; and the previously more pastoral environment was dramatically altered by the emergence of a new central building which was perceived as massive compared with already existing structures.

The Ranch change process occurred in three stages, two of which were thoroughly planned and one which was planned but altered to meet changing conditions. The first stage was a twelve month preparation period from June, 1972 through May, 1973, during which time the Ranch staff planned for the anticipated expansion and role transition. The second stage provided for orientation and training of new staff during the three-month period from June through mid-September, 1973, when the actual increase in staff and resident population occurred. In this stage some adjustments were made, precipitated by unanticipated stress-responses, which impacted planning for the third stage. The third stage included the nine-month period from mid-September, 1973 to mid-June, 1974, and incorporated intensive staff training, role clarification, and modification of the organizational structure to accommodate the stress-response generated during the second stage.

The researcher, as assistant director of Buckeye Boys Ranch at the time of expansion and transition, had the responsibility for total Ranch staff training. This section describes the dynamics and procedures involved in the preparation for and implementation of staff development, as an inventive strategy for change during a period of stress.
B. FIRST STAGE: THE PREPARATION PERIOD

1. Philosophical Consideration of Staff Training

a. administrative expectations and philosophy:

The role of the executive director (Dr. Leslie A. Bostic) evolved considerably over the twelve-year period to the 1973 Ranch expansion, in order to meet constant growth and change. He had to become a tough, seasoned administrator to cope with the intense, prolonged, multiple demands associated with institutional management. As he experienced these demands, he gradually developed a firm consistent pattern of basic expectations and a personal philosophy of treatment.

As a professionally trained social worker, and because of his own desire to provide opportunities for staff growth and maturity, Dr. Bostic encouraged an atmosphere of flexibility and openness to new ideas. He was open to suggestions for change, even when such changes were contrary to his own core values. On occasion, this receptive attitude created internal conflict when the new ideas were at variance with Dr. Bostic's personal philosophy of residential treatment. He was unique in the respect that, even though his capacity to endure the internal conflict created by such variance had its limits, he tried very hard not to mandate his expectations. There were times when his patience was exhausted and his deep concerns surfaced. These were usually at crisis-points, and unfulfilled expectations were brought more sharply back into focus as Dr. Bostic expressed his feelings and perceptions. Usually this involved some renegotiation of direction. On rare occasions, Dr. Bostic made arbitrary decisions without negotiation.

There were two primary areas incorporating the essence of Dr. Bostic's philosophy of residential treatment: basic expectations for group living; and, quality of treatment. The basic expectations were as follows:

1) each resident should be provided with the necessary essentials of food, clothing, and shelter; and, all medical, academic, recreational, social, emotional, ethical, and spiritual needs should be met, in an atmosphere of safety, security, and nurturance;

2) residents should not harm themselves, others, or property, and staff should provide the necessary limits to support this expectation;
3) the environment should be protected from extreme or deliberate abuses, and the resident's personal life-space should be kept safe, clean, and uncluttered;

4) each resident should maintain reasonable standards of personal hygiene, personal appearance, appropriate clothing, and generally socialized conduct; and,

5) all residents should be active and involved, through a variety of program options within a relatively firm and consistent structure.

The quality of treatment philosophy involved such concepts as: life-space; staff; relationships; feelings; decision-making; and school. The following statements were excerpted from a paper presented by Dr. Bostic\(^2\) and reflects his philosophy at the time staff training was implemented:

**Life-space:** We tried to design the facilities to provide for a high degree of freedom. Rooms are without locks on the doors and without bars on the windows and without a custodial appearance.

The Ranch cottages are situated so that kids can have areas to "blow-up in"... the kids learn pretty quickly that there is an area here which allows for the venting of feelings and frustrations. This moves from a physical understanding—knowing that they can go to the basement to blow up—to also realizing that infringements in terms of negative, disruptive comments can also be channeled.

**Staff:** The nuts and bolts of the program is to have people in the setting who can interact, who can help kids in their decision-making capacities, and who can set some limits simply by their presence.

First of all we must provide some external limits. These limits, however, cannot be based on locks and bars and make sense. They have to be based on people, available on the spot, to help kids control themselves until the relationship is established. Once a relationship is formed, limits are easy because limits become internalized controls.

\(^2\)Excerpts from paper presented to the National Criminal Justice Institute, Sam Houston State University, Houston, Texas by Leslie A. Bostic, July 17, 1972.
relationships: Our whole focus at Buckeye Boys Ranch is to have time with the kids—one or two years in the program—so that opportunities for relationship formation can take place.

You have to have people with the kids who can themselves be effective in their own relationship approach. Unless a person is reasonably happy with himself, he or she is probably not going to be very happy in a situation with hostile, troublesome people.

The operation of the Ranch is based on some degree of trust and respect, and the assumption that we can learn to live together and work out some problems of living. The premise is that you as a person have some rights and that I as a person have some rights, and that we can put them together and make it functional.

I would rather say right on the spot, "this displeases me; I do not like this behavior; I am not going to tolerate it; this is what I expected," and I would rather show them in black and white where the lines are. Once you do that, kids understand where you are coming from, and that you still care.

We must not write kids off. We must not say that, "he has been hurt too much; he is lost, why bother?" We must not move into that attitude. People are strong. We see evidence of that.

feelings: We try to let kids know that we are human beings who are going to make some wrong decisions, and when we are angry we are going to show it. We would rather show it, even though we may make the wrong decision, than to cover it with a false smile and walk off into the office and curse the kids.

If I get mad with a kid, or blow up at him, I am not saying, "hey man, you are out; I am not going to like you; I am going to reject you; I am going to give you the business." Instead, I am saying, "bud, I care about you; that is where I am; I want to share with you, and I want you to know this," and over a period of time, just over and over, kids are able to trust.

Kids know they can beat you at aggression. A boy can literally tear you apart if you attempt to deal with him in a repressive, aggressive way. You must learn to back off and develop some understanding of what it means when you say to him, "I know you are
angry, but I want you to understand that I have not done anything to you personally to cause this reaction."

I think conflict is the greatest thing we have going for us. Conflict has to be there; it is only through the successful resolution of conflict that change can occur.

decision-making: Delinquents probably have more capacity to make a good showing and do well in life than many who are labeled "emotionally disturbed but not delinquent." Delinquent kids make decisions all the time; they are decision-makers. Their choice of decisions is what gets them into trouble.

As an effort to get kids involved in making decisions, we allow them to fail without making an issue of it. The whole concept, the whole philosophy, must be on trying to help people make decisions about their own lives ... to learn to make appropriate decisions.

school: We cannot bring the kids in and put the screws to them and expect them to go into the school tomorrow and make passing grades. We have to say, "what do you want out of this experience?" and if he says, "I don't want anything; I want you to get the hell out of here; I don't want anything," we respect that for awhile. We have to.

The program can be structured; it does not mean chaos. It simply means that there is a recognition of the needs and rights of people with whom you are working; and this must go beyond the mere following of rules in a one, two, three, lock-step fashion.

Dr. Bostic's ongoing concern has been that the Ranch stay small enough to maintain the personal touch. His conclusions stress this concept:

My own goal is to see that we do not get beyond sixty or seventy kids, living on grounds twenty-four hours daily. I do not feel that when you get into the hundreds you can be effective.

b. philosophy of Ranch consulting psychiatrist

The Ranch consulting psychiatrist, Dr. Thomas L. King, M.D., embraced the overall philosophy that clients had the right of self-determination, even when this came in conflict
with institutional needs or expectations. He was particularly concerned when the demands of the institution appeared to infringe on the rights of the child, or when the emotional needs of the client were perceived to be secondary to the physical needs of the institution.

Although he accepted the need for non-threatening physical restraints of clients, when they posed a significant or immediate threat to self or others, he was adamantly opposed to the use of aggressive reaction on the part of staff toward clients. In addition, Dr. King was exceptionally guarded in his use of chemotherapy, and prescribed medication for boys in residence only in the most extreme circumstances.

Dr. King developed a specific set of "criteria for progress toward mature adulthood," which incorporated twelve crucial areas of growth potential. These were criteria by which the ambiguous terms "mental health," "adjustment," and "maturity," could be more clearly measured. These criteria formed a comprehensive picture of what went into making an individual feel good about himself and the world around him and toward learning to live in harmony with himself and the world. Dr. King's criteria were as follows:

Our efforts as treatment resources are directed to do everything we can to enable a youngster to reach his maximum potential for adjustment, whatever that may be. We must bend our efforts to developing a milieu program as well as an individual program for each youngster that will allow such maximum growth.

In thinking, planning, and relating with youngsters, keep these criteria in mind and let them guide you in terms of your direction toward accomplishment of treatment goals as well as in your evaluation of where a particular youngster is operating at any given moment.

Self Concept

Almost every youngster, who is emotionally disturbed, has very poor feelings about himself. These feelings have come about not only in terms of his own internal feelings but his perception of how people in his environment feel about him. He may express the fact that he has a poor self-concept in a variety of ways of behavior, usually dysfunctional in type and hard to live with generally.
Improvement in self-concept can come about through success experiences, accepting relationships with peers and adults, looking to the future with greater hope, and learning to "put an arm around yourself" or accept a supporting arm from someone else.

**Open Communication System**

Most individuals with dysfunctional behavior have a variety of mechanisms which serve to protect them from real or perceived stress but which mask and distort their true meanings and feelings. These systems are usually very inflexible and allow for little choice, which increases their inability to really work effectively.

Anything which can be done to open up these systems usually leads to improved adjustment. Acting as a good role model for open communication by which a person knows how he thinks and feels and is able to convey this to another in a non-infringing way, is one method. Encouraging and rewarding similar efforts on the part of the youngster is another way.

**Following Constructive Rules**

Everyone follows a set of rules, but often the set of rules an individual follows are dysfunctional in terms of bringing him into conflict with himself or with society. If someone says, "we have no rules," then the rule is that there are no rules.

If this is so, hopefully through the example and relationship with an understanding adult; alternate systems of rules may be explored and tried by the youngster and he may find that these alternate rules work better for him. It is important to understand that there are at least three different kinds of rules:

1) Behavioral/Biological Rules: All mankind has specific characteristics—verbal language; opposing thumb; upright posture; and the capacity for abstract reasoning. Regardless of the culture from which he springs, man is a communal animal and develops rules which protect his species and his identity. Man will always react violently to protect his personal integrity, his body space, and his territory. Consequently, rules which must always be enforced are those which protect man against loss of property (stealing), physical abuse (fighting) and invasion of privacy (personal life-space).
2) Cultural or Agency Rules: These rules vary from culture to culture, with some similarities and some differences. For example, the Ranch has as a rule "no smoking in bedrooms," and anyone who is involved in the Ranch culture is expected to enforce such a rule consistently and without exception. There should be a consensus of which rules are enforceable, and each of these rules should have a solid reason behind it (and not personal feelings or a moral value-judgment).

3) Interpersonal (or Personal) Rules: These are behaviors which are infringements upon you personally (and these are the rules most frequently broken). Your obligation is to point out to the infringer that you are being infringed upon, using the first person singular "I-Messages." We often get in trouble when we try to enforce personal rules as though they were cultural rules.

Decision-Making

Everyone makes decisions about their own lives. Whether or not these decisions work to the betterment of the individual is a criterion for mental health. Often times, the decisions one makes brings one into conflict with others.

Whenever a youngster's decision-making becomes dysfunctional or brings him into conflict with others, this should be pointed out to him, and he should be offered alternates and encouraged to use them.

Self-Regulation

Occasionally, an individual may decide that he wishes another individual to control and direct his life. Sometimes, the individual may wish his life to be almost completely taken over by someone else. This very often leads to prolonged non-productivity and poor adjustment.

Individuals should be encouraged to be in charge of their own lives within their levels of maturity and competence. Nothing should be done for a youngster that he can do himself.

Expression of Feelings

It is often a difficult thing to express one's feelings in an appropriate manner. Cultural restrictions as well
as restrictions imposed by the more immediate environment of family and friends often cause one to distort expression, to withhold expression, or to overexpress certain feelings. This can lead to fairly serious dysfunctional behavior.

One should be evaluating a youngster’s ability to appropriately and honestly express himself in the following areas:

1) **Joy** - Can he enjoy himself, laugh appropriately, seem to gain pleasure from people and himself?

2) **Anger** - Can he express dissatisfaction and hurt without overreacting or becoming destructive to himself or others?

3) **Grief** - When saddened, is he comfortable with tears and expressions of discomfort, and can he receive emotional support from others?

4) **Affection** - Can he freely give of himself to another person physically and emotionally, and can he receive the same from another individual?

5) **Fear** - If frightened, can he be honest about this and do something constructive either by himself or with another to lessen his fears?

**Impulse Control**

Sometimes our feelings, particularly negative ones, seem to overwhelm us, and we lose control, often letting our feelings run rampant. This almost always results in a negative response from the environment, often with dire consequence.

Our goal with a youngster is, through example and support, to teach him to learn his "breaking point," and at that time to channel his feelings in ways that will not bring retaliation, but will result in relief for him.

**Interpersonal Relationships**

1) **PEERS:** Very often emotionally disturbed youngsters have a great deal of difficulty relating to their peers. Their relationships may be superficial, transient, too intense, or lead to increasingly dysfunctional behavior.
Hopefully a youngster can learn through experimentation with various peers and guidance from adults to form lasting, meaningful peer relationships with peers his own age and sex as well as with members of the opposite sex.

2) ADULTS: With adults, a youngster may be distant, distrustful, fearful, manipulative, or overdependent. These attitudes prevent him from using the adult as a role model or learning anything constructive from the adult.

   It is hoped that through trial and error, a youngster can come to trust adults, live at peace with most of them at least, and even try to constructively emulate some of them.

3) AUTHORITY FIGURES: With authority figures, both adult and peer in origin, a youngster may be fearful, obsequious, withdrawing, or defiant.

   It is hoped that he may learn to trust benevolent authority, adhere to reasonable rules and regulations, and to constructively work to change social rules that are dysfunctional.

   **The Use of Leisure Time**

   Individuals who have problems with their thoughts, feelings and self concept cannot often use free time in any way which is pleasurable to them. They often lack experience and exposure to hobbies and activities which might stimulate their interest and "turn them on." With shortened work weeks and, therefore, an increase in leisure time, this may be an increasing problem for more of us.

   In working with disturbed youth, we should attempt to expose them to a wide range of activities, without necessarily insisting on participation, in order to hopefully stimulate their interest in pursuing areas which can lead to success experiences and continued interest and self entertainment.

   **Community Adjustment**

   Very often, particularly with a delinquent youth, an individual's adjustment and behavior is such that he cannot adjust to the community, or the community cannot adjust to him.
In such a situation, the learning of alternate behavior, intelligent trials of exposure of the youngster in gradual doses to the community, and the education of the community to accept the youngster, is indicated.

**School Adjustment**

In a very high number of cases, an emotionally disturbed child has a real problem in school either in problems relating to learning or in problems relating to his behavior being disruptive to other's learning.

In these situations, highly specialized school programs must be devised to overcome any learning disability and to take advantage of any assets the youngster may have in the school area. Also programs must be devised to handle his disruptive behavior so that he does not infringe on others. Finally, trial in a public school system must be accomplished.

**Work Adjustment**

Many youngsters have extremely poor work habits and are very easily discouraged. Their work is often self-defeating and non-productive.

In order to comfortably exist in society, an individual must be a producer rather than just a consumer. Successful exposure to work experiences, within his area of ability, and with proper rewards, is a way of developing constructive work habits.

Dr. King summarized his criteria as a series of rules for treatment of clients at Buckeye Boys Ranch:

**Rule 1.** Anything which is done, which improves an individual's self-concept, leads to improved adjustment and better mental health. Anything which is done to lower self-concept leads to increasingly dysfunctional behavior.

**Rule 2.** One goal of treatment is to introduce flexibility into the communication system and increase versatility for handling stress. A second goal is to encourage an open communication system wherein an individual is able to honestly convey how he thinks and feels in a non-infringing way, without fear of reprisal.

**Rule 3.** A goal of treatment is to encourage an individual to follow a set of constructive rules which are internal as well as external.
Rule 4. An individual should be encouraged to develop decision-making which is functional and non-infringing in nature.

Rule 5. Individuals should be encouraged to regulate their own lives within their levels of maturity and competence.

Rule 6. The honest, functional, non-infringing expression of all emotions should be encouraged as part of the treatment process.

Rule 7. A treatment goal is to establish good impulse control in an individual.

Rule 8. The development of honest, open, mutually gratifying, non-infringing and appropriate peer, adult and authority interpersonal relationships for a youngster, is a goal of treatment.

Rule 9. Development of the constructive use of leisure time is a goal in treatment.

Rule 10. A non-infringing, productive community adjustment is essential in order for an individual to remain in that community.

Rule 11. A successful social and academic adjustment in a public school system which allows an individual to maximize his learning potential, is a goal of treatment.

Rule 12. Development of productive, stimulating work habits that lead to financial independence and self-support is a goal of treatment.

c. assistant director's philosophy

The assistant director, Dick Gebhardt, firmly embraced the concept that the personal growth of staff was the most likely avenue to subsequent personal growth in the clients. As a professionally trained educator and social worker, and as the result of his own growth experiences, Dick believed that staff must have both responsibility and authority to effectively carry out their assigned roles and tasks. He also believed that it was extremely important to delegate authority to staff who traditionally have little power, to balance power and strengthen staff self-concept and sense of participation.
Dick felt deeply that the milieu must reflect the goal of enhancing responsible behavior in staff and clients, as noted by John Gardner,

... Traditionally, we have spent enormous energy exhorting the individual to act responsibly, and very little energy designing the kind of society in which he can act responsibly ... We must identify those features of modern organization that strengthen the individual, and those that diminish him. Given such analysis, we can design institutions that would strengthen and nourish each person.\(^3\)

The environment needed to continue its already established aspects of acceptance, warmth and non-threatening and humane treatment. In addition, the assistant director emphasized that the environment should be enriching: physically; intellectually; emotionally; socially; and interpersonally; in ways which would communicate to the residents that the world was not an alien or hostile place to live. The environment needed limits and structure, but should be neither punitive nor permissive. The consequence or rewards for each resident's behavior should be clearly defined and consistently applied. A vital part of the environment should provide learning situations in which each resident could,

1. ventilate his feelings (anger, grief, joy, fear, love, hate, etc.) in ways which are constructive and appropriate;
2. modify undesirable behavior and learn age-appropriate means to satisfy his desires and wants;
3. learn the rewards of socially desirable behavior and deferred gratification of needs;
4. experience the rewards of close, non-infringing interpersonal relationships; and,
5. correct distorted perceptions so that he can deal more effectively with the demands and stresses of life.

The assistant director also believed that recreation plays an important part in the total rehabilitative process. There appears to be a significant relationship between leisure or
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recreational patterns of boys and destructive or delinquent behaviors. Play itself becomes antisocial when the need for fun, excitement, or adventure takes the form of mischief, delinquency, or aggression.

All staff have a primary responsibility to generate enthusiasm for recreational activities that are fun, challenging, exciting, and diverse. Both well-planned and spontaneous play, adapted to the age and stage of the boys, can assist and guide them toward self-control and self-discipline.

Dick Gebhardt summarized his views of some very important aspects to consider in any child-care setting:

- Be firm, fair and consistent; don't waver, don't be afraid to set realistic limits and keep them. Kids want and seek structure (and they test the limits to make sure where the boundaries are, and to see that the limits are consistent).

- The interpersonal relationship with each individual child is the single most important factor in effecting change. Without this, you will make minimal gains.

- Structured and spontaneous activities (your core program) is the best deterrent to acting-out behaviors. Kids like to be doing things (especially latency age) and thrive on challenge.

- We all expect rewards and consequences for our behaviors. Don't be afraid to individualize for each child in rewards and consequences and don't worry about "concerns about differential consequences" (or how the kids will perceive inequities). Establish ground rules that are clearly understood:

  1) Specific rewards for children, for positive behaviors (point system; taken economy; or whatever) are still based upon their individual capacities to perform. You may have some general (and specific) expectations for housekeeping, but the 10 year old standards may differ somewhat from the 15 year old standards, even though they get a similar reward. Consequently, expectations (and progress) must be incremental.

  2) Consequences should be related to the incident(s), but keep in mind what the presenting problems
were that brought the child to your care in the first place. Be consistent with each individual youth, and if s/he complains that s/he feels unfairly treated, acknowledge the child's right to feel that way, but point out that s/he is an individual and should be treated as an individual.

3) Regardless of what the child has done to receive consequences, always give him the respect s/he needs, and help him maintain his dignity. The old adage, "a child needs love the most when s/he deserves it the least," still holds true. A rational approach is helpful, but not always necessary. If you are angry or upset, don't be afraid to show it. How you handle your feelings (hopefully appropriately) serves as a role-modeling option for the boy with whom you interact.

- Your enthusiasm is crucial in stimulating kids to try, to date, to risk themselves. Establish comfortable routines and traditions upon which they can rely, and spice it up sometimes with a change of pace.

- Get away from the kids periodically. You need an emotional respite or you will burn out rapidly. Avoid being permissive or punitive - try for the middle ground. If you lose control of your feelings at some point, or become disrespectful of the kids, apologize honestly to them. They will understand.

- Be yourself! Don't be dishonest or try to "con" the kids. They can spot a phony a mile away. Accept the kids' feelings without reservation or criticism, but set limits on how they express feelings. Help them find alternative, socially appropriate ways to deal with feelings.

d. institutional norms; the desired milieu

Buckeye Boys Ranch, Inc. is a private, non-sectarian residential treatment center for adolescent and pre-adolescent boys, and is licensed annually by the State of Ohio, Department of Public Welfare. The Ranch is located near Grove City on eighty acres of land approximately ten miles south of downtown Columbus, Ohio. The Ranch is an open setting, consisting of four buildings accommodating a total of fifty boys in residence. A satellite halfway house, Hirsch Hall, is located near The Ohio State University in Columbus. Hirsch Hall houses twelve older youths, most of
whom have graduated from the Ranch program and are moving toward emancipation.

The Ranch has the primary responsibility to provide a self-contained setting for boys whose behaviors are not generally appropriate or acceptable to the wider community and who exhibit delinquent, neurotic, or pre-psychotic symptoms. It is a designated treatment institution where these boys may be exposed to an atmosphere of physical and emotional safety through the establishment of reasonable limits structured to prepare them for functional and productive community living. This setting is charged with: 1) protecting adolescent and pre-adolescent boys against experiences seriously detrimental to their health and well-being; 2) ensuring that they receive appropriate care (which includes proper meals, clothing, and housing) in a milieu of acceptance and concern and 3) ensuring interpersonal, educational, vocational and recreational experiences designed to enhance personal growth and independence.

Beyond these primary needs, general goals have been established for all boys in the Ranch setting: 1) to learn to strengthen his personal self-awareness and self-esteem; 2) to learn to appropriately express his feelings in ways which enhance his autonomy and integrity which do not infringe on the rights of others; 3) to learn to risk and trust in personal interactions with others; 4) to learn to thoughtfully consider alternatives rather than constantly yield to impulses; and, 5) to learn new values and concepts which stimulate movement toward self-regulation and self-actualization.

Finally, the Ranch is committed to appropriately diagnose and effectively carry out prescribed treatment plans designed to meet each boy's personal needs. These plans are directed toward specific goals, involving the use of individualized programs, under the guidance of the boy's clinical counselor.

e. rationale for selection of resident clients

The selection of boys for admission to the Ranch is open and is determined by availability of bed space, the immediacy of referrals, and the reality of funding. If a vacancy is anticipated within a reasonable period of time (two weeks to two months), the referring agency submits case history data reflecting psychiatric, psychological, social, academic, and personal assessments made by previous clinicians and counsellors. The data is screened by
selective members of the Ranch clinical team, and this process yields some indication as to whether or not the Ranch has the resources to meet the boy's needs.

After screening the case data, an intake interview with the boy (and his family if available) is conducted. There are four basic criteria which must be met in order that a boy be admitted into the Ranch system:

1. The boy must be no younger than ten and no older than sixteen years old at the time of intake.

2. The intake committee must be in general accord that their collective diagnostic assessments of the boy have reasonable implications for effective treatment within the Ranch setting.

3. The Ranch program must be seen as flexible enough to not only implement the prescribed treatment modes, but also to meet the interpersonal, physical, intellectual, social, and emotional needs of the boy in growth-inducing ways.

4. The boy must be accepting of placement at the Ranch and willing to make some effort to try to develop some alternative ways of handling his dysfunctional behaviors.

In some cases when a boy has been in a holding institution (e.g. detention home; state facility; children's home) for an extended period of time, he may be motivated to come to the Ranch as "the lesser of two evils," if there are no other alternatives. In other cases, where the distress of a dysfunctional family system is clearly evident, a strong recommendation may be made to remove the boy from the family even if he actively opposes placement away from home.

While each boy admitted to the Ranch is unique, with characteristics which separate him for everyone else, he also shares some commonalities with most other boys referred. These similarities include: antisocial behaviors; academic or school behavioral problems; family conflict involving personality clashes or value-system differences; and personal emotional distress ranging from mild discomfort to near-psychosis. Occasionally these characteristics are also accompanied by some physical disability (for example epilepsy, diabetes, partial blindness, deafness, hemophilia). Other general personality traits include poor or distorted self-concept; inappropriate or dysfunctional communication; extremes in
behaviors which are often symptomatic of deeper distress; and personal life-styles which may be counter-cultural, over-compliant or over-compensatory, dependency-based, or severely neurotic in content.

Boys who are most likely to be accepted for the Ranch have characteristics which include: no alternative homes available (boys who do not have a place to go and whose behaviors are such that they are generally difficult to place); non-criminal or situational delinquencies (school truancy; incorrigibility; runaway); cultural or social mal-adaptation; severe or profound learning disabilities; counter-cultural value systems; emotional disturbances; manic or hyperkinetic acting-out behaviors; withdrawn or depressive tendencies; psycho-neurosis; pre-psychoses; battered child syndrome; severe dependency; deprivation; psycho-physiologic reactions; controllable medical problems; non-disabling deformities; or endrocinological malfunctions.

In terms of limitations, certain patterns of behavior or specific characteristics are of concern: chronic fixed alcohol, hallucinigen or hard drug dependency; congenital retardation; severe medical disability; hard-core criminality; profound fixed dependency; sociopathy; personality disorders; or psychoses. Boys with any one of these conditions are usually seen as less likely to be treatable in our open setting. Although candidates with these features are not automatically disqualified, such characteristics are carefully considered by the intake committee.

Once a boy has been admitted to the Ranch, there is no specific time period in residency. The length of stay ranges between six to thirty months, and eventual discharge is dependent upon interrelated areas: 1) the boy's own comparative personal growth on a twelve-point scale of "Criteria For Progress Toward Mature Adulthood"; 2) Ranch staff perception of the boy's readiness to return to the community; 3) the boy's own perception of his readiness to move to an alternative placement; 4) the perception of the family of their readiness for the boy's return home and 5) the perception of the referring agency of the family readiness for the boy's return home (or the potential for an alternative placement).

f. emerging requirements for new staff selection

The traditional houseparent model was no longer perceived as the most appropriate approach to work with the increasingly disturbed and disruptive boys being referred to the Ranch. The more unruly, aggressive, acting-out boys
were difficult to manage. Their behaviors stimulated negative and antagonistic feelings in the houseparents, who felt that the boys should be obedient and respectful.

The Clinical Planning Committee recommended that the new staff should be able to handle the physical demands and the emotional drain associated with the role of youth leader. Suggested qualities of staff included:

- The self-assurance, maturity level, and self-awareness to be able to appropriately deal with intense feelings expressed by others, without being personally threatened by those feelings.

- The inner strength to reach out, establish, and maintain significant and caring relationships with other people, regardless of age, differences, or culture.

- The capacity for being accepting; non-judgemental; warm; and a reality-based human being.

- The personal integrity to be honest to self and to others, and to be able to express feelings toward others in a non-infringing, mutually-respecting manner.

- The ability to set firm, fair, consistent, non-punitive limits in ways which permit the individual to retain dignity.

- The desire to learn new or different ways of looking at human behavior, and the willingness, ability, and flexibility to adapt to constantly changing conditions.

- The ability to communicate effectively, both verbally and in written expression, observed behaviors and interactions of self and others.

The Clinical Planning Committee recognized that not every candidate would have all the suggested staff qualities. However, these qualities were stressed as crucial to the program.

2. Identification of General Goals of Training

One basic learning theory tenet is the concept "start where the learner is" and go from there. The assistant Director had experienced an institutional training process, using this learning theory concept in the early 1960's. This training process was designed to strengthen staff, and
occurred in a juvenile detention center in which it was possible to shift the philosophy of an institution from a punitive, rigid, holding unit to a treatment and program-oriented environment over a six year period. This was initially stimulated in 1957 by the murder of a detention matron by five teenage girls making an escape, resulting in the replacement of the institutional director. The new director, Jerry O'Hara, faced with an angry and reactive community; a hostile, inconsistent, bickering, frightened staff; and a group of fearful boys and girls in an old, unsafe building, utilized as his major resources the unused skills and potentialities of his staff, in a manner which was rewarding to them and consistent with the goals of the director.

At first, most of the staff were resistant to the idea of loosening rather than more stringently tightening the security measures imposed, so Mr. O'Hara began the process of more involvement of the workers. The shift supervisors were assigned the task of setting up and conducting sequential weekly in-service training schedules; the work hours were adjusted so that everyone could be at the agency at the same time for these sessions; the working titles of the direct services staff were changed from "Guards" and "Matrons" to "Group Leaders"; and the workers themselves, despite a high incidence of non-high-school graduates, were asked to participate in the research and presentation of in-service training data to the total institutional staff.

The primary focus for the first year of training was on concepts of human behavior, generally presented by a wide range of training films followed by group discussion. Two or three of the workers quit. Finding this approach inconsistent, with their own needs, but most of them began to take a much greater interest in what was really happening when a child acted out. The majority of the workers who had been quite rigid in their demands now began to show considerable restraint in their use of any force whenever incidents occurred.

In conjunction with this, Mr. O'Hara was able to encourage the executive officers of over one hundred local women's community clubs and groups to form a Ladies Auxiliary to the Juvenile Court. Within two years this group successfully spearheaded a campaign to build a new, modern juvenile
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4Data collected from conversations with Gerald P. O'Hara, former Director of Summit County Juvenile Court Center (1957-1963); and the writer's personal experiences as a participating group leader and supervisor at the Summit County Juvenile Court Center (1960-1965).
court center and detention home, costing the community nearly two million dollars. The ladies also donated time and money for enrichment of the detention program for the children, and created a scholarship fund for court employee use. Many of the group leaders were suddenly given the opportunity to go to college for the first time, and this was strongly encouraged. Eventually, attendance in school for self-improvement was to become a requirement for employment with the court.

With the move to the new building in 1960, the director and all staff members began to hold monthly total-staff meetings to work through problems arising from perceived roles; expectations; and communication patterns. Weekly in-service training also continued, and intensive emphasis was placed on the worth and professionalism of each employee. From this, the use of "Problem-Centered In-Service Training" emerged. Thus, shift supervisors and group leaders began, as a team, to look at specific situations which in turn led to generalized philosophies. An example of this was the concentration on the use of isolation as one technique of punishment or control. The teams were assigned outside readings about the history and current practices of isolation, and then met to discuss the problem. As the differing personal philosophies of the use of isolation came out, it became apparent to the team members that the use of isolation was an expedient way to remove problems from a group, and the workers began to see that they themselves often created the problems by not providing adequate outlets for the children's creative and physical energy. From this emerged the idea that creative programming with built-in opportunities for involvement in a variety of activities for the children might reduce the number of incidences where isolation would be necessary (later proven correct). In this manner the group "discovered" the efficacy of sound programming and one mode of prevention which not only created a more relaxed and enjoyable atmosphere for the youths and the staff, but also pointed toward the concepts of a treatment orientation. Although Director O'Hara had frequently expounded these same ideas originally, they were not really accepted or implemented until the staff participation in their development.

Programming was then increasingly stressed, and soon each group leader became involved in preparing daily "lesson plans" for a wide range of physical, cognitive, artistic, creative and emotional experiences and activities aimed at providing every child in each worker's group to have optimum chances for success. Since it was necessary
for the worker to more intimately know each individual child as well as the total group in order to effectively program for them, daily logs and periodic individual evaluations were established, utilizing the generalized knowledge from training sessions in human behavior and concepts of stress. Whenever anyone resigned, s/he was replaced by a college student who was given a scholarship while working. As each group leader received a degree, s/he was given the option of increased salary or transfer to the court-side as a probation officer in clinical replacement positions.

At the end of three years, in 1963, all detention staff were totally involved, doing many things they had never had the opportunity or felt competent to do. A sense of pride, achievement, and individual worth emerged. Salaries had increased to a highly competitive level. Service delivery and services provided for the children were vastly improved. Overall morale was high. Incidents of violence became virtually non-existent. Bickering and unrest had almost disappeared. The staff had cohesed and become consistent a a group.

In 1972, the Ranch child-care staff were not at the level of technical sophistication achieved in 1963 by the Summit County group leaders. However, the Ranch staff philosophy of openness, caring and non-violence had been firmly established since its inception in 1961. With the projected opening of Stowell Hall, the time was appropriate for organizational change. From an administrative point of view, such organizational change could be readily implemented in terms of sanction from the top. However, the primary problem which emerged was the need to stimulate the trust and motivation of subordinate staff to fully achieve these goals. The assistant director could have proceeded with innovative changes in the organization by the expedient process of directives. Realistically, unless the staff were willing to carry out the directives with enthusiasm, enjoyment, and dedication to a mutual goal, the changes would fall far short of their projected potentials. Consequently, the assistant director decided that the most appropriate approach should involve the same basic techniques used by Jerry O'Hara. The purpose of this approach was to assist each worker to become increasingly competent, while maintaining and improving the standards of services to clients. The general goals were subsequently defined:

a. All staff should participate in the training, regardless of age, stage, experience, position, tenure, prior training, or shift worked, and the trainer should insure their psychological and emotional safety during the training.
b. Primary training emphasis should concentrate on five concurrent content areas:

1) basic expectations related to housekeeping, personal hygiene and grooming, daily program schedule, rationale for rules, impulse control, safety, health care, meals, record-keeping, and general house duties;

2) specific areas of responsibility, focusing on positions, role clarification, behavior-management and limit-setting, program development and implementation, use of Ranch and community resources, and parenting duties;

3) interpersonal relationships, looking at concepts of mutual respect, non-infringing behaviors, acceptance, trust, risk-taking, honesty, role-modeling, communication, self-awareness, feeling expression, client rights, and staff rights;

4) paraprofessional and clinical awareness, presenting concepts of social functioning, child development, stress response, insight therapies, normal and abnormal patterns of behavior, confidentiality, decision-making, learning theory, role theory, behavior modification and adaptive behavior techniques, I-level classification system, emotional knapsacks, and differential treatment;

5) personnel practices and procedures, scheduling, budget constraints, position descriptions and expectations, time-management, organizational structure, institutional rights, and related programs.

c. The long-range goal should emphasize and achieve staff cooperation and cohesion, as the Ranch evolved, with increasingly enhanced service delivery to clients.

3. Preparation for Change: June 1972 to May 1973

The assistant director was keenly aware of the impact the expansion and transition would have on the houseparents. The two primary houseparent teams, Vera and Everett ("Mom" and "Pop") Newburn, and Nancy and James ("Nan" and "Big Jim") Demorest, had been with the Ranch for many years. They were loyal, dependable, honest, effective and valuable individuals, between 50 and 60 years old, and had always given the Ranch their utmost support and dedication. They
had been the cornerstone of the Ranch program, and over the years had accumulated substantial power and clout with the boys and staff. A major concern was that the houseparents be given every opportunity to select appropriate alternative roles prior to the actual expansion.

Faced with the loss of a familiar role, and considerably diminished authority and power in an expanding agency, the houseparents experienced feelings of anxiety, fear, anger, grief, and alienation. They needed support, reassurance, opportunities to vent their feelings, and involvement in the planning process.

By early January, 1973, the new building, Stowell Hall, was under roof. The full and part-time child-care staff expressed concern, curiosity and excitement about the options available to them. A reorganization plan for the Ranch child-care staff was established, with specific position descriptions for review. At this point, "Mom" Newburn had decided to assume the role of Food Services Supervisor, and "Pop" Newburn was interested in the role of Maintenance Supervisor. All other Ranch child care staff reviewed the new position descriptions: Program Coordinators; Unit Supervisors; Program Leaders; Evening Unit Leaders; Night Unit Leaders; Unit Aides; and Program Aides; and began to make decisions related to the roles they desired. The positions were as follows:

a. Program Coordinator (3 positions), is directly responsible to the assistant director, and has the following duties and responsibilities:

1) Directly supervises all Youth Care Specialists (3 Unit Supervisors; 3 Program Leaders; 3 Evening Unit Leaders; 3 Night Unit Leaders; 3 Part-time Unit Aides; and 4 Part-Time Program Aides) and is responsible for preparing periodic progress and growth assessments on the quality of Youth Care staff functioning.

2) Makes all decisions as to the assignments of Youth Care staff, sees to it that these assignments are implemented and coordinates all scheduling and time-keeping of Youth Care staff. Has the responsibility to see that replacement staff are available for coverage during sicknesses and vacations, and for additional or reduced coverage during special periods (holidays, school vacations, tennis tournament, other special occasions).
3) As an auxiliary member of the Clinical Planning Committee (CPC), has the primary responsibility to see that the safety, security and structure of the Ranch Youth Care System is maintained, and coordinates the implementation of basic and special programs; prescriptive treatment directives; medications and special health needs; and all other programs as directed by the CPC and the Assistant Director.

4) Plans with an assists the CPC and the Assistant Director in identifying needs and implementing ongoing staff training and staff development for all Youth Care Specialists, designed to promote the following goals:

a) Establishment and maintenance of reasonable, clearly-defined limits for all boys, through cultivating significant youth-adult relationships, and through a full understanding of the Ranch rules and structure.

b) Dealing directly with the boys as individuals in terms of providing an atmosphere of warmth and care through mutual planning and implementation of project-centered activities, and through growth-inducing and constructive experiences designed to enhance the boys' feelings of self-worth.

c) Helping the boys learn alternative behaviors in expressing feelings, impulse-control, decision-making, and movement toward independence in ways which are not infringing on others.

d) Awareness of crucial background or treatment data on individual boys, for use in understanding behaviors and learning to work with boys with special needs.

5) Mediates escalating conflict situations between Youth Care staff and boys.

6) Works directly with boys on the group; provides unit coverage as needed; makes sure the boys' personal habits and living units are maintained to acceptable standards of cleanliness and health; provides auxiliary classroom or recreation coverage when necessary; and writes behavioral observation reports.
7) Coordinates all reports required by all Youth Care staff, and directs these reports to the appropriate recipients.

8) All other duties or directives as established or required by the Assistant Director or the Clinical Planning Committee.

b. Unit Supervisor (3 positions), has the following duties:

1) In the absence of the Program Coordinator, the Unit Supervisor on duty assumes all duties and responsibilities of the Program Coordinator for that period of time scheduled.

2) Assists the Program Coordinator in staff training, program development and implementation, and in the maintenance of safety, security, structure, and comfort for the boys in the Ranch program.

3) Works directly with boys on the group, and follows all modes of treatment as prescribed by the Program Coordinator and the CPC (Clinical Planning Committee), toward helping the boys learn alternative behaviors in expressing feelings, impulse-control, decision-making, and movement toward independence in ways which are non-infringing.

4) Makes sure the boys' personal habits and living units are maintained to acceptable standards of health and cleanliness.

5) Establishes and maintains reasonable, clearly-defined limits for all Ranch boys as outlined by the Program Coordinator and the CPC. Makes sure that all of the boys are fully aware of the Ranch rules and structure.

6) Directly supervises all Unit Aides on duty, to insure that all basic and special programs are consistently implemented.

7) As needed or directed by the Program Coordinator, participates in auxiliary classroom coverage as Teacher-Aides; provision of emergency school or medical transportation needs as required; and recreational or other youth care duties as directed.

8) Writes behavioral observation reports as requested by the Program Coordinator and the CPC, and is available for verbal reports and conferences with the Counselors as needed.
9) Deals directly with the boys as individuals in terms of providing an atmosphere of warmth and care, and engages in the group process with the boys in the planning and implementation of project-centered activities in the units. Provides growth-inducing and constructive experiences with and for the boys, in ways designed to enhance boys feelings of self-worth.

10) All other duties and functions as outlined by the Program Coordinator and the CPC.

c. Program Leader (3 positions), has the following duties:

1) During school hours, under the direction of the School Coordinator, provides auxiliary classroom coverage as a Teacher-Aide. As needed, also assists the teachers in identifying, planning for, and implementing special and general educational, vocational and recreational programs for each boy.

2) When necessary, provides any school, recreation, medical, or program-related transportation for boys, as directed by the Program Coordinator.

3) After regular school hours, assists the Program Coordinator in providing unit coverage as needed, recreational programs as indicated, or other youth-care duties as directed.

4) Works directly with toys on group, and follows all prescribed modes of treatment as directed by the Program Coordinator and the CPC (Clinical Planning Committee).

5) Establishes and maintains reasonable, clearly-defined limits for all Ranch boys as outlined by the Program Coordinator and the CPC. Makes sure that all boys are fully aware of Ranch rules and structure.

6) Deals directly with the boys as individuals in terms of providing an atmosphere of warmth, care and safety, while helping them learn alternative behaviors in expressing feelings, impulse-control, decision-making, and movement toward independence in non-infringing ways.
7) Makes sure that the boys' personal habits and living units are maintained to acceptable standards of cleanliness and health.

8) Participates actively in staff training sessions and staff development programs as established by the Program Coordinator and the CPC.

9) Writes behavioral observation reports as requested by the Program Coordinator and the CPC, and is available for verbal reports to the Counselors as needed.

10) All other duties and functions as outlined by the Program Coordinator and the CPC.

D. Evening Unit Leader (3 positions), has the following duties:

1) Unit Leader 7 supervises Argo House, and Unit Leader 9 supervises Hislop House. Unit Leader 8 fills in both houses on the other's days off. All are supervised by the Program Coordinator.

2) During their period of coverage, the Evening Unit Leaders are to stay in their respective houses with the boys, and maintain an orderly, functional and comfortable atmosphere, through cultivating and maintaining growth-inducing relationships with the boys.

3) Establishes and maintains reasonable, clearly-defined limits for all Ranch boys as outlined by the Program Coordinator and the CPC (Clinical Planning Committee). Makes sure that all the boys are aware of the Ranch rules and structure.

4) Makes sure that the boy's personal habits and living units are maintained to acceptable standards of health and cleanliness.

5) Works directly with boys on the group, and follows all prescribed modes of treatment as directed by the Program Coordinator and the CPC, toward helping the boys learn alternative behaviors in expressing feelings, impulse-control, decision-making and movement toward independence.

6) Participates actively in staff training sessions and staff development programs as established by the Program Coordinator and CPC.
7) Writes behavioral observation reports as requested by the Program Coordinator and the CPC, and is available for verbal reports to the Counselors as needed.

8) Plans for and implements ongoing unit activities of interest to the boys, and provides opportunities for constructive and growth-inducing group programs.

9) After bedtime for the boys, makes occasional safety and bed checks and writes up any special incident reports. Sees that the house is in good order before being relieved by the Night Unit Leader.

10) Makes sure the boys move over to Stowell House for the evening meal, and supervises the preparation of evening snacks and cleanup.

11) All other duties and functions as outlined by the Program Coordinator and the Clinical Planning Committee.

e. **Night Unit Leader** (3 positions), has the following duties:

1) Both Unit Leaders supervise Stowell House from 11:00 p.m. to 1:00 a.m., making safety and bed checks as frequently as practical. At 1:00 a.m. Unit Leader 12 covers Hislop and Argo Houses until 6:15 a.m., while Unit Leader 10 covers Stowell House. At 6:15 a.m., Unit Leader 12 stays in Argo House, and Unit Leader 10 moves to Hislop House. Both men stay in these respective houses until 9:00 a.m.

2) During the period between 11:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m., both Unit Leaders are to perform light maintenance tasks as directed (basic cleaning; replacing light bulbs; make sure unit kitchens are clean, and all dishes rinsed and in dishwashers; and other duties). Unit Leaders are directly supervised by the Program Coordinators.

3) The Night Unit Leaders maintain the safety, security, structure and communication links for the entire Ranch system during the periods from 11:30 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. The Senior man on duty is always in charge.

4) The following reports are to be completed by 6:00 a.m. on the days specified, and turned over to the Program Coordinator at that time: Mondays: Maintenance
and repair needs; Unit medical supply needs; weekly activities charts; Tuesdays: Weekly individual summary reports to CPC; Wednesdays: Unit medical supply needs; Thursdays: Maintenance and repair needs; work-for-pay rating sheets; Fridays: Weekly individual summary reports to CPC.

5) From 6:15 a.m. to 9:00 a.m., maintains an orderly, functional, and comfortable atmosphere for the boys in Hislop and Argo Houses. Wakes up the boys, supervises their housekeeping duties and rates them on the quality of work performed, and makes sure they move over to Stowell House for breakfast. Closes up the Hislop and Argo Houses at 9:00 a.m., after making sure the House is in good order.

6) Establishes and maintains reasonable, clearly-defined limits for all Ranch boys as outlined by the Program Coordinator and the CPC (Clinical Planning Committee). Makes sure that all boys are aware of the Ranch rules and structure.

7) Writes behavioral observation reports as requested by the Program Coordinator and the CPC, and is available for verbal reports to Counselors as needed.

8) Participates actively in staff training sessions and staff development programs as established by the Program Coordinator and CPC.

9) All other duties and functions as outlined by the Program Coordinator and the CPC.

f. Part-Time Unit Aide (3 positions), has the following duties:

1) Works directly with the boys in the units on weekends and selected evenings, and follows all prescribed modes of treatment as directed by the Program Coordinator and the CPC (Clinical Planning Committee).

2) Establishes and maintains reasonable, clearly-defined limits for all Ranch boys as outlined by the Program Coordinator and the CPC. Makes sure that all boys are aware of the Ranch rules and structure.

3) Makes sure that the boy's personal habits and living units are maintained to acceptable standards of health and cleanliness.
4) Deals directly with the boys as individuals in terms of providing an atmosphere of warmth, care and safety, while helping them to learn alternative behaviors in expressing feelings, impulse-control, decision-making, and movement toward independence.

5) Participates actively in staff training sessions and staff development programs as established by the Program Coordinator and the CPC.

6) Writes behavioral observation reports as requested by the Program Coordinator and the CPC, and is available for verbal reports to the Counselors as needed.

7) Plans for and implements ongoing unit activities of interest to the boys, and provides opportunities for constructive and growth-inducing group programs.

8) All other duties and functions as outlined by the Program Coordinator and the CPC.

9. Part-Time Program Aide (4 positions), has the following duties:

1) Works directly with the boys on group, and follows all prescribed modes of treatment as directed by the Program Coordinator and the CPC (Clinical Planning Committee).

2) Establishes and maintains reasonable, clearly-defined limits for all Ranch boys as outlined by the Program Coordinator and the CPC. Makes sure that all boys are aware of the Ranch rules and structure.

3) Makes sure that the boy's personal habits and living units are maintained to acceptable standards of health and cleanliness.

4) Deals directly with the boys as individuals in terms of providing an atmosphere of warmth, care and safety, while helping them to learn alternative behaviors in expressing feelings, impulse-control, decision-making, and movement toward independence.

5) Upon request of the Program Coordinator, takes groups of boys off grounds for individual or group activities, or plans and implements on-grounds group activities.
6) Participates actively in staff training sessions and staff development programs as established by the Program Coordinator and the CPC.

7) Writes behavioral observation reports as requested by the Program Coordinator and the CPC, and is available for verbal reports to the Counselors as needed.

8) All other duties and functions as outlined by the Program Coordinator and the CPC.

Another change which affected the environment was the need to allocate office space. This was accomplished over a three month period from early March through late May, 1973, as follows:

a. Executive Director (Les Bostic): the office in Argo House presently occupied by the bookkeeper (Ruth and Joyce), will become the Executive Director's office. In addition, the present staff room (communication center) will be converted into the Executive Reception and Conference Area, for multi-purpose use.

b. Business and Personnel: the present administrative office presently assigned to the Assistant Director.

1) Business Manager - Gary Beougher will use the office presently assigned to the Assistant Director.

2) Bookkeepers - Ruth Temple, Joyce McFarland will use the office presently assigned to the Executive Director.

3) Secretary-Receptionist - Betty Haywood will use the same office already designated. Clerical volunteers will also share this office when they are available.

c. School Planning Center: the School Coordinator will be based in this office (which also houses supplies; duplicating machine; professional library), and this area will be used for planning and preparation by teachers; teacher-aides; and student-teachers. It is not a lounge, but is a work center. In addition, each teacher will have a "home-room" (e.g. Language Arts Room; Social Studies Room; Math-Science Room; Art Room; Remedial Reading Room) and the IMC Aide has the Instructional Materials Center. The teachers and the IMC Aide have primary responsibility for
their individual home rooms, and the School Coordinator has primary responsibility for the School Planning Center office.

d. Clinical Wing: the present Ranch school in the Hislop House basement will be converted as follows:

1) Treatment Services Director (Dick Gebhardt, Assistant Director) will use the present math-science classroom as an office. This area will also be used for Intake interviews; administrative, supervisory and planning conferences; and selected staff development sessions (note: the chalkboard should remain in this office as a useful training aid for concept clarification).

2) Clinical Secretaries (Dorothy Combs; and one other secretary, to be selected on or after September 1, 1973) will use the present language arts classroom.

3) Chaplain-Counselor (Harold Davidson) will use one-half of the present food-storage room, after it is remodeled.

4) Psychologist (to be selected as soon as an appropriate candidate is found) will use the other half of the food-storage room, after it is remodeled.

5) Records Room: contains all past and current case data folders for every boy; forms; supplies; staff mailboxes; etc. Will use the present school library room.

6) Clinical Planning Center (the present Teacher's Planning Center) will be used as clinical conference room; for the professional library; and for small group staff sessions. Adjacent to the coat-room and the bathroom.

e. Medical Clinic: the Ranch psychiatrist (Dr. Thomas King, M.D.) and medical students on placement at the Ranch, are based in this Stowell Hall office, along with medical supplies and equipment.

f) Satellite Offices: these offices are designated for use in the milieu, and are located as follows:

1) Hislop Counselor (Gary Logan) this clinician has the primary case management responsibility for the 14 boys in Hislop House; for the supervision of student-
interns; and for the coordination of volunteer services. The present Hislop Mat Room will be converted into a combination office and group-process room.

2) **Argo Counselor** (Jane Osuga) this clinician has the primary case management responsibility for the 12 boys in Argo House, as well as these additional duties: public schools and court liaison; coordinates intake and admission procedures; community job development; supervision of student-interns, etc. The present Argo counselor's office is utilized for this position.

3) **Stowell Counselor** (to be selected by July 1, 1973) this clinician has the primary case management responsibility for the 24 boys in Stowell Hall; the supervision of student-interns; and for crisis intervention for the Ranch School system. The designated counselor's office in Stowell Hall will be used.

4) **Clinical Student Unit** (for 4 or 5 student-interns on Field Placement at the Ranch). The present Art Room in the Hislop House basement will be used as a group office, and the Electronics Room will be used for dictation and interviews. These students will be supervised and trained by the Hislop, Argo, and Stowell Counselors.

5) **Interview Office** (for clinicians; coordinators; student interns) is in Hislop House upstairs, currently being used by Dr. King. This office will be available for: interviews with boys; phone calls; staff evaluation sessions; staff supervisory conferences. It may also be used as an auxiliary staff office.

6) **Hislop Staff Office:** in the bedroom area of Hislop House, this office is primarily used by the Youth Leaders (Youth Care Specialists). This area may also be used as an auxiliary interview office by student-interns; coordinators; clinicians.

7) **Communications Center**: the Program Coordinators (or the Night Supervisor) will use this area in Stowell Hall as a base, and each Coordinator or Supervisor on duty is responsible for the office on their shift. Every Youth Leader will use this office for: signing on and off duty; report reading and report writing;
pickup and return of keys; and verbal communication with other staff at shift-change. Since this office houses the ongoing progress notes on every boy (clinical; program; medical; recreational; school), the office is totally off-limits to all boys, without exception.

Two areas, which required considerable planning and replanning, involved the intake/admission timetable for new boys, and the hiring/orientation procedure for new staff. Since 13 of the "old" boys were leaving and had to be replaced, and an additional 24 beds had to be filled, the "population explosion" had to be carefully timed. Concurrently, twelve new staff had to be hired, given initial orientation, and brief training, and phased in under extremely tight budgetary constraints. As the opening date of May 30, 1973 approached, a crisis point occurred. The Board of Trustees, in reviewing the budget, found it necessary to compress the admissions from a three month period to a four week period. This meant bringing in eight or nine new boys each week. Also, new staff were given only one week advance time for orientation, before they assumed full coverage responsibilities.

During April and May, one or two intake interviews were conducted almost every clinical workday. Many boys were accepted who were marginal at best, and a few were selected who would not normally have been considered.

The choice of potential staff was encouraging, and over 80 applicants were screened and interviewed out of nearly 200 inquiries. The majority of the applicants for employment had an undergraduate degree and several had a masters degree. This was a period of mild economic recession, and despite the relatively low salary scale, the applicants were highly competitive for the child-care positions. All candidates were interviewed by the Assistant Director, and those who were seriously considered were interviewed by small groups of boys and other clinical staff members. The Executive Director made the final decision on all those chosen, as the appointing authority.

An unexpected resource became available to the Ranch in late 1972. Ken and Phyllis Relyea, a Grove City couple who were interested in the Ranch, offered a completely furnished house for staff use. This house, situated on 112 acres of wooded, hilly land, was located in rural Jackson County, about a mile from Limerick, Ohio. It was isolated from the outside world, but had all the modern conveniences of central heating, electricity, inside plumbing, and a 6-party telephone. It was an ideal location for the use of a
structured human relations training approach. There were facilities to sleep up to twelve people, and ample cooking and refrigeration resources.

Initially, the Relyea retreat was used in November 1972 by the Executive Director and the Assistant Director to hammer out some of their philosophical differences over a 72-hour period. The second retreat was held in mid-January, 1973, and was a 48-hour session involving "Mom" and "Pop" Newburn, Nan and Jim Demorest, the relief houseparents, Maryanne and Chuck Weed, an MSW graduate student, Melanie Howison, and the Assistant Director. The primary thrust was the initial preparation for the emergent role changes. Other areas covered were basic meal and housekeeping expectations; role-modeling; limit-setting; and basic expectations for boys. This retreat established the pattern which was successfully used in 15 subsequent retreats during the period from late August 1973 through mid-May, 1974.

The training format involved "work periods" of up to two hours, separated by "play periods" or free time. Meals were prepared by the Assistant Director and dishes and housekeeping were shared by all participants. The hiking trails were used frequently, and a spring fed lake (two miles away) was available for swimming during the summer months. The staff was relaxed, under no particular pressure of time, away from the boys, and became almost euphoric. Many of the fears, angry feelings, grieving and sense of alienation were dealt with during this initial houseparent session.

C. SECOND STAGE: THE ORIENTATION PERIOD

June, 1973

The influx of 37 boys and 12 staff during the four weeks in June, 1973, was relatively smooth considering the impact of the expansion. As a budgetary move, the Board of Trustees had not only compressed the admissions into a four week period, they had also cut four positions from the projected "bare bones" staffing pattern; three youth leaders and one clinical counselor. As a result, the new boys were on a 1 staff to 12 boy direct service ratio during first shift, which was a significant departure from the 1 staff to 6 boy ratio under the houseparent model and the clinical coverage was increased from a 1 to 13 ratio to a 1 to 25 ratio. This placed the staff and the boys in an extremely vulnerable position.

Many of the boys who were admitted were very unruly or unsocialized, and in some cases were quite primitive in their
behaviors. Jane Osuga and Gary Logan, the two clinicians, were in the bind of spending more time dealing with crises than in working with the individual problem areas which had initially brought the boys to the Ranch. Tony West, the recreation specialist, was placed in the almost untenable position of three major concurrent roles: recreation supervisor; work supervisor; and detention supervisor. He was expected to perform each function simultaneously, and often had 25 to 30 boys involved under his direct supervision.

The new youth leaders were, with rare exceptions, totally unseasoned. Some were fearful of their roles, others were too aggressive toward the boys. Staff were expected to set non-punitive limits, but had yet to learn to deal effectively with their own reactive feelings related to overt boy behaviors or emotional outbursts. To assist in providing immediate structure, Johnny Walker, a career Air Force NCO (with a Masters Degree in Oriental Philosophy) was placed in the role of senior program coordinator.

One additional role, that of business manager, was created and Gary Beougher was appointed to the position. Gary assumed eventual responsibility for most business and personnel, food services, maintenance, laundry, and other supportive services.

The boys were initially grouped by age and stage, and specific behavioral characteristics, as follows:

ARGO HOUSE: Generally the most self-regulated boys who have shown that they are able to relate to others in usually positive, non-infringing ways. Able to make decisions which move them toward independence without hurting others, and consistently are able to control their impulses. Basically these are the pre-release; pre-Hirsch Hall; or Community-oriented boys in public school. These boys will have the most community privileges, and are expected to require the least amount of supervision.

HISLOP HOUSE: These are generally the most peer and power-oriented boys who will frequently be geared toward work-study programs, and may have some resistance to school for extended periods of time. Often will respond positively to adults when on a one-to-one basis, but respond negatively to adults when with peers, to maintain peer status. These boys need specific limits established prior to the activity, and a clear understanding of the expectations beforehand.
STOWELL HALL: These boys are usually younger, and more anxious or acting-out than in the other houses. They should have a higher concentration of staff supervision and program should be geared more toward on-grounds activities.

The primary training thrust during June involved selection of designated youth leaders to assume staff leadership roles. Johnny Walker and Tony West, with prior experience, were already involved. Two of the new youth leaders, Dave Schroeder and Chuck Greer, with Masters Degrees in Education, were selected as Assistant Program Coordinators.

The Assistant Director arranged to take these selected staff with him to the Summit County Juvenile Detention Home to look at their program. Jim Cannata, Director of Detention Services in Akron, prepared his staff to demonstrate how their quite extensive program was planned and implemented. Jim spent some time with Johnny Walker and the detention supervisors spent time with Tony West; Chuck Greer; and Dave Schroder.

The Court Transactional Analysis Specialist, Mike Johnson, spent time with Gary Logan around the use of TA in detention groups. The assistant director spent some time with Chuck Simonson, Director of Court Services, around administrative functions and staff development, and to promote the Ranch as a treatment resource for the Summit County Court.

Because of the staff coverage problem, there were no formal staff training sessions during June. The assistant director did spend about 30 minutes individually each week with each of the 12 new staff, touching on their concerns and communicating specific expectations. The general themes which were presented the first month were as follows:

a. Sometimes the clinical theories advanced at the Ranch are unclear to direct service staff, and inhibits their capacity to deal with actual situations. There is the concern that clinical staff tend to do little or nothing about some situations which seem to need attention or action. In our efforts to understand the pathology, we sometimes approach situations very gingerly, with minimal or not apparent intervention. We may appear to be inconsistent in how we deal with problems, but clinical staff, with training, in human behavior, is in a better position to make these decisions. Since youth leaders spend a lot of time with (and have impact on) the kids, their ideas and approaches should be considered. However, until they have begun to demonstrate competence in handling situations, youth leaders must defer to the clinical point of view.
b. Most boys want to be liked by both staff and boys, and this is often a double bind. The boys try to meet staff expectations, but peer pressure to resist is an equal or greater force. It is crucial to clearly communicate our expectations to the boys, with the understanding that they should try to follow the rules; should involve themselves in trying to change; should try to heed what the adults say; and, if they listen to their peers, should understand that kids do not always try to help each other. While it is not unrealistic to assume that many of the boys are damaged or fragile, they still understand clear expectations, consistently administered. Sometimes we tend to overlook the fact that the boys not only understand consequences for behaviors, but also expect consequences to be applied. Thus, if we have evidence that something is going on, we need to take some form of action.

c. In the areas of the destruction of any item, or (in a more general application) to any aversive kinds of behavior, the "why" concept of behavior is usually almost impossible to answer. Often, the kids themselves do not know why they do what they do, but there is frequently quite intense feeling behind the action. In working with any youth who displays such behavior, you have choices of, 1) ignoring the behavior; 2) reacting (or overreacting) to the behavior; 3) trying to deal directly with the behavior; or, 4) trying to deal with the feelings behind the behavior. You need not be a skilled therapist to recognize many feelings, and sometimes a simple acknowledgment that you are aware of the youth's feelings is enough to forestall the acting out. Often if the feeling level is untouched, the behavior may either continue or re-emerge in some other form.

d. The primary tools you have to use are yourselves: your knowledge base; your skills; your ability to communicate expectations in a non-threatening way; and (most important) your capacity to form relationships and to be enthusiastic enough that you can generate enthusiasms in the students as well. Any relationship should contain the elements of trust; concern; mutual respect; non-infringing behaviors; enhancement of autonomy and integrity for each individual; risking the self; and, the capacity to set and maintain reasonable limits. Limit-setting is merely the consistent reinforcement of the expectations by verbally or non-verbally reminding the violator of these expectations, until the individual develops the necessary self-regulation to maintain the expectations without external reminder.
July/August, 1973

The staff development meetings, starting July 5, 1973 and held during July and August, were designed to begin to expose staff to more specific content related to child-management procedures. Several other related areas were involved:

a. The revised Fair Labor Act of 1973 was expanded to include institutional and other service-delivery staff who had been exempt from a 40-hour week status. It would become effective on October 1, 1973 for the Ranch requiring additional staff, a change in schedules, and hourly rates with overtime for more than 40 hours/wk.

b. The annual fund-raising Buckeye Tennis Tournament, held on the Ranch grounds was being expanded to a field of 64 professional players. The experiences of the first three smaller tournaments (1970, 1971, and 1972) with the pressures on both staff and boys, indicated a need for more pre-planning and structure, with full staff participation.

c. The State of Ohio Welfare Department, responsible for licensing the Ranch, required considerably more accountability for the expanded Ranch staff, population and facilities. The basic expectations of safety, parenting, and general child care had to be presented and implemented to the Welfare Department standards.

d. The Federal Supreme Court had made several decisions related to delinquency adjudications, and the state and county courts were becoming increasingly reticent to be used for disciplinary measures by the Ranch. The emergence of the "status offender" laws placed the Ranch in the position of having to suddenly cope with unruly behaviors internally, with little or no external court assistance as had been the case in the past. Staff had to become more aware of and competent in crisis intervention.

e. The federal Title 4-A program was being replaced with Title 20 funding, involving considerable change and expansion of the paper-work requirements for eligibility. Staff needed to meet the specific record-keeping demands of the Title 20 program.
f. The South-Western City Schools were planning to expand the teaching staff from two to six teachers. The new teachers were generally unfamiliar with the Ranch and each other, and needed to be integrated into the system with a cooperative and cohesive approach.

Since staff coverage was still a severe problem, the interim staff training program was divided into four sessions, held every Thursday:

1:15 p.m.- 2:30 p.m. Group 1 (second shift staff)
3:00 p.m.- 4:15 p.m. Group 2 (first shift staff)
5:30 p.m.- 6:45 p.m. Group 3 (all Hirsch Hall staff)
10:15 p.m.-11:30 p.m. Group 4 (night shift and part-time staff)

This arrangement was somewhat wearing on the assistant director (hereafter referred to as the "trainer" of "facilitator"), but did achieve the goal of beginning to solidify the staff and disseminate appropriate approaches to deal with programs and problems.

Other approaches were utilized during the summer of 1973, as attempts to open communication and encourage relationship-building:

a. the trainer continued to maintain individual, informal, interpersonal contacts with each staff member, giving ongoing support and providing some direction where necessary;

b. monthly all boy/all staff meetings were attempted, meeting first as a total group and then moving into small groups of 6 to 8 staff and boys, for discussion. Because of the behavioral problems of many of the boys in the larger group, these meetings were discontinued after three months;

c. the staff from each individual house met on a bi-weekly basis for 90 minutes each time, to discuss specific house-related problems and individual boys. The trainer and the house clinician shared in case presentations and individual boy staffings;

d. the clinical staff met as the Clinical Planning Committee once each week, to discuss specific cases with the consulting psychiatrist, and to discuss problem areas related to Ranch concerns. This
period was also used for training clinical staff in clinical techniques, theory, and role clarification;

e. the policy committee was formed to meet the need for improved communication between the administrative, clinical, school, and supportive services staff, and to more clearly define policies and procedures.

f. the Ranch provided some funds for staff to attend workshops, seminars, visits to other equivalent institutions, and purchase of books and periodicals for training. During July and August, every child care and clinical staff made at least one trip to a workshop or other agency.

During the fourth weekend in August, the Ranch School retreat was held at Relyea Retreat. Six school teachers, three youth leaders, Gary Logan, Johnny Walker, and the facilitator (Dick Gebhardt), stayed from early Friday morning until 3 p.m. Sunday. In addition, two of the administrators from the South-Western school district, Faye Alban and Dave Abbott, attended on Saturday and Sunday.

The format was simple, but effective. Work som, play some, and don't worry about the outside world. The natural beauty of the woods and hills, coupled with the feeling of complete privacy and self-sufficiency, provided an environment which enhanced interpersonal risk-taking and communication. The facilitator utilized the environment, inside and outside the house, as a total milieu to which the participants were exceptionally responsive. There was no television in the house, and no radio or record player. There were cards, some table games, a wood-burning fireplace, a small electric organ, a two-person outdoor hammock, and assorted game balls, frisbees and other active participation equipment.

The first day involved lunch together, followed by cleanup, getting settled in, and exploring the 112 acres of land around the house. Of particular interest were the hiking trails, which all led to an open field at the top of the steep, densely wooded hillside. The view was breathtaking and the small meadow was completely isolated.

The first "problem-solving" task presented an overview of the boys who would be in the teacher's classes and the most appropriate combinations of boys from an emotional/interpersonal viewpoint. This turned into a three-hour session, and terminated only for the Friday evening meal. The task
had provided some commonality, but the Ranch staff and the school staff were still somewhat guarded with each other. After supper, the facilitator used several structured human relations techniques (getting acquainted triads; magic sphere/magic cube non-verbal communications; dyadic encounters; and mutual backrubs) to break down or "unfreeze" some of the interpersonal barriers which existed. The group was highly responsive, and the second work session from 8 p.m. to 10 p.m. was a spirited and cooperative effort to come up with school rules and procedures which would be complementary to and supported by Ranch staff. At 10 p.m. the whole group went on a night hike up the main trail, without flashlights. Since it was quite dark, with no moon, it was necessary to hold hands to stay together. The mile walk to the summit culminated in a circle in the meadow, telling ghost stories and sharing positive feelings. The group returned to the house at midnight in complete silence.

The Saturday program was much the same with an increasingly relaxed atmosphere during the day, culminating in everyone getting involved Saturday evening in such risk-taking games as "pass the bod" and mutual body massages. The facilitator had included some alcoholic beverages for the Saturday night program, and these were imbibed in a party atmosphere.

At 10 p.m. the group spontaneously decided to go swimming at the lake two miles away, and drove there in two rather crowded cars. Since it was still very dark, a "buddy system" was established with orders to stay close to shore and close to each other. Also, no one had thought to bring swimming suits to the Relyea Retreat on Friday, but the darkness dispelled any concerns about modesty and no one was deterred from swimming. After the swim, and return to the house, everyone felt very close and did not want to split up. Consequently, all the mattresses from the two main bedroom areas were spread out on the living room floor, and the entire group slept in comfortable proximity to each other.

Sunday was designated as a quiet activity day, with only two one-hour work sessions (one in the morning; one in the afternoon). There was a general reluctance to leave at the end of the final session and all the participants were into hugging each other. The feelings of closeness and comfort, in some cases, extended several weeks beyond the first retreat, and were periodically re-established in subsequent retreats.

September, 1973

During the summer months, the boys had become more and more unruly, and limit-testing increased daily. Considerable
damage to the plasterboard walls, furniture, windows, and other Ranch property had taken place. It was estimated that over $8,000.00 in property damage occurred through deliberate or emotionally reactive vandalism. The maintenance staff was unable to keep up with the demand for repairs. The youth leaders (who were short staffed) felt considerable role-strain: on the one hand they were expected to set limits and maintain a reasonably orderly environment; conversely, the orientation training had consistently emphasized that staff were not to physically abuse the boys in the process of limit-setting. The two clinicians were in the bind of trying to establish treatment relationships while also trying to contain overt and negative behaviors. The assistant director was overextended in the continual crises, the unanticipated effects of the Ranch expansion, and the boy management concerns; and, the executive director's time had been almost completely dominated by the expanded tennis tournament.

In early September, the executive director became reinvolved as a resource: he had convinced the Board of the need for additional staff and, had been able to regain the three youth leader positions and one clinical position, to begin after September 1, 1973. In addition, he secured enough funds to provide for overtime payments so that staff could come in for weekly training sessions as a group, and attend weekend marathon sessions at Relyea Retreat.

With the increasingly reactive property destruction by several of the more aggressive boys, the executive director decided to restate the basic behavioral expectations to the staff and the boys. An all staff/all boy meeting was held and Dr. Bostic gave a very clear warning that any further deliberate damage or overt physical abuses would result in potentially severe consequences. Staff were directed to use whatever means were necessary to effectively curb the boys' aggressive behaviors, and the boys were advised to find other ways in which to express their feelings of aggression or hostility. The message was firmly conveyed that staff must set appropriate limits in order to provide an environment in which effective treatment could occur.

Two clinical decisions had been made in late July: the Interpersonal Maturity Level Classification System (I-Level) would be used to classify all the boys in residence; and, the youth leader hierarchy needed to be replaced a treatment team structure. Toward these ends, Gary Logan began training an MSW graduate student intern, Don Wilka, to screen and classify the boys during late August/early September. Concurrently, the assistant director began setting up the treatment teams, in late August.
By mid-September, the combination of several factors had tempered the behavioral problems exhibited by the boys:

a. the Ranch school had begun, and the eight new teachers and aides provided first shift coverage which had been marginal all summer;

b. the boys were grouped together by the I-level classification, and specific approaches were established to deal with their particular needs and integration levels;

c. a new clinician, Arnie Ishiyuka, was appointed to provide the third clinical position;

d. three new recreation leaders, Cathy Lindamood, Danny Ratusz, and Bill Roche, were appointed to strengthen the overall program;

e. the executive director's mandate to staff, to become more effective in setting limits, provided a sense of authority which gave staff more "clout" with the boys; and,

f. the establishment of treatment teams, with differential approaches and more clearly defined expectations and roles, provided a structure with which boys and staff could more comfortably identify.

At this point, the second stage was completed, and the assistant director began the third stage—the implementation of advanced training of all Ranch staff.

D. THIRD STAGE: ADVANCED TRAINING IMPLEMENTATION

1. Step One: Providing the Basic Structure

a. formation of autonomous treatment teams

During the last week in August, 1973, four treatment teams were established: Hislop Team; Argo Team; Upper Stowell Team; and Lower Stowell Team. Each team consisted of three full-time Youth Leaders and one part-time Youth Leader, and one teacher assigned by the school. Hislop and Argo teams were supervised by Gary Logan, and Upper and Lower Stowell teams were supervised by Jane Osuga. Team meetings were scheduled for one hour, from 2:15 p.m. to 3:15 p.m.: Argo met on Mondays; Upper Stowell met on Tuesdays;
Hislop met on Wednesdays; and Lower Stowell met on Thursdays. All team meetings were held in the Clinical Planning Center in Hislop Clinical Wing.

By the end of September, the new clinician, the three new recreation leaders, and three MSW student interns, had complete their orientation periods and were becoming involved in the treatment teams. Arnie Ishiyuka took over Hislop House, and the MSW students were each assigned to a team: Don Wilka to Argo; Rich Morris to Upper Stowell; and George Kostura to Lower Stowell.

b. schedule revision by mutual problem-solving

The weekly all child-care staff training sessions had begun the second week in September, and were held in the trainer's office every Wednesday from 9:00 a.m. until 10:30 a.m. Since a schedule change was imminent, due to the 40-hour week Fair Labor Laws applying to residential treatment centers, the facilitator presented the problem to the group for solution. The problem was posed to small groups of 3 or 4 people in each group, as follows:

PRESENTING PROBLEM: In three weeks, the Treatment Times will become autonomous. In order to function, each team needs the following elements:

1) The Team must be supervised by a trained social worker or seasoned clinician, who is free to take the therapeutic role with the children and does not have to cover the unit on a group basis.

2) From a budgetary standpoint, there is a limit of three full-time Child Care Workers and one half-time Child Care Worker, to cover one unit (12 to 15 children) on a 16 hour/day, 7 day/week basis during the school year. Night shift staff are separate from the teams.

3) All members of each Treatment Team, regardless of shift, must be an exclusive part of that Team, and not swing between two Teams.

4) The Team Members must be scheduled in for a weekly Team Meeting, together as a group, regardless of days off or shift worked, to discuss the children, treatment strategies, and program decisions.

ASSIGNMENT: Your group task today is to create a rotating (repeatable) schedule for one Treatment Team, which must include the following elements:
1) Staffing pattern (3-1/2 child-care positions): school year.
   a. one person on first shift on regular school days; and 
      one person on first shift on weekends and holidays.
   b. one person on second shift, every day.

2) A 10-minute overlap between each shift, for communication.

3) To the degree possible each full-time child-care worker must have the same pattern of days-on/days-off, 
   for complete schedule equality.

4) To reduce the cumulative fatigue factor, no child-care worker should normally be scheduled for more than four 
   days on duty at a time.

5) All child-care workers must be scheduled in for a Weekly Team Meeting, and this time should be built into the regular 40 hrs./wk. schedule.

6) Remembering that all overtime worked must be paid at time-and-a-half (and that too much overtime can ruin 
   the budget), it is necessary to keep all child-care worker's schedules as close to 40 hrs./wk. as possible; or (over a six-week period) make sure that no child-care worker is scheduled for more than 240 hours total (counting any scheduled overtime on a 3-hours paid for 2-hours worked basis into the cumulative 240 hours).

The child-care staff worked for two weeks on this project, and were able to make up two mutually-agreed-upon schedules. 
The goal of the facilitator was to give staff the opportunity to see the complexity of scheduling and to have a better understanding of the related budgeting problems. The facilitator then presented the two schedules and the staff chose the one which was most appealing to the majority. This schedule went into effect October 1, 1973 with complete staff support. The format of mutual problem-solving was used for many of the subsequent training sessions.

c. The I-Level Classification as a common language.

Gary Logan had specialized in the Interpersonal Maturity Level Classification System, with the Ohio Youth Commission. 
The I-Level looks at the individual's self-perception and perception of the external environment, and at the way in which the individual integrates self with environment.
Specific treatment approaches are prescribed for each group, as defined by the I-Level Classification, and certain groups are either compatible or incompatible with each other. All the staff were exposed to the concepts of I-Level, and over the ensuing months this became the "common language" to which staff could relate. This was designed to provide the entire staff with a specific, planned and mutually-shared knowledge base, for a total treatment thrust.

d. Formulation of long-range Ranch goals.

A marathon planning session was held on Monday, October 1, 1973, from 5:00 p.m. to 3:00 a.m. Specific goals were as follows:

1) To discuss and formulate overall Ranch goals toward which the four major subsystems (clinical; youth care; school; supportive services) can cooperatively and consistently apply their collective energies. These goals must be acceptable to each coordinator and to the administrative subsystem.

2) To clarify the coordinator's roles as they relate to the overall Ranch system, and to establish the boundaries and parameters of each of the four major subsystems, and of the administrative subsystems. In this process, where subsystems overlap, definite boundaries must be established and maintained.

3) To review the recommendations and problem areas stated by the recent Ranch survey, and to produce collective and individual responses and planning as these areas are related to the established goals and roles.

4) To establish definite lines of communication; policy formulation; behavioral expectations for staff and boys; and procedural implementation of the overall program as each part relates to the whole.

The approach toward meeting these goals was stated:

A coordinator's meeting will take place for an undetermined number of hours, as a marathon session. Each member of the coordinating staff will provide his own inputs and program expectations, based on his personal and systemic responsibilities. The meeting will take place away from the Ranch, and basic needs will be met to provide adequate comfort and freedom from interruptions. The meeting will continue until the specific goals are hammered out. The finished product will then be pulled together and presented to the Executive Director for review and subsequent recommendations.
Intervention began when the facilitator asked the coordinators to come up with areas which they felt needed to be discussed, after considerable discomfort was expressed by the coordinators about systems conflicts which were emerging. The group met at Gary Logan's home from 5:00 p.m. on. The primary thrust of the facilitator was to mediate (from an administrative viewpoint) areas where conflict threatened to break down communication. The facilitator's goal and expectation was to assist the coordinators to rely on their own resources more and more, as each subsystem develops to its optimum level, while maintaining their respective boundaries in a mutually respecting and cooperative manner. This had implications for ongoing cooperation and program expansion, in which the coordinators must consistently rely on mature collaboration and decision-making which strengthens staff, boys, and program in the process.

The workshop lasted for 9 hours, until 3:00 a.m. The first three and a half hours were directed toward general Ranch goals, and their implications as far as the philosophical base was concerned. One area quite evident was Jim's (Cowardin) total dedication to the behavior modification approach, with a desire to expand this system into the whole Ranch program. This expansion was not endorsed by the other coordinators.

Several "gray areas" were dealt with: who would assume the responsibility (John); how kitchen boys could be recruited (Jim will assist Gary B.); are we to be a "treatment" or a "holding" institution (unanimously opted for treatment); how can we get the boys to attend school (John will assist Jim in this); to what degree can boys be freed-up for clinical counseling (Jim will help work out a schedule with Gary L.); how about assistance in school coverage on Wednesday Staff Development meeting times (Gary L. will assign clinical staff to be at the school for that 90-minute period).

Each coordinator and the Assistant Director also outlined personal specific goals for the Ranch, as applicable to specific subsystems, and these (plus the general goals) were presented for further discussion at the Coordinator's meeting of Tuesday, October 2, 1973 from 5:30 – 7:30 p.m. and at the Policy Meeting on Wednesday, October 3, 1973 from 8:00 a.m. – 9:00 a.m. with Dr. Missildine.

This workshop pointed up a need for further clarification of roles and a tightening up of goals, but the primary need was to come to some agreement as to how these goals should be implemented.
In terms of meeting the specific goals outlined, the general coordinators all agreed that the following measurable general Ranch goals were amendable to each substem:

1) Provision of adequate facilities, equipment and staff to implement the treatment goals.

2) Provision of appropriate life-support (availability of adequate food, clothing, shelter and care).

3) Written, prescriptive, personal goals established for each boy at the time of admission.

4) Consistent provision of coordinated programs for each boy, designed to promote personal growth (physically; intellectually; socially; and emotionally).

5) Provision of interpersonal, educational, vocational, social and recreational experiences designed to implement the established prescriptive goals.

Regarding the Coordinator's roles, these are partially defined by the specific goals expressed for each subsystem. The following goals were mutually acceptable to all coordinators and the Assistant Director, as applicable to the functions and goals perceived by each:

Jim Cowardin (School Services System Coordinator)

a) Design strategies to enhance social, academic, and vocational skills of each student at BBR school.

b) To attend coordinators meetings in order to increase cooperation between the school and other facets of the Ranch program.

c) To create a system of positive discipline in the school using the techniques of human learning.

d) To attain 90% attendance for boys selected to attend a full Ranch school program.

e) To build a curriculum covering elementary to high school academic skills.

f) To individualize instruction in the curriculum at BBR school.
Gary Beougher (Supportive Services System Coordinator)

a) To provide adequate maintenance to all facilities.
b) To ensure proper food services and preparation of meals.
c) To provide fiscal accountability for all Ranch funds.
d) To provide appropriate clothing to all boys.
e) To screen new staff and provide to the system the best qualified individuals for the jobs.
f) To purchase the necessary items of equipment to adequately implement the program.

Johnny Walker (Youth Care Services System Coordinator)

The primary goals of the youth care system are to provide each boy with housekeeping, recreational, and everyday living environments on individual and/or group basis which when merged with the overall Ranch Treatment System will prepare for functional and productive community living:

Secondary Goals:

a) To insure that the safety, security and structure of the Ranch Youth Care System is maintained, and coordinates the implementation of basic and special programs; medications and special health needs; transportation to and from activities; and other programs as directed.

b) Deal directly with the boys as individuals in terms of providing atmosphere of warmth and care through mutual planning and implementation of project-centered activities, and through growth-inducing and constructive experiences designed to enhance the boys (feelings of self-worth).

c) Help the boys learn alternative behaviors in expressing feelings, impulse-control, decision-making, and movement toward independence in ways which are not infringing on others.

d) Works directly with boys on the group; provides unit coverage as needed; makes sure boys' personal habits and living units are maintained to acceptable standards of cleanliness and health; provides auxiliary
classroom or recreation coverage when necessary; and writes behavioral observation reports.

e) Establish and maintain reasonable, clearly-defined limits for all Ranch boys as outlined. Make sure all boys are fully aware of Ranch rules and structure.

f) Provide and monitor the work for pay program.

g) Plan with and assists the Assistant Director in identifying needs and implementing ongoing staff training and staff development for all youth care specialists.

h) Mediates escalating conflict situation between Youth Care Staff and boys.

Dick Gebhardt (Assistant Director)

Overall personal goals for the Ranch Treatment System are as follows:

a) To continually upgrade the level of functioning of all Ranch staff through the provision of ongoing and relevant staff development.

b) To establish and maintain a system of record-keeping and data collection designed to stimulate and implement ongoing rigorous research.

c) To open channels of communication with all staff so they may increase their capacities of self-expression, personal insights and relationships with others.

d) To create and maintain an atmosphere or milieu of mutual trust, mutual respect, interpersonal risk and acceptance, and movement toward independence, in which each boy may move at his own pace in physical and psychological freedom and safety.

e) To establish, maintain, review and update firm, fair, consistent limits which are consistently observed and maintained by all staff.

f) To establish and maintain a group of volunteers to supplement the clinical services, supportive services; school services; and youth care services subsystems.
Gary Logan (Clinical Services Systems Coordinator)

a) Facilitate the development and implementation of the Treatment Program for each boy.

b) Develop criteria and procedures for admission of boys. This should be along with the other coordinators.

c) Develop criteria and procedures for discharge from the Ranch.

d) Improve the capability of Clinical staff:
   1. Therapist
   2. Teachers
   3. Team Leaders
   4. Case Managers

e) Provide direct services to boys through counseling and therapy. Provide, where appropriate, counseling and therapy to families.

f) Serve as liaison with referral agencies, providing progress reports and other needed feedback.

g) Assist in developing positive placement for boys discharged from the Ranch.

h) Provide minimal after-care services.

e) Use of Relyea Retreat for staff training.

All Ranch staff were exposed to the opportunity to spend at least 24 hours at Relyea Retreat. Four primary groups were established: Program and Recreation staff; Clinicians, teachers, and treatment teams; administrators, coordinators, and supervisors; and supportive services staff. The training retreat schedule was set up over a nine-month period, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Participating Group</th>
<th>Date &amp; Time Leave/ (est.)</th>
<th>Date &amp; Time Ret. (est.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Teachers and Aides (14)</td>
<td>Fri 8-24 8 a.m.</td>
<td>Sun 8-26 4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Recreation Leaders (8)</td>
<td>Fri 9-28 1 p.m.</td>
<td>Sun 9-30 10 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Clinical Staff (13)</td>
<td>Fri 10-12 8 a.m.</td>
<td>Sun 10-14 10 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Argo Treatment Team (10)</td>
<td>Fri 10-26 8 a.m.</td>
<td>Sat 10-27 4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>U. Stowell Treatment Team (11)</td>
<td>Fri 11-2 8 a.m.</td>
<td>Sat 11-3 4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each retreat involved considerable preparation, including menu planning and staff scheduling to accommodate house coverage during the periods of absence. Two examples of the typical retreat format were as follows:

RECREATION WORKSHOP (Fri. Sept. 28 to Sun Sept. 30, 1973)

Fri. Sept. 28, 1973

Noon - 12:30 p.m.  Lunch at Ranch
12:30 - 1:00 p.m.  Load up supplies
1:00 - 3:30 p.m.  Drive to Relyear Retreat
2:30 - 4:00 p.m.  Getting settled; exploration of the area
4:00 - 5:30 p.m.  First Session "GETTING ACQUAINTED"
5:30 - 6:00 p.m.  Free time
6:00 - 6:30 p.m.  Supper
6:30 - 7:30 p.m.  Free time
7:30 - 9:00 p.m.  Second Session "ESTABLISHING THE BOUNDARIES"

9:00 - 10:00 p.m.  Night hike
10:30 - ..........  Snacks and informal communication

Sat. Sept. 29, 1973

8:30 - 9:30 a.m.  Breakfast
9:30 - 10:30 a.m.  Free time
10:30 - Noon  Third Session "BUILDING THE FOUNDATION"
12:15 - 12:30 p.m.  Lunch
12:30 - 2:30 p.m.  Swimming or hiking
2:30 - 4:00 p.m.  Fourth Session "CREATING A 'THING' TOGETHER"
4:00 - 5:30 p.m.  Free time
5:30 - 6:00 p.m.  Supper
6:00 - 6:30 p.m.  Free time
6:30 - 8:00 p.m.  Fifth Session "MAKING IT WORK"
8:00 - 9:30 p.m.  Outdoor Recreational Activity
9:30 - ..........  Snacks and informal communication
Sun. Sept. 30, 1973

8:30 - 9:15 a.m. Continental Breakfast
9:15 - 10:00 a.m. General cleanup; load up personal gear
10:00 - 11:30 a.m. Drive to Ranch


7:00 a.m. Load up food and other supplies
7:15 a.m. Participants arrive for breakfast at Ranch (optional)
7:40 a.m. Load up cars with personal items
8:00 a.m. Depart from Ranch - drive to Relyea Retreat
9:30 a.m. Get settled; explore area; learn general rules
10:15 a.m. FIRST SESSION "BUILDING THE TREATMENT TEMA"
11:45 a.m. Free period
12:00 Noon Lunch and cleanup
1:00 p.m. SECOND SESSION "INTRODUCTION TO I-LEVEL THEORY AND APPLICATION"
4:00 p.m. Free Period
5:00 p.m. Supper and cleanup
6:00 p.m. THIRD SESSION "THE USE OF I-LEVEL TECHNIQUES IN ARGO HOUSE"
8:00 p.m. Night Hike or Free Period
9:30 p.m. Informal Communication

Saturday, October 27

8:00 a.m. Breakfast and Cleanup
9:00 a.m. FOURTH SESSION "THE TREATMENT TEAM: ROLES AND FUNCTIONS"
11:30 a.m. Free Period
12:00 Noon Lunch and Cleanup
1:00 p.m. FIFTH SESSION "INDIVIDUALIZED & GROUP PROGRAMS IN ARGO HOUSE"
3:00 p.m. Load up cars; final cleanup
3:30 p.m. Leave Relyea; head for Ranch

Participants should bring the following items:

- sleeping bag (or sheets and blankets) and a pillow
- warm, rough clothing and heavy-duty shoes
- a flashlight
- any other personal items desired (towel, toilet articles)
- a bathing suit (for the hardy) or fishing tackle
f) Ranch symposium on residential treatment

Part of the overall thrust of the Ranch as a learning laboratory was the planning and implementation of a symposium on residential treatment. This had a dual purpose; stimulated by Dr. Bostic's constant determination to upgrade the Ranch as a treatment center:

1) to further acquaint agency placement workers, institutional coordinators, and other interested professionals with the multi-track system of care at the Ranch, and to discuss specific issues related to referrals and placement consideration; and,

2) to help all participating Ranch staff cohere around a mutual task, to strengthen the emerging feeling of professionalism of Ranch staff, and to enhance the sense of pride in being affiliated with the Ranch.

The symposium was entitled, "What Do We Do, After You Say Goodbye?" and had the following format:

"WHAT DO WE DO AFTER YOU SAY GOODBYE?"
(a symposium on residential treatment)

9:00 - 9:30 registration and coffee
9:30 - 9:50 "Introduction and a Historical Perspective of the Ranch" ................. Les Bostic
9:50 - 10:50 "Emotional Knapsacks" (followed by a question and answer period) ........ Dr. Hugh Missildine
10:50 - 11:00 (Break period)
11:00 - 11:30 "Referral and Intake Process"...Gary Logan
11:30 - Noon "Philosophical and Ethical Considerations of Residential Treatment" ...Dick Gebhardt
Noon - 1:00 Lunch, and Ranch Tour
1:00 - 1:20 Panel Discussion (3-minute overviews)

A. Staff Development........Dick Gebhardt
B. The Ranch Milieu and Youth-Care System .................John Walker
C. The Clinical Treatment System ..............Gary Logan
D. The Ranch Educational System ........Jim Cowardin
E. The Halfway House System...Bob Marrah
F. The Cost of Residential Care ........Gary Beougher
1:25 - 2:40 Small group discussion sessions. Each session will be presented three times during this period, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:25 - 1:50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:50 - 2:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15 - 2:40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each participant may, therefore, be involved in any three groups of the six general areas briefly presented in the panel discussion.

2:45 - 3:00 Total group: participant responses or comments and closing remarks ...........Les Bostic

g. Marathon meeting to establish consistent policy.

On January 4, 1974, Johnny Walker, Gary Logan and Dick Gebhardt met in a ten-hour marathon meeting, to discuss and determine appropriate policies and procedures for recommendation to the policy committee. These all were geared toward the increasing autonomy of the treatment teams, and to more integrated services on a Ranch-wide basis. The recommendations were as follows:

1) Acceptance of the school recommendations discussed in the teachers' meeting as an initial step prior to discussing them with Faye Alban and Jim Rudder (see attachment). Our policy acceptance of any or all recommendations would establish a consistent and extended approach as a full treatment thrust, understanding that if any part of this were contrary to South-Western School's policy, it would have to be modified accordingly.

We did have some reservations about the use of student lounge, and feel that it might be inappropriate to include ping pong, pool table, TV or record player. We have some concern about using the auditorium and feel the present "teachers' lounge area" would be more appropriate especially for smoking and quiet games or conversation.

2) A Maintenance Checklist should be designed for use by the Night Youth Leaders, to communicate to the maintenance staff (through "Pop" Newburn) what items or areas need immediate attention (example: fire or safety hazards; extended recent damage; climate control problems, etc.). Johnny Walker
will develop a form for this, as well as a procedure; will share it with Gary Beougher for final approval; and will try to have it implemented by Sunday, January 13th.

3) **Distribution of Keys to Staff:** It is recommended that each coordinator be given full responsibility for the distribution and recovery of all keys used within the specified subsystems. This would mean that the coordinator determines the key needs for his own staff, and would procure them from Gary Beougher through whatever procedure Gary wishes to establish.

4) **Laundry:** The procedures as outlined in Gary Beougher's attached memo (January 4, 1974) to Dick should be implemented as stated, with the addition that Johnny Walker will see that all items are marked before attempting the new laundry procedure.

5) **Boys' Orientation Procedures:** for all new boys, which includes pre-released and pre-transfer procedures. Gary Logan will set up a marathon clinical meeting soon for discussions and recommendations to be presented to the policy committee for final consideration and approval.

6) **Decentralization of Daily Records and Logs:** It is recommended that Hislop and Argo treatment team records and logs, currently contained in the Stowell Communication Center, be placed in the Clinical Offices in their respective houses. This will enhance the autonomy and integrity of these treatment teams, and reduce the need for so many people to be in the Communication Center in Stowell. As soon as the Upper and Lower Stowell unit offices are remodeled (the present kitchenette areas), it is further recommended that the daily records and logs presently housed in the Communications Center be moved to the Unit Offices.

7) **Mealtime Infringements:** There is some concern about the infringements some boys are making during the scheduled meal periods (running, personal harassment, etc.), and the original policy of seating arrangements by house has been completely disqualified by boys and staff. It is recommended that to reduce the conflict at tables, staff be assigned
specific table positions to cover all tables at noon and strategic areas at other meals) and permit the boys to sit wherever they wish.

8) A "Notice of Citation" Form is proposed, to provide a more immediate handling of situations involving Youth Care staff and to communicate to the treatment teams and other staff members, what has occurred. Thus, if a boy were placed on temporary restriction pending treatment team or discipline committee action, the conditions would be written out and implemented at the time of the incident.

9) Staff Relationships: Both Gary Logan and Johnny Walker have received feedback from some of their respective staff that they feel a need for positive reinforcement from time to time. Because of the pressures of high volume work, there has been minimal opportunity to spend much supervisory time with counselors or Youth Care Leaders, and often the only feedback they get is negative concern when things go wrong. It is strongly recommended to all administrative and coordinator staff that whenever opportunities arise (formal or informal) to honestly give positive appraisals to staff for their work efforts, such feedback should be given. Job satisfaction often hinges on these kinds of details, and good supervisory and management practices are reflective in this concept of positive feedback.

10) Case Management: It is recommended that the Lower Stowell Treatment Team assume the initial role of Case Managers on a three-month trial basis, to get a table of experience prior to implementation on a full scale Ranch basis. The first case will be assigned to each Lower Stowell team member on Thursday, January 10, 1974.

2. Step Two, Providing Basic Theory

Starting on the second Thursday in October, 1973, and every week thereafter, eight staff training sessions were held in the facilitator's office in the Hislop Clinical Wing. There were two required courses which all youth leaders completed: Course I: "Concepts of Human Behavior," and Course II: "Concepts of Intervention." Attendance was part of the job expectation, and staff who came in on their regular days off received 3 extra vacation days or 3 extra
days pay after the two required courses were completed. The courses were as follows:

Course I: Concepts of Human Behavior. This was the first of two required courses for all Ranch Youth Leaders. Exploration and discussion of theoretical and practical concepts of human behavior: Social Functioning; Behavioral Patterns; Stress; Systems Analysis; Personal Values; and, Life-Styles, as they apply to groups and to the individual in society, and specifically, to the Ranch setting. This was a four-week course, from October 12, through November 1, and concentrated on theory into practice through group discussion and structured activities.

Course II: Concepts of Intervention. (pre-requisite: Course I, or special arrangement). This was the second of two required courses for all Ranch Youth Leaders. General and specific modes of intervention were explored: Ranch Milieu; Group Process; Relationships; Risk-Taking; Limit-Setting; Role-Playing; Structure; Confrontation; Program; Behavior Modification; and Self-Awareness. This was a four week course, from November 8 to December 5 and utilized role playing and structured activities as the primary training approach.

3. Step Three. Youth Leaders as Case Managers

In October, 1973, Jane Osuga left the Ranch for a position with Franklin County Children Services. This placed the Ranch again in a very vulnerable position, with two clinicians, Gary Logan and Arnie Ishiyuka trying to maintain four treatment teams. As part of the MSW training program, Don Wilka, a graduate student, was assigned to supervise the Hislop Treatment Team under Gary Logan's direction. Don was also interested in doing some shared staff training with the facilitator, and assisted in developing and presenting a six-week course on the emerging role of Youth Leaders as Case Managers. Gary Logan, Johnny Walker, Don Wilka and the facilitator, Dick Gebhardt, discussed the emerging role of youth leaders as case managers, and determined that the following responsibilities could be realistically incorporated:

1. YOUTH ADVOCACY
   a. home and family contacts
d. special events
   b. telephone calls
e. medical/dental needs
   c. weekly pay vouchersf. personal clothing needs
2. DATA COLLECTION AND COORDINATION

a. daily progress notes  
b. critical incident reports  
c. weekly school notes  
d. weekly team meeting  
e. monthly progress reports  
f. monthly summary reports

3. AGENCY CONTACTS

a. home and family visits  
b. community concerns/ A.W.O.L.'s  
c. quarterly individual staffings  
d. major program changes  
e. projected or alternative placement  
f. limited aftercare services

These duties or responsibilities were carefully developed, and implemented only after the youth leaders had been fully trained to incorporate them into the Ranch system. Considerable emphasis was placed on consistent and appropriate application of these duties by participating staff. This was a prelude to more clinical intervention by selected youth leaders, following rigorous and specialized training. Each treatment team member was assigned three boys over a six-week period, within the framework of their own team, by designated house. Training was implemented through the Wednesday Staff Development Meetings, Treatment Team Meetings, and Team Manager supervision. Projected case managers were designated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argo House</th>
<th>Hislop House</th>
<th>Upper Stowell</th>
<th>Lower Stowell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tony West</td>
<td>Carl Janiak</td>
<td>Dave Schroeder</td>
<td>George Stravelakis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Cook</td>
<td>Hearcel Craig</td>
<td>Dave Hamilton</td>
<td>Bert Couch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nan Donorest</td>
<td>Chris Rebbin</td>
<td>Rik Foreman</td>
<td>(vacancy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Roche</td>
<td>Cathy Lindamood</td>
<td>Danny Ratusz</td>
<td>Johnny Walker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The projected training and implementation schedule of these expanded roles and responsibilities were as follows:

Course III. The Role of the Case Manager

Wed. Dec. 12

1. Concepts of Case Management (I)  
2. Agency Contacts  
a. home visits  
b. community problems  
c. A.W.O.L. procedures
Wed. Dec. 19

1. Youth Advocacy
   a. home and family contacts
   b. weekly pay vouchers
   c. telephone calls
   d. special events (birthdays, holidays, etc.)
2. Concepts of Case Management (II)
3. First boy assigned to each of the team members

Wed. Jan. 9

1. Youth Advocacy
   a. clothing purchases and maintenance
   b. missing, damaged, or stolen personal items
2. Data Collection and Coordination
   a. daily program notes
   b. critical incident reports

Wed. Jan. 16

1. Concepts of Case Management (III)
2. Data Collection and Coordination
   a. weekly school reports
   b. team meetings: individual case recording
3. Second boy assigned to each of the team members

Wed. Jan. 23

1. Data Collection and Coordination
   a. monthly progress reports
   b. monthly summary reports
2. Agency Contacts
   a. major program changes
   b. quarterly individual staffings

Wed. Jan. 30

1. Concepts of Case Management (IV)
2. Agency Contacts
   a. planning and projected placements
   b. temporary aftercare services
3. Third boy assigned to each of the team members

Areas which needed clear and concise guidelines were:

1. Additional specified staff as Case Manager, to back-up the assigned Case Managers in emergencies.
2. Procedures for implementation of these responsibilities consistently and fairly.
3. Case assignments - who works with which boys in the most effective ways.

4. Coordination of group and individual team goals, to avoid staff conflicts and enhance team cooperation.

5. By individual team, expanded group treatment modes directed by I-Level classification, as a team effort.

6. Expansion of inter-group and intra-group communication.


This same program was also implemented at Hirsch Hall (with some modifications appropriate to the different setting and staffing pattern).

Following this training sequence, a six-week course, starting February 6, 1974, and ending March 13, 1974, was presented to all child care staff.

Course IV: The Role of the Paraclinician (pre-requisite: successful completion of Courses I, II, III and at least six months full time experience as a Youth Leader at Buckeye Boys Ranch). Involved outside readings, report writing, participatory classroom projects, and visits to other child-caring treatment institutions. Expanded concepts of Human Behavior and Modes of Intervention, as they related to the Paraclinical Role, were presented. In addition, techniques of interviewing; diagnostic tools; Communications Theory; Crisis Intervention; Guided Group Interaction; Transactional Analysis; Bibliotherapy; and Parent Effectiveness Training were discussed. This course was offered every Wednesday from 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. and concentrated on strengthening the clinical dimensions of treatment. By the end of Course IV, the Paraclinical (later to be named "paraprofessional") staff had discussed and mutually agreed upon specific skills which all Youth Leaders should acquire during the first six months of apprenticeship.

a. RANCH STRUCTURE

1) All Ranch rules and policies.
2) Multiple roles and expectations of Youth Leaders.
3) An overview of the Ranch as a whole - the subsystems; service delivery expectations; external resources; and the formal and informal organizational structures.
4) The role and functions of Treatment Teams.
5) The role and responsibilities of Case Managers.

b. THEORETICAL CONCEPTS

1) Social functioning, conflict, and stress.
2) Limit-setting, discipline, and strategic intervention.
3) Developmental tasks and behavioral characteristics of children from birth through adolescence.
4) "Parent Effectiveness Training" and "I-Messages" as applied to interpersonal relationships and limit-setting.
5) "Interpersonal Maturity Level Classification System" and the implications for differential group treatment approaches.
6) "Behavior Modification" as a treatment approach.
7) "Gestalt, Reality and Insight Therapies" in treatment.
8) "Transactional Analysis" as a treatment approach.
9) "Positive Peer Culture" as a treatment approach.

c. INTERPERSONAL SKILLS

1) Personal knowledge of and acquaintance with every boy and staff member in the Ranch program (by name, appearance, and house assignment).
2) Formation of beginning relationships with boys and staff, which are significant; mutually-respecting; non-infringing; and growth-producing.
3) Establishment and maintenance of reasonable limits through appropriate intervention, by actively supporting Ranch rules and policies.
4) Steadily increasing sensitivity to the needs of boys and staff through an expanded self-awareness and insights into personal feelings.
5) Expanding knowledge of individual boys' backgrounds and prescribed treatment approaches.
6) Consistently expanding ability to accurately identify and appropriately deal with own personal feelings generated by stressful situations, while concurrently setting reasonable limits and dealing with boy's feelings hidden behind overt behaviors.

d. COMMUNICATION SKILLS

1) Basic verbal and written reports of observed behaviors and interactions with boys.
2) Advanced verbal and written reporting of observed behaviors and interactions with boys, beginning to incorporate own personal involvement as a factor of the interaction.

3) Complete and accurate reporting, verbally and in writing, of observed behaviors and interactions with boys, incorporating personal insights and theoretical concepts reflecting appropriate interventive techniques.

4) Ability to conduct three taped individual interviews with a selected boy, over a specified time period, with a predetermined goal designed to strengthen the boys' social functioning.

e. PROGRAM SKILLS

1) Written program plans and implementation of five 60-minute quiet in-house games for 6 to 12 boys. (Total: 5 hours).

2) Written program plans and implementation of four 30-minute planned discussion groups for 6 to 8 boys. (Total: 2 hours).

3) Written program plans and implementation of six 45-minute big muscle indoor activities for 6 to 12 boys. (Total 4-1/2 hours).

4) Written program plans and implementation of three 90-minute big muscle outdoor activities for 10 to 20 boys. (Total 4-1/2 hours).

5) Written program plans and implementation of two 120-minute multiple simultaneous small group activities for 12 to 16 boys. (Total 4 hours).

4. Step 4. Program Development

One area which was still somewhat low key was the activity program. Faced with the summer vacation period, the facilitator encouraged staff to begin planning for boy-centered programs which would stimulate and interest the boys, and divert their energies into creative or productive activities. This course was offered for a six-week period from March 29 through May 3, 1974, on Fridays, from 1:30 p.m. to 2:30 p.m. Planning and implementation were conducted by Cathy Lindamood, Johnny Walker, and Dick Gebhardt, and was designed to strengthen staff skills in researching, developing, implementing, and evaluating in-house programs.

Four major areas were covered:

a) activities which constitute program;

b) researching and developing program plans;
c) program implementation; and,
d) observation, evaluation and communication.

This program area stressed the use of self as a catalyst to stimulate activities, as well as the concepts of preparation and lesson plans. 4" x 6" index cards were developed by the group, with a specific resource or activity clearly outlined on each card. Staff were given additional resource options in the community, including concepts of volunteers to augment the program.

5. **Step 5. The Clinician as Coordinator**

As the child care roles began to emerge and solidify, the clinical staff began to explore clinical roles. There were three clinicians by December, 1973: Gary Logan, Arnie Ishizuka, and Bob Hormann (a specialist in guided group interaction, who had replaced Jane Osuga). The expectations for clinical staff and students had continued to expand, even to the degree that each clinician was working at least two evenings a month, until 10:00 p.m. to supplement child care coverage and to act in a supervisory capacity.

By the end of May, 1974, the clinical staff had tentatively agreed upon roles and responsibilities for clinical counselors, in four major areas. These were as follows:

a. **Treatment Team Coordinator**

1) Directly supervise and train all youth leaders assigned to the house.
2) Plan for and conduct all Treatment Team meetings for the house.
3) Coordinate the overall house program.
4) Coordinate all family and agency contacts related to boys in the house.
5) Maintain ongoing communication with clinical, coordinating and administrative staff toward total Ranch consistency.
6) Involvement and inputs into Ranch policy and procedural decisions and implementation process.

b. **House Manager**

1) Direct involvement with personnel practices which include hiring, evaluation, and separation procedures related to staff assigned to the house.
2) Full responsibility for administration and accountability for the house budget and payroll, by assisting the Ranch business office in the planning and implementation of the house budget each fiscal year.

3) Meet all primary and secondary needs for the personal life space requirements for each boy assigned to live in the house.

4) See that all housekeeping needs and standards are met by house staff and boys.

c. Clinical Team Member

1) Directly involved in the Intake Process, and in Intake, Transfer, and Discharge decisions, by maintaining a rigorous posture of clinical and ethical accountability as both "Child Advocate" and "Devil's Advocate" in the decision-making process.

2) Strong involvement in teaching and learning as a reciprocal process with other clinical staff as part of the personal/professional growth and development program.

3) Some selective activities such as seminars, workshops, consultive roles, guest speaker, etc., with clinically-oriented public relations involvement.

d. Clinical Therapist

1) Direct accountability for the Clinical treatment of all boys living in the house, or selected boys on the Day Care Program, through the use of individual, family, group and/or milieu therapies.

2) Assist in the supervision and training of graduate or undergraduate students assigned or placed within the Ranch setting.

3) Responsible for initiating and following all written reports to agencies, families, etc., as these reports are related to house or specific clinical assignments.

In addition, each clinical counselor was expected to become involved in all other duties or assignments which might be specified by the Executive Director, Treatment Director or Clinical Coordinator, as needs changed or emerged, related to the roles and functions of the Clinical Counselor.

6. Training Outcomes

Over the nine-month period from September, 1973, through May, 1974, there were several observable changes in the
staff. As each treatment team began to cohere and take on its own autonomy, a strong sense of house and team loyalty began to emerge. A sense of camaraderie and freedom to express feelings were evident. Staff had been given responsibility and authority, and a definite balance of power surfaced.

For a brief period during the spring, 1973, several of the youth leaders unexpectedly demanded higher salaries and more benefits. Their rationale was that since their duties and professional skills were being upgraded, so too should their salaries increase. They went so far as to sign a petition and send copies to all the board members, bypassing the Executive Director and Assistant Director in the process. They were advised that the 1974 budget was not flexible enough to meet any salary increase at that time. However, the Board Personnel Committee did study the problem of the very low salary scales at the Ranch, and recommendations for a revised scale were established, to begin in September, 1974. Concurrently, the idea of a staff career ladder was explored, with some opportunities for advancement in the Ranch system.

Consistent with the concept of a career ladder was the need for staff evaluation. The clinical team and the Policy Committee spent several months developing an almost too sophisticated and complex staff evaluation scale, and this was introduced in early summer, 1974 for all Ranch staff.

The clinical team also stimulated a major change in the intake procedure, with the more clinical orientation of the treatment teams. An overnight stay of about 24 hours for all prospective youths was initiated, and the team members were able to have considerable inputs into the final decision to accept or reject each candidate.

By early June, 1974, the treatment teams were firmly established, and youth leader roles were clearly defined. Although each team had some slight modification in roles, a typical case manager role was as follows:

Basically, each Case Manager will assume primary responsibility (accompanied by expanded authority) for six or seven boys. This involves role-specific duties which are designed to provide better service to the residents. Some of the Case Manager duties are projected as follows:

a. Assumes the primary role of Case Manager for six or seven residents by gradually acquiring an in-
depth understanding of the background; behavior patterns; family dynamics; strengths; and problem-areas of each boy in the unit;

b. Attends to client-centered needs, as designated:

1) Takes an assertive leadership role in encouraging and maintaining a unit atmosphere of mutual positive regard and respect for self, others, and property, and generates sustained enthusiasm for and pride in both personal and shared life-space, grooming, and appropriate demeanor;

2) Conducts weekly unit resident group meetings to discuss program, concerns, and individual requests to the team;

3) Maintains an ongoing, growth-producing relationship with each client in the unit through individual contacts and personal concern;

4) Makes necessary preliminary arrangements and contacts with the client and/or his family (or alternative resources), related to phone calls; on-grounds, off-grounds or home visits; special outings; etc., prior to team consideration for approval.

5) Handles individual resident clothing needs; toilet articles; laundry and bedding; special purchase requests; transportation needs and expenses; and other necessary procedures.

c. Takes a position of client advocacy for each individual resident at all team meetings, and has these responsibilities:

1) Presents client requests to the team for discussion, consideration, and decision; and, participates fully in all treatment team deliberations and duties;

2) Presents and receives inputs on general group interaction and specific individual behaviors;

3) Shares a leadership role with the coordinator in presenting case data for individual staffings on boys from the unit;
4) All other team functions as designated or directed.

d. Under the leadership and supervision of the Senior Program Leader collaborates in the planning, development and implementation of ongoing resident program activities for second-shift weekdays and all day on weekends and major holidays. Involves own unit in the process; works closely with the other Resident Manager on shared activities which may involve both units; and has alternative plans ready in the event the primary activity scheduled cannot be implemented.

e. On a tri-weekly basis (every third Tuesday) has an individual case conference with the Coordinator to discuss cases; unit needs and programs; personal concerns; supervisory inputs; and mutual feedback designed to strengthen professional skills.

f. Has the primary responsibility to communicate group-life data on each client, through these processes:

1) Writes general statements of group process in the team log (that are not specific to individuals) which reflect patterns of group dynamics;

2) Maintains individual written logs for the six residents, incorporating on-going daily records in all areas of group-life functioning: school; recreation; medical; interpersonal; unit; reactive (citations; SIR's, etc.); family contacts; etc.;

3) Writes a detailed synopsis of the available data on each client, once every three months, from materials in the individual logs. These Case Manager Reports should be clear, concise, and representative of the specific client, and will be used as follows:

a) As a record of cumulative data, to discern patterns of behavior and individual dynamics;

b) As one aspect of communication within the tri-weekly case conference with the coordinator; and,

c) As a concrete indicator of client movement through the residential team process, to be incorporated into the quarterly progress report sent to the referring agency by the coordinator.
g. All other duties and responsibilities as directed by the Senior Program Leader; Coordinator; or other designated supervisors or administrators. These include the Youth Leader position expectations, as directed by the Executive Director of Buckeye Boys Ranch.

Two more courses were offered to Youth Leaders, during the summer of 1974:

**Course V Paraclinical Internship I** (prerequisite: successful completion of Course IV and at least one year of full-time experience as a Youth Leader at Buckeye Boys Ranch). This course was conducted during the months of June, and early July, 1974, and was offered to six participants who were interested in skill development. This course involved concepts of report-writing; paraclinical case management, and group dynamics. Participants each had individual weekly sessions and a bi-weekly group seminar.

**Course VI Paraclinical Internship II** (prerequisite: successful completion of Course V). This was a four-week course from mid-July to mid-August, 1974, and was offered to three participants who were interested in program development, staff supervision, and staff development. Participants met weekly as a group, and individually.

By the end of the summer, 1974, a "mass exodus" occurred when seven youth leaders resigned: five enrolled in graduate school for advanced degrees; and two found better-paying supervisory or clinical roles in other social service agencies. The training, and the environment of learning and growth, was apparently one factor in these decisions.
APPENDIX G

FACSIMILES, RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY
OF INSTRUMENTS USED IN THIS STUDY
Please note your number in the upper right corner.

In the next ninety minutes you will be given three written exercises which are directly related to a study being conducted at Buckeye Boys Ranch. Part I (white paper) takes about 24 minutes; Part II (pink paper) takes another 24 minutes; and Part III (yellow paper) an additional 20 minutes. There will be a 10-minute break between Part I and Part II; and another 10-minute break between Part II and Part III.

As you receive each part, please write your number on the space shown in the upper right corner of the first page of each part.

Before we begin, please complete the following information (approximately 5 minutes):

1. __________________________________ 2. Birthdate___________________
3. Highest grade completed (circle only one in each category):
   a. elementary 1 2 3 4 5 6
   b. secondary 7 8 9 10 11 12
   c. undergraduate 1 2 3 4 degree in ____________________
   d. graduate 1 2 degree in ____________________
   e. graduate 1 2 degree in ____________________

4. Work experience (current position first):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. LEVINSON & HUFFMAN SCALE (8 minutes): Below are listed fifteen statements. Please read the first statement and decide how you personally feel about the statement. Then put an "X" on the line which is closest to your feelings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A teenager should be allowed to decide most things for himself...........</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Whatever some educators may say, &quot;spare the rod and spoil the child&quot; still holds, even in these modern times...........</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It isn't healthy for a child to like to be alone, and he should be discouraged from playing by himself...............</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It helps the child in the long run if he is made to conform to his parents' ideas................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. If children are told much about sex, they are likely to go too far in experimenting with it..</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. In making family decisions, parents ought to take the opinions of children into account......................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A well-raised child is one who doesn't have to be told twice to do something..................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. A child should not be allowed to talk back to his parents, or else he will lose respect for them..................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. There is a lot of evidence such as the Kinsey Report which shows we have to crack down harder on young people to save our moral standards................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statement

10. The saying "Mother knows best" still has more than a grain of truth.............

11. It is important to teach the child as early as possible the manners and morals of his society.............

12. A lot of the sex problems of married couples arise because their parents have been too strict with them about sex.............

13. A woman whose children are messy or rowdy has failed in her duties as a mother.

14. A child who is unusual in any way should be encouraged to be more like other children.

15. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel a great love, gratitude, and respect for his parents.............
PART II

A Basa Short Form (12 minutes): Below are twelve sets of statements. Each statement is labeled "a" or "b". Read the first set of statements, and decide which of the two statements you most agree with. Then circle either "a" or "b". Please answer every question in this manner. When you have completed all twelve, go on to the next section.

1. a. Astrology will never explain anything.
   b. Someday it will probably be shown that astrology can explain a lot of things.

2. a. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas. As they grow up they ought to try to carry them out and not be content to get over them and settle down.
   b. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down.

3. a. If people would discuss matters more before acting, everybody would be better off.
   b. If people would talk less and work more, everybody would be better off.

4. a. What a youth needs most is strict discipline, rugged determination, and the will to work and fight for family and country.
   b. What a youth needs most is to be free to make up his own mind, to be flexible and to work and fight for what he considers right personally even though it might not be best for his family and country.

5. a. Nowadays more and more people are prying into matters that should remain personal and private.
   b. Nowadays, not enough investigating of personal and private matters is done.

6. a. The businessman and the manufacturer are much more important to society than the artist and the professor.
   b. The artist and the professor are much more important to society than the businessman and the manufacturer.

7. a. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.
   b. Self-reliance, respect for democracy and lack of need to submit to authority are the most important virtues children should learn.
6. a. Many fine people honestly could never bring themselves around to feeling a great love, gratitude, and respect for their parents.

   b. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel great love, gratitude, and respect for his parents.

9. a. The wild sex life of the old Greeks and Romans was tame compared to some of the goings-on in this country, even in places where people might least expect it.

   b. Some of the goings-on in this country, even in places where people might least expect it, are tame compared to the wild sex life of the Greeks and Romans.

10. a. Homosexuals are not criminals and should not be punished.

    b. Homosexuals are hardly better than criminals and ought to be severely punished.

11. a. When a person has a problem or worry, it is best for him to think about doing something about it, not be distracted by more cheerful things.

    b. When a person has a problem or worry, it is best for him not to think about it, but to keep busy with more cheerful things.

12. a. Every person should have complete faith in some supernatural power whose decisions he obeys without question.

    b. No person should have complete faith in some supernatural power whose decisions he obeys without question.
Part II

A. Bass Short Form (12 Minutes): Below are twelve sets of statements. Each statement is labeled "a" or "b." Read the first set of statements, and decide which of the two statements you most agree with. Then circle either "a" or "b." Please answer every question in this manner. When you have completed all twelve, go on to the next section.

2. a. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas. As they grow up they ought to try to carry them out and not be content to get over them and settle down.

(b.) Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down.

4. (a.) What a youth needs most is strict discipline, rugged determination, and the will to work and fight for family and country.

b. What a youth needs most is to be free to make up his own mind, to be flexible and to work and fight for what he considers right personally even though it might not be best for his family and country.

7. (a.) Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.

b. Self-reliance, respect for democracy and lack of need to submit to authority are the most important virtues children should learn.

8. a. Many fine people honestly could never bring themselves around to feeling a great love, gratitude, and respect for their parents.

(b.) There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel great love, gratitude, and respect for his parents.

10. a. Homosexuals are not criminals and should not be punished.

(b.) Homosexuals are hardly better than criminals and ought to be severely punished.
12. (a.) Every person should have complete faith in some supernatural power whose decisions he obeys without question.

b. No person should have complete faith in some supernatural power whose decisions he obeys without question.
B. P.I. SCALE (6 minutes)

**I DIRECTIONS:** From the list of staff members (on the attached sheet) write the names of three people who in your personal opinion best fit each of the following descriptions.

1. Who are the persons who seem best able to express their feelings without hurting the feelings of others?
   a. 
   b. 
   c. 

2. In your opinion, who are the three persons in this group who seem to understand themselves best; that is, are aware of their shortcomings and strengths?
   a. 
   b. 
   c. 

3. Who are the ones who seem best able to keep an open mind and not jump to premature conclusions?
   a. 
   b. 
   c. 

4. Who are the three persons who seem the most able to deal effectively with everyday tensions and anxieties?
   a. 
   b. 
   c. 

5. Which three persons seem capable of forming deeper and more profound relationships with others and seem to be genuinely concerned with other people?
   a. 
   b. 
   c. 

Attachment (1)
II DIRECTIONS: Read each of the five statements listed below, and mark an "X" in the space which is closest to how you feel about the statements.

SA = Strongly Agree
A  = Agree
MA = Mildly Agree
SD = Strongly Disagree
D  = Disagree
MD = Mildly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am able to express my feelings without hurting the feelings of others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I understand myself, and am aware of my shortcomings and strengths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am able to keep an open mind and not jump to premature conclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am able to deal effectively with everyday tensions and anxieties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am genuinely concerned with other people and am capable of forming deep and profound relationships with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FORCED CHOICE F SCALE (Berkowitz and Wolkon 1964)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This scale was designed to measure authoritarianism as defined by the California study (Adorno et al., 1950) while avoiding two problems encountered with previous scales: 1) acquiescence response set and 2) inadequate counterbalancing which yields unreliability and perhaps multidimensionality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sample | The authors presented each positively worded F Scale item along with its reversal. The respondent was instructed to select one statement of the pair and indicate the extent to which he agreed with it relative to its opposite. Three levels of agreement were provided: "slightly more", "somewhat more", and "a great deal more". Thus there were six scale points, three levels of agreement for each of the two alternatives. These were scored from 1 to 7, with 4 representing the absent midpoint. |

Twenty-five items which appear in the original F Scale and also in both Bass' and Christie's sets of negatively phrased items were selected. These 75 items, 25 originals and two sets of reversals, arranged in random order, comprise Form I. From the items in Form I, two forced-choice scales were constructed. Form II (FCC) used the original items paired with Christie's reversals; each pair constituted an item. The items appeared in random order. Form III (FCB) was exactly the same as the previous one, except the Bass reversals were coupled with the original F statement. Stems appeared in the exact same random order used in Form II. In each forced choice form (FC), for 13 randomly chosen items, the original statement from the F Scale preceded its reversal, while in the other 12 items, the reversal came first. The original F+ statements appeared first in the same items of each FC form. In short, the only difference between the two forms used was in the set of reversed items employed in the pairing. |

The various forms were administered to two major groups. The first comprised 153 Junior College students, who received the tests in the following different orders: |

- **Condition 1 (N=51):** Form II (FCC) followed by Form I
- **Condition 2 (N=54):** Form I followed by Form III (FCB)
- **Condition 3 (N=48):** Form III (FCB) followed by Form I, followed by Form II (FCC)

The second sample included 135 students attending the summer school of the College of Liberal Arts of Boston University, who received the questionnaires in four different orders: |

- **Condition 1 (N=25):** Form I followed by Form II (FCC)
- **Condition 2 (N=23):** Form I followed by Form III (FCB)
- **Condition 3 (N=43):** Form II (FCC) followed by Form I
- **Condition 4 (N=44):** Form III (FCB) followed by Form I

---

1See the write-up of the original F Scale in this chapter which also lists the Bass and Christie reversals.
For this sample, Form I was reduced from 75 to 50 items by eliminating the Sassa reversals.

Reliability

The following reliability coefficients were obtained after combining across conditions. In each case the largest possible number of cases was used.

(Hoyt) Reliabilities of Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Junior College Sample</th>
<th>Liberal Arts Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F+</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF-</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF-</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCC</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCB</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reliabilities of the reversed scales are larger than usually obtained, probably due to the length of the scales (CF- and BF-).

Validity

Scores obtained on the various forms were correlated with those from the original F Scale. To the extent that the new scales measure the same thing as the F Scale, these correlations should be high. The results are presented in table form below.

Validity (correlation with F+) of Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Junior College Sample</th>
<th>Liberal Arts Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Validity</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF-</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF-</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCC</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCB</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notice that both forced-choice scales yielded higher correlations with $F^+$ than did the two $F^-$ scales. In addition, the FC scores correlated highly with $F^-$ scores. Thus, the authors reason, "the forced-choice form predicts well to both a measure confounded with agreement response set and another confounded with disagreement response set (while the two do not correlate as highly with each other). This seems to suggest that the FC format is relatively insensitive to each of these opposing response tendencies".

There was, however, some indication that order of presentation affected responding. Stems in which $F^+$ preceded $F^-$ correlated only between .24 and .54 with items constructed in the reverse order. Nevertheless, this did not cause the items to exhibit differential association with $F^+$ scores.


This scale is self administered; each form of 25 items requires an estimated 15-20 minutes to complete.

The forced-choice technique appears to be one of the best solutions to the problem of agreement set. This scale correlates highly with $F^+$ and $F^-$ subscales of balanced forms, although these subscales usually do not correlate highly with each other. This may be due in part to a change in the meaning of the negative items in the presence of their authoritarian opposites. One of the problems encountered in constructing negative items has been the difficulty of determining what changes were needed to create psychological opposition in statements that had several logical opposites. Perhaps putting the opposites together makes the implied underlying dimension more salient to the subject.

The authors discuss the difficulty of validating a new scale against an old one of questionable validity (i.e., the original $F$ Scale), and suggest that further exploration of their scale needs to be done in studies of behavior. It is possible, as mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, that a forced choice scale makes rational considerations too salient, thus decreasing the validity of a scale designed to measure "deep" and irrational personality tendencies. This is little more than a conjecture, however. Only further empirical work will determine its worth.

FORM II (Forced Choice Christie)

(* Included on short form)

1. a. It is highly unlikely that astrology will ever be able to explain anything.
   b. Someday it will probably be shown that astrology can explain a lot of things.

2. a. Sex crimes, such as rape and attacks on children, are signs of mental illness; such people belong in hospitals rather than in prison.
   b. Sex criminals such as those who rape and attack children, deserve more than mere imprisonment: such criminals ought to be publicly whipped, or worse.

3. a. No sane, normal, decent person could ever think of hurting a close friend or relative.
   b. It's only natural for people to sometimes have thoughts about hurting a close friend or relative.

4. a. If it weren't for the rebellious ideas of youth there would be less progress in the world.
   b. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down.

5. a. There are many difficulties a person cannot overcome no matter how much will power he has.
   b. No weakness or difficulty can hold us back if we have enough will power.

6. a. Many people have too great a fear of plots hatched in secret by politicians.
   b. Most people don't realize how much of our lives are controlled by plots hatched in secret places.

7. a. A person with bad manners, habits, and breeding can hardly expect to get along with decent people.
   b. People should be willing to overlook failures in manners and unpleasant personal habits in other people.

8. a. Human nature doesn't make war inevitable; man may some day establish a peaceful world.
   b. Human nature being what it is there will always be war and conflict.

   b. You may dislike a person very much, but the chances are that if you get to know him well you'll have more respect for him.

10. a. It would be a good thing if people spent more time thinking and talking about ideas just for the fun of it.
    b. If people would talk less and work more, everybody would be better off.

11. a. What a youth needs most is strict discipline, rugged determination, and the will to work and fight for family and country.
    b. In the long run it is better for our country if young people are allowed a great deal of personal freedom and are not strictly disciplined.
12. a. Nowadays more and more people are prying into matters that should remain personal and private.
b. There are times when it is necessary to probe into even the most personal and private matters.

13. a. The businessman and the manufacturer are much more important to society than the artist and the professor.
b. The artist and the professor are probably more important to society than the businessman.

14. a. Science has its place, but there are many important things that can never possibly be understood by the human mind.
b. The findings of science may some day show that many of our most cherished beliefs are wrong.

15. a. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.
b. One of the most important things children should learn is when to disobey authorities.

16. a. Most honest people admit to themselves that they have sometimes hated their parents.
b. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel great love, gratitude, and respect for his parents.

17. a. The wild sex life of the old Greeks and Romans was tame compared to some of the goings-on in this country, even in places where people might least expect it.
b. In spite of what you read about the wild sex life of people in important places, the real story is about the same in any group of people.

18. a. Even though people of all sorts mix together nowadays, you don't have to worry very much about catching an infection or disease.
b. Nowadays when so many different kinds of people move around and mix together so much, a person has to protect himself especially carefully against catching an infection or disease from them.

19. a. It's nobody's business if someone is a homosexual as long as he doesn't harm other people.
b. Homosexuals are hardly better than criminals and ought to be severely punished.

20. a. People can be divided into two distinct classes, the weak and the strong.
b. It doesn't make much sense to divide people into groups like the weak and the strong; too many people are strong in some ways and weak in others.

21. a. When a person has a problem or worry, it is best to face it and try to think it through, even if it is so upsetting that it keeps him from concentrating on other things.
b. When a person has a problem or worry, it is best for him not to think about it, but to keep busy with more cheerful things.
22. a. It is more important for this country to have a just legal and political system than a series of trustworthy leaders, however, courageous, tireless, and devoted they might be.
b. What this country needs most, more than laws and political programs, is a few courageous, tireless, devoted leaders in whom the people can put their faith.

23. a. An insult to honor should always be punished.
b. Insults to our honor are not always important enough to bother about it.

24. a. Some people are born with an urge to jump from high places.
b. An urge to jump from high places is probably the result of unhappy personal experiences rather than something inborn.

25. a. Every person should have complete faith in some supernatural power whose decisions he obeys without question.
b. It's all right for people to raise questions about even the most sacred matters.
FORM III (Forced Choice Bass)

(* Included in short form)

1. a. Astrology will never explain anything.
   b. Someday it will probably be shown that astrology can explain a lot of things.

2. a. Sex criminals such as those who rape and attack children should be treated as sick people, not publicly whipped or worse.
   b. Sex criminals such as those who rape and attack children, deserve more than mere imprisonment: such criminals ought to be publicly whipped, or worse.

3. a. No sane, normal, decent person could ever think of hurting a close friend or relative.
   b. A sane, normal decent person might have to hurt a close friend or relative.

4. a. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas. As they grow up they ought to try to carry them out and not be content to get over them and settle down.
   b. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down.

5. a. Weaknesses and difficulties can hold us back; will power is not enough.
   b. No weakness or difficulty can hold us back if we have enough will power.

6. a. Our lives are not at all controlled by plots hatched in secret places.
   b. Most people don't realize how much of our lives are controlled by plots hatched in secret places.

7. a. A person with bad manners, habits, and breeding can hardly expect to get along with decent people.
   b. Decent people can get along with a person who has bad manners, habits and breeding.

8. a. Human nature being what it is, universal peace will come about eventually.
   b. Human nature being what it is, there will always be war and conflict.

   b. Familiarity does not breed contempt.

10. a. If people would discuss matters more before acting, everybody would be better off.
    b. If people would talk less and work more, everybody would be better off.

11. a. What a youth needs most is strict discipline, rugged determination, and the will to work and fight for family and country.
    b. What a youth needs most is to be free to make up his own mind, to be flexible and to work and fight for what he considers right personally even though it might not be best for his family and country.
12. a. Nowadays more and more people are prying into matters that should remain personal and private.
   b. Nowadays, not enough investigating of personal and private matters is done.

13. a. The businessman and the manufacturer are much more important to society than the artist and the professor.
   b. The artist and the professor are much more important to society than the businessman and the manufacturer.

14. a. Science has its place, but there are many important things that can never possibly be understood by the human mind.
   b. Because of science, it will be possible for the human mind to understand most important things.

15. a. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.
   b. Self-reliance, respect for democracy and lack of need to submit to authority are the most important virtues children should learn.

16. a. Many fine people honestly could never bring themselves around to feeling a great love, gratitude, and respect for their parents.
   b. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel great love, gratitude, and respect for his parents.

17. a. The wild sex life of the old Greeks and Romans was tame compared to some of the goings-on in this country, even in places where people might least expect it.
   b. Some of the goings-on in this country, even in places where people might least expect it, are tame compared to the wild sex life of the Greeks and Romans.

18. a. A person does not have to worry about catching an infection or disease just because many different kinds of people move around and mix together a great deal nowadays.
   b. Nowadays when so many different kinds of people move around and mix together so much, a person has to protect himself especially carefully against catching an infection or disease from them.

19. a. Homosexuals are not criminals and should not be punished.
   b. Homosexuals are hardly better than criminals and ought to be severely punished.

20. a. People can be divided into two distinct classes, the weak and the strong.
   b. People cannot be divided into two distinct classes, the weak and the strong.

21. a. When a person has a problem or worry, it is best for him to think about doing something about it, not be distracted by more cheerful things.
   b. When a person has a problem or worry, it is best for him not to think about it, but to keep busy with more cheerful things.
22. a. What this country needs most, more than a few courageous, tireless, devoted leaders in whom the people can put their faith, is better laws and political programs.
b. What this country needs most, more than laws and political programs, is a few courageous, tireless, devoted leaders in whom the people can put their faith.

23. a. An insult to honor should always be punished.
b. An insult to our honor should be studied, not punished.

24. a. Some people are born with an urge to jump from high places.
b. No people are born with an urge to jump from high places.

25. a. Every person should have complete faith in some supernatural power whose decisions he obeys without question.
b. No person should have complete faith in some supernatural power whose decisions he obeys without question.
TRADITIONAL FAMILY IDEOLOGY SCALE (Levinson and Huffman 1955)

Variable
This scale is designed to assess differences in family ideology along an autocratic-democratic continuum and is based on five personality factors: conventionalism, authoritarian submission, exaggerated masculinity and femininity, extreme emphasis on discipline, and a moralistic rejection of impulse life.

Description
This scale is composed of 40 six-point Likert-type items, each of which was intended to represent as many of the five factors as possible. The theoretical basis of the authoritarian-democratic personality dimension is described in The Authoritarian Personality (Adorno et al., 1950). These five factors are not regarded as being statistically or conceptually independent. No further information about the source of the items or the selection of those composing the final scale is given. Of the scale items, 34 were regarded as autocratic and six as democratic. Responses to each item were given a value on a scale ranging from +3 (strong agreement) to -3 (strong disagreement) and were converted into item scores by the addition of +4.

Scoring was reversed for the democratic items. The range of scores was 40-280, with a high score indicating adherence to a traditional autocratic family ideology. For convenience, the mean score per item (1-7), computed by dividing the total score by 40, was multiplied by 10 to yield a range of scores from 10 to 70. The item DP's averaged 2.0 and varied from .04 to 3.5.

Sample
The sample contained 109 adults in evening classes in psychology at Cleveland College, 67 men and 42 women between the ages of 20 and 40, either full-time students of college age or part-time students from various occupational groups.

Reliability/ Homogeneity
The (corrected) split-half reliability for the Traditional Family Ideology scale (TFI) was .84. Further data are reported under Results and Comments.

Validity
In an item analysis, it was found that the discriminating power of five of the items did not achieve the five percent significance level. The TFI Scale was correlated with two shortened forms of the E and F Scales (which statistically approximated their longer original forms) yielding values of .65 and .73, respectively.

As with the E and F Scales, TFI scores varied from high to low across religious denominations in the following order: Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, and "unaffiliated." TFI scores increased, on the average, with church attendance. On four projective questions concerning various family roles and practices, the responses of the lowest and the highest scoring quarters on the TFI were compared, and "authoritarian" vs. "egalitarian" scoring categories were formulated. The results indicated that the categories which differentiate high and low scorers reflect the variables on which the TFI Scale was originally constructed.

Estimated administration time is about 25 minutes.

The mean for the sample of 109 was 33.3 (s.d.=7.8), which is slightly on the democratic side of the theoretically neutral point of 40. An abbreviated 12-item form of the TFI Scale (items starred twice on the 40 item scale below) was presented to five groups (total of 507 subjects) in Boston. The group means averaged 32.6 (the s.d.'s 10.7). In these groups, the TFI Scale correlated .6 with the E Scale, .7 with the F Scale, and .5 with a religious conventionalism scale.

The following table presents specific data for the 12 item scale administered to these 5 groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>s.d.</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>RC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Harvard Summer Session</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Boston University Sophomores</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Boston University Freshmen</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Registered Nurses</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student Nurses</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-all</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Harvard summer session group had a 6-week test-retest reliability of .93 and a split-half reliability on the initial test of .92.

The authors' hypothesis that individuals are relatively consistent in their tendency to take a democratic or an autocratic stand in various ideological spheres is supported by the significant correlations between the TFI Scale and the E and RC (Religious Conventionalism) Scales. It appears that an individual's family ideology overlaps with his ideological views of other social institutions. The significant correlations obtained between the TFI Scale and the F Scale demonstrate a close relationship between the democratic-autocratic continuum of family ideology and the egalitarian-authoritarian continuum of personality.

### TRADITIONAL FAMILY IDEOLOGY SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>D.P.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39. A child should not be allowed to talk back to his parents, or else he will lose respect for them. (II, IV)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. There is a lot of evidence such as the Kinsey Report which shows we have to crack down harder on young people to save our moral standards. (IV, V)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel a great love, gratitude, and respect for his parents. (II)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. A well-raised child is one who doesn't have to be told twice to do something. (II, IV)</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. A woman whose children are messy or rowdy has failed in her duties as a mother. (II, V)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. It isn't healthy for a child to like to be alone, and he should be discouraged from playing by himself. (I, V)</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. If children are told much about sex, they are likely to go too far in experimenting with it. (I, V)</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. A child who is unusual in any way should be encouraged to be more like other children. (I, V)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. The saying &quot;Mother knows best&quot; still has more than a grain of truth. (I, II)</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Whatever some educators may say, &quot;Spare the rod and spoil the child&quot; still holds, even in these modern times. (IV)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. It helps the child in the long run if he is made to conform to his parents' ideas. (II, IV)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. A teen-ager should be allowed to decide most things for himself. (II, IV)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Agreement with these items is given a low score, disagreement a high score.

The numbers in parentheses at the end of each item refer to the personality variables they are thought to tap. The numbers are given here for their possible suggestive value; it is not assumed that any item is a "pure" expression of any variable. The variables are named as follows: I. Conventionalism; II. Authoritarian Submission; III. Exaggerated Masculinity and Femininity; IV. Extreme Emphasis on Discipline; V. Moralistic Rejection of Impulse Life.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>D.P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>*27. In making family decisions, parents ought to take the opinions of children into account. (II, IV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>51. It is important to teach the child as early as possible the manners and morals of his society. (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>*52. A lot of the sex problems of married couples arise because their parents have been too strict with them about sex. (IV, V)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Husband and wife roles and relationships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>D.P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>31. Women who want to remove the word obey from the marriage service don't understand what it means to be a wife. (II, III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>20. Some equality in marriage is a good thing, but by and large the husband ought to have the main say-so in family matters. (III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>28. One of the worst problems in our society today is &quot;free love,&quot; because it mars the true value of sex relations. (I, V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>34. It is only natural and right for each person to think that his family is better than any other. (I, II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4. A marriage should not be made unless the couple plans to have children. (I, V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>38. A man who doesn't provide well for his family ought to consider himself pretty much a failure as husband and father. (I, III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>14. Faithlessness is the worse fault a husband could have. (I, III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>44. In choosing a husband, a woman will do well to put ambition at the top of her list of desirable qualities. (III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>7. A wife does better to vote the way her husband does, because he probably knows more about such things. (II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>8. It is a reflection on a husband's manhood if his wife works. (III, V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>*43. Women should take an active interest in politics and community problems as well as in their families. (I, III)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. General male-female relationships; concepts of masculinity and femininity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>D.P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>46. A man can scarcely maintain respect for his fiancée if they have sexual relations before they are married. (III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>50. It goes against nature to place women in positions of authority over men. (II, III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>37. It is a woman's job more than a man's to uphold our moral code, especially in sexual matters. (III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>49. The unmarried mother is morally a greater failure than the unmarried father. (III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>26. The most important qualities of a real man are strength of will and determined ambition. (III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>25. Women can be too bright for their own good. (II, III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>10. Women have as much right as men to sow wild oats. (III, V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>16. Petting is something a nice girl wouldn't want to do. (III, V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>13. Women think less clearly than men and are more emotional. (III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1. Almost any woman is better off in the home than in a job or profession. (I, III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>32. It doesn't seem quite right for a man to be a visionary; dreaming should be left to women. (III, V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>19. Even today women live under unfair restrictions that ought to be done away with. (II, III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2. It's a pretty feeble sort of man who can't get ahead in the world. (III)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. General values and aims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>D.P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>55. The family is a sacred institution, divinely ordained. (I, II)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AN ABBREVIATED TRADITIONAL FAMILY IDEOLOGY SCALE (FORM FERPT)

1. Some equality in marriage is a good thing, but by and large the husband ought to have the main say-so in family matters.

2. If children are told much about sex, they are likely to go too far in experimenting with it.

3. Women who want to remove the word obey from the marriage service don't understand what it means to be a wife.

4. The most important qualities of a real man are determination and driving ambition.

5. A child should never be allowed to talk back to his parents, or else he will lose respect for them.

6. A man should not be expected to have respect for a woman if they have sexual relations before they are married.

7. It is somehow unnatural to place women in positions of authority over men.

8. The family is a sacred institution, divinely ordained.

9. A woman whose children are at all messy or rowdy has failed in her duties as a mother.

10. If a child is unusual in any way, his parents should get him to be more like other children.

11. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel a great love, gratitude, and respect for his parents.

12. The facts on crime and sexual immorality show that we will have to crack down harder on young people if we are going to save our moral standards.
### PERSONALITY INTEGRATION SCALE (Duncan 1966)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Reliability/Homogeneity</th>
<th>Validity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This scale measures personality integration as outlined by Jahoda (1958) and Seeman (1959). Personality integration essentially represents a state of optimal adjustment. It gains some objectivity by using peer ratings.</td>
<td>Seven items were written to represent categories (and one subcategory) used by Jahoda to reflect positive mental health. These items reflected 1) ability to express feelings, 2) self-understanding, 3) openness, 4) handling anxiety, 5) sticking with beliefs, 6) forming deep relationships, and 7) overall success. Item 5 did not relate to the other six and was deleted.</td>
<td>Residential College groups, such as fraternities and sororities, have been the groups used.</td>
<td>Split-half reliabilities varied from .78 to .85. Test-retest reliability for an unspecified period was .88 (Duncan, 1966).</td>
<td>Convergent: No correlations with similar scales have been calculated although some of the predictive validity data are relevant in this regard. Discriminant: High scorers did not differ significantly on intelligence-type tests or on a creativity measure from a control group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Predictive: When compared to a control group, people nominated as highly integrated rated themselves higher on the same scales, had generally higher self-esteem, were somewhat more internal, engaged in more activities and had higher grades (Duncan, 1966; Seeman, 1966). They also tended to use more effective and positive terms concerning interpersonal relationships when describing a picture test. (Hearn and Seeman, 1971).

Location

Administration
Administration requires groups of people who know each other, but it should be very easy and take about 15 minutes for the group.

Results and Comments
Positive points: Considerable validity suggests that these ratings could usefully be related to self-esteem.

Negative points: Peer ratings are rather difficult logistically to collect.

Suggestions: The use of peer ratings can be a valuable validation and adjunct to self-report scales of esteem.

If it is possible to obtain the proper subjects it might be more valuable to collect more ratings and relate them to each area of esteem one is interested in using procedures like those of Norman (1963).
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**Items**

Peers nominate three people who best fit each of the following descriptions:

1. Who are the persons who seem best able to express their feelings without hurting the feelings of others?

2. In your opinion who are the three persons in this group who seem to understand themselves best; that is, are aware of their shortcomings and strengths?

3. Who are the ones who seem best able to keep an open mind and not jump to premature conclusions?

4. Who are the three persons who seem the most able to deal effectively with everyday tensions and anxieties?

5. Who are the ones who are most likely to stick by their own values and beliefs, even when these may be somewhat unpopular? This item did not relate to the other items and was deleted.

6. Which three persons seem capable of forming deeper and more profound relationships with others and seem to be genuinely concerned with other people?

7. Which persons seem to you to have been the most successful in all phases of their life: social, personal, educational, etc.?