1979

The Relation Between Environmental Factors and Acting-Out Behaviours of Youth in a Treatment Centre

Denis Andrew Belicki
Wilfrid Laurier University

THE RELATION BETWEEN ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS AND ACTING-OUT BEHAVIOURS OF YOUTH IN A TREATMENT CENTRE

by

Denis Andrew Belicki

A THESIS

Submitted to the Department of Psychology
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree Master of Arts

Wilfrid Laurier University
Waterloo Ontario Canada
December 1979

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my appreciation to the following for their guidance and advice in completing this thesis: to the thesis committee, Dr. Sid Hellyer, Dr. Mary Kay Lane and Dr. Robert St. Claire-Smith. Dr. Jack Santa-Barbara provided additional assistance in the design of the thesis.

I would like to thank the secretarial staff of the Psychology Department, especially Beryl Davids, for their help in this project.

The completion of this thesis would not have been possible without the support and understanding of my wife Kathy.

Abstract

The present study examined the relation between social climate/staff attitude variables and disruptive behaviours within a school, a day-treatment service and three residences located in a centre for emotionally disturbed children. Ten categories of disruptive behaviour were recorded in three settings for ten weeks (five weeks in two settings). Data analysis revealed that the settings differed significantly in acting-out incidence. A series of discriminant analyses indicated that what might be referred to as a "traditional" approach best discriminated the settings. Social climate variables were found to be a major component of the discriminating functions.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Page

Page

INTRODUCTION

Acting-out behaviour and its consequences have been extensively studied. A noteworthy amount of attention has been given to the theoretical aspects of acting-out behaviours. More practically, a number of researchers have indicated the adverse consequences of acting-out behaviours which include: staff injury, resident injury (Clarke, 1975), disruption of harmony within a setting, physical damage to the setting (Martin, 1977), staff feelings of rejection and in the case of running away, sexual or criminal exploitation of the individual (Sinclair, 1975). In addition, a result that potentially may affect the institution itself was noted by Lubeck and Empey (1969):

> ... a continuing failure to find effective substitutes for physical controls might defeat the corrective and integrative function of the mediatory institution-the most compelling function for which it was created. (p. 244)

Although disruptive behaviours are important we presently do not possess an adequate understanding of their aetiology and treatment. We appear deficient in the data base to account for and explain these behaviours. Additionally, running away has received more attention than other disruptive behaviours, yet this behaviour still cannot be predicted. The literature manifests three general approaches to the study of acting-out behaviours: personality,

attitude, environment. Although the first two approaches have received the greatest study they have not been able to successfully explain disruptive behaviours. The potential explanatory value of environmental/contextual research has not yet been fully determined.

Acting-out behaviours have been measured primarily in two ways: one method involved the recording of discrete categories of behaviour while the second involved the collapsing of categories to obtain a global measure of incidence.

A great deal of research has investigated the relation between individual adolescent characteristics and acting-out behaviours. Researchers have concentrated on the pathological characteristics of the child as predictors of acting-out. Studies conducted by Clarke and Martin (1975), Lubeck and Empey (1969) and Saunders, Reppucci and Sarata (1973) are representative examples of this approach.

One interesting consistent result of acting-out research is that it has been observed time and time again that personality variables are not predictive of acting-out, yet research in this unproductive area still continues. This failure to identify personality traits characteristic of delinquents is consistent with a general lack of success, in

the wider field of psychology, to demonstrate clear relationships between measures of personality on the one hand and behaviour on the other (Mischel, 1968). A sample of the range of variables that have been studied is given in Table 1.

Personality variables were found to be significantly related to acting-out in only one study. Lubeck and Empey (1969) found interactions between personality variables and the type of institution. However, personality variables were not independently significant; they were significant only in interaction with the institution. Using four sets of predictors (personality, peer influence, offence, background) Lubeck and Empey demonstrated differences in the relative capacity of these variables to predict disruptive behaviours in two different settings. Lubeck and Empey state that since their samples were randomly assigned to one or the other type of institution, the importance of the organizational impact cannot be ignored. Throughout the study both organizations effected independent changes in structure. The researchers observed that the relation of the four sets of predictor variables changed when structural changes occurred in the organization. This suggests that there may be no

Table 1

Sample Range of Acting-Out Variables Studied

Researcher	Variables Studied	Relationship
Sinclair (1971)	high warmth	more warmth lead to less acting-out
	high authority	more authority lead to less acting-out
	high willingness to talk	more willingness to talk lead to less acting-out
	high agreement	more agreement lead to less acting-out
Martin (1977)	high control	none
	high warmth	more warmth lead to less acting-out
	high strictness	none
	high suppression of problems	more suppression lead to less acting-out
	high staff status	more status lead to less acting-out
	high passivity	none
Davids (1970)	high frustration	more frustration lead to more acting-out
Clarke and Martin (1975)	high task failure	more failure lead to more acting-out
Hollandberg and Sperry (1951)	high physical punishment	more punishment lead to more acting-out
Talbot (1957)	high anxiety	high anxiety lead to more acting-out

uniform sets of personality variables that are predictive of disruptive behaviours within the context of organizational characteristics. One might view the results as suggesting that the continued investigation of situational variables may increase the amount of explained variance in acting-out behaviours.

The second approach, which focussed on attitude variables, has recently received increased attention. Sinclair (1971), using an attitude measure developed by Jesness, investigated the effects of staff attitudes on disruptive behaviours in general. The measure utilized contained 144 items and 13 subscales and was designed to determine staff opinion on a number of issues, some of which are specific and others which are more general. Sinclair envisioned acting-out as primarily determined by the manner in which the supervisor managed the residents. Supervisors who were "kind but strict" in their treatment and interactions with residents experienced the lowest disruptive behaviours indices. "Successful" supervisors were: warm, strict, willing to discuss resident's problems and agreed with their wives' attitudes (who were co-workers in the setting) concerning the centre's

operation. His strongest finding revealed that an attitude of willingness to discuss problems was important in the reduction of acting-out behaviours. Clarke (1971), in a comprehensive survey of the acting-out literature, independently came to the same conclusion and stated that " confiding in staff could prevent running away during the period of high risk that follows admission".

Martin (1977), using an attitude measure recently developed by Cawson, investigated the effects of six attitude variables: traditional control, work, passivity, distance, suppression of problems, staff status, on acting-out behaviours. The 100 item, six subscale measure utilized was designed as an aid to the description of treatment centre regimes. Only three attitudes, staff status, suppression of problems and distance, covaried with acting-out behaviours. Martin found suppression of problems to be related to decreased acting-out while Sinclair found that a willingness to discuss problems was related to decreased acting-out. This apparent disparity has not been resolved.

Other researchers have concentrated on resident behaviour utilizing a broader contextual framework. The following are examples of a broader research approach to the study of acting-out.

Davids (1970) found that as a resident's frustration increased correspondingly so did the possibility of physical aggression. Hollandberg and Sperry (1951) demonstrated a positive relation between physical punishment and aggressive acts. Talbot (1957) demonstrated a positive relation between resident fights and refusal to comply with staff requests. These previous studies have focussed on isolated pieces or aspects of context, whereas a comprehensive gestalt approach may be more meaningful.

Moos' paradigm presents an appropriate model for the contextual approach. He envisions environments as possessing unique "personalities" and that the consensus of people forming an environment constitutes a measure of "social climate". Moos argues that social climate exerts a directional influence on individual's behaviours and he considers staff an important component of the social climate (Moos and Houts, 1968). Moos (1973) and his associates have studied nine types of environments extensively and have developed perceived social climate scales for each of these environments: psychiatric wards, community-oriented psychiatric treatment programs, correctional institutions, military basic training, university student residences, junior and high schools,

social and task groups, work milieus and families.

Other researchers, although not utilizing social climate terminology, have also investigated the utility of a contextual approach. For example, in a classic study Hartshorne and May (1928) demonstrated that children, when given the opportunity, behave delinquently in a situation where they would normally not do so. This research implies that attempts to explain and treat delinquency must pay due regard to the strong influence of the individual's immediate social and physical environment. Pace (1962) indicates that social climate is a valuable measurement of environmental perceptions in colleges and universities. He recommends that the social climate paradigm may be more useful in obtaining a measure of how individuals regard their environment than traditional approaches. Maslow and Mintz (1956) have demonstrated that interpersonal perceptions are highly sensitive to variations in the physical environment. Studies have indicted that substantial differences may occur in the behaviours of the same individuals when they are in different milieus (e.g., Barker and Gump, 1964).

The purpose of the present study, utilizing one social climate measure (Moos) and two attitude measures (Cawson, Jesness) involved an examination

of differences in acting-out incidence, staff attitude and perceived social climate, and staff demographic data across five settings in a residential treatment centre for disruptive children. The discriminating power of the attitude and social climate measures was determined.

More specifically, the study involved a contextual approach to the examination of acting-out behaviours with an attempt to determine the importance of 10 social climate characteristics in conjunction with 19 staff attitudinal variables. The study examined an interaction of contextual variables and attempted to relate newly created conglomerate variables, or functions, to acting-out behaviours within settings.

METHOD

Research Participants

Overall, five settings were involved in the study. Forty-eight students, ranging in age from 5 to 16 years and 13 teachers, with a mean age of 32.6 years, participated from the School. From Day-Treatment 16 out-patients, ranging in age from 6 to 16 years, and 8 staff with a mean age of 21.4 years, were involved. In House A, 10 residents, ranging in age from 9 to 12 years, and 14 staff, with a mean age of 23.0 years, participated. From House B, 8 residents, ranging in age from 9 to 12 years, and 7 staff, with a mean age of 27.4 years, participated. In House C, 11 residents, ranging in age from 9 to 12 years, and 14 staff, with a mean age of 21.1 years, participated. In total, 93 residents and 56 staff were participants in the study.

Research Setting

The research was conducted at the Thistletown Regional Centre for Children and Adolescents, located in Toronto. Thistletown has 13 residences for more than 100 children. There is no locked accomodation within the Centre. The typical presenting problems of the residents are conduct disorders, aggression,

and non-compliance. The children range in age from 3 to 16 and the general length of stay is less than nine months.

Individuals with mental retardation, brain damage, or requiring locked accomodation are excluded from the Centre. Referrals are accepted from physicians, public health nurses, agencies, parents and the Ministry of Correctional Services. The Centre serves the District Municipalities of Muskoka and Metropolitan Toronto, Simcoe County and the Regional Municipalities of Peel, York and Durham.

Individual Research Settings

School: The School at Thistletown is operated by the Ministry of Education. An emphasis is placed on preparing the student to return to a community school. Instruction involves small groups not exceeding six in one classroom. The School has about 60 students, not all of whom were involved in the study.

Residents attending the School interact with a variety of staff although a considerable amount of time is spent with the teaching staff. The treatment philosophy regarding acting-out behaviours is standardized throughout the Centre. Children are not allowed to exhibit aggression toward other students or staff and if this occurs they can be

asked to leave the School and return to their residence. Discretion is used with the younger children who have poor verbal skills.

Day Treatment: There were about 25 children attending Day-Treatment throughout the course of the study although not all of them were involved. This setting treats children aged 6 to 16 with various types of emotional and behavioural problems that were apparent in the home or the community.

The following staff are involved with Day-Treatment children: Child Care Workers, Social Workers, a Psychologist, a Psychiatrist, a Speech Therapist and a Nurse.

Three house settings were involved in the research study. All of the houses involved were similar on the following dimensions: utilization of multi-disciplinary treatment teams, staff training, age and experience, size, design, resident age and physical location. A more detailed description follows.

House A: This setting is a ten bed residential unit for adolescents. The unit emphasizes normalization in that the troubled adolescent's behaviour is tolerated, but the individual is living in a structured environment around which he

is taught to cope with the expectations of staff and fellow residents. The child's strengths are emphasized and new coping patterns are learned.

A multi-disciplinary team monitors the treatment programs for the families and supervises the clinical functioning of the Child Care Workers in each of the house settings. Students from varied mental health disciplines are an adjunct to this team.

House B: This house is an eight bed adolescent unit. It is open on a five day basis because of the importance of the child belonging to and being in contact with his family. The house does provide seven day treatment when required. Prior to admission there is a screening to assess the needs and motivation of the family and to formulate a treatment plan. The child is usually seen by the School diagnostician at this time so that integration into the School is facilitated.

House C: This house is a ten bed seven day treatment unit which deals with young adolescents. These children must either live in a family, or if this is not the case then at the point of admission all possible efforts are made to secure a substitute system with whom the children will be involved during treatment and with whom they will

reside at the termination of treatment.

Entrance into each of the preceding settings was carefully planned. The researcher was present at the institution for several months prior to actually conducting the study. During this time the researcher became familiar with the staff and residents in each of the settings and acquainted himself with the operation of the Centre.

A summary describing the entry into Thistletown and each of the research settings is given in greater detail in Appendix M. This appendix also contains a detailed description outlining how the researcher obtained consent to conduct research in the settings.

Instruments

There were four principal measures: Jesness Staff Attitude Questionnaire (JSAQ), Cawson Staff Attitude Questionnaire (CSAQ), Ward Atmosphere Questionnaire (WAS) and a measure outlining categories of acting-out behaviour.

The JSAQ contains 144 items which are designed to determine staff opinion on a number of issues, some of which are specific to a setting and some of which are more general. The JSAQ was in large part adapted from a scale developed by Earl S. Schaeffer and Richard Q. Bell of the National Institute of

Mental Health. There are 13 scales in the instrument with the items mixed in order of presentation. The individual is asked to respond to each item by marking one point on a six point scale ranging from "Disagree very much" (scored -3) to "Agree very much" (scored +3). No reliability figures are available for the JSAQ. Sinclair (1971) has found it to be a valid measure. The subscales are listed in Table 2 and explained in Appendix A.

Table 2

CSAQ, JSAQ and WAS Subscales and Test-Retest Reliabilities*

CSAQ Subscales	JSAQ Subscales	WAS Subscales**
Traditional Control (.84)	Authority	Involvement (.79)
Work (.74)	Distance	Support (.78)
Passivity (.35)	Control	Spontaneity (.69)
Strictness (.84)	Breaking Will	Autonomy (.76)
Suppression (.83)	Harshness	Practical Orientation (.68)
Status (.64)	Independence	Problem Orientation (.83)
	Aggression	Anger (.71)
	Achievement	Order (.75)
	Affect	Clarity (.76)
	Suppressed Affect	Control (.77)
	Equality	
	Discussion	
	Defensiveness	

*JSAQ reliability figures are not available

**WAS reliabilities are based on one week

The second measure, the CSAQ, contains 100 items. The CSAQ was designed as an aid to the description of treatment centre regimes. On the basis of logical

equivalence of content (supported by measures of internal consistency) and the experience of other researchers, the items were organized into six scales. These are listed, with their test-retest reliability figures, in Table 2 and explained in Appendix C. Respective copies of both attitude questionnaires are given in Appendices B and D. Martin has found the CSAQ to be a valid measure.

The third measure utilized was the WAS, Form R (Moos, 1973). Moos developed two indices for treatment environments-- the WAS and the Community-Oriented Program Environment Scale (COPES). The latter is primarily used in day hospitals and residential workshops. As the residents in the present study were primarily in-patients the WAS was utilized.

The 100 item, 10 subscale questionnaire has been demonstrated to have adequate test-retest reliabilities (all subscales greater than .67) and the subscale internal consistencies are all adequate (greater than .59) Results of studies (e.g., Gripp and Magara, 1971; Leviege, 1969) have indicated that the WAS is sensitive to treatment environment changes as perceived by both

residents and staff.

The final 100 item Real Form WAS was derived from data gathered from 160 different psychiatric programs in North America. Item intercorrelations, item to subscale correlations and subscale intercorrelations have been calculated on each of four random samples drawn from the above data. Items which had low item to subscale correlations and/or extreme item splits were dropped. Items which correlated too highly with each other or which displayed substantial content overlap were eliminated. Table 2 lists the final 10 WAS Form R subscales and test-retest reliabilities. Definitions of each subscale are given in Appendix H. Copies of the questionnaires used in the School, Day Treatment and the houses are respectively given in Appendices E,F and G.

The fourth measure requireda person in each setting to record the incidence of disruptive behaviours. The measure had 10 categories: staff-resident fights, resident-resident fights, fire-setting, verbal arguments, furniture upheaval or damage, defiance, passive-aggression, leaving the classroom or house, entering the classroom or house, and other. The list was developed by requesting staff involved in the study to generate a complete

list of acting-out behaviours that were subsequently rated in terms of severity and frequency. A final item pool consisted of the most serious types of acting-out, as determined by the staff and the researcher, with the highest rate of occurrence. A copy of the measure is given in Appendix I and a detailed explanation of the categories is given in Appendix J.

Procedure

Table 3 summarizes the overall design and procedure. The Settings column indicates where the measures were obtained. The Pre-Measures column indicates what measures were obtained prior to commencing the study. For example, in Day Treatment staff were requested to complete the CSAQ, JSAQ, and WAS before the study. The During Study Measures column indicates what measures were obtained during the ten weeks of the study. For example, the Day Treatment staff were requested to complete the CSAQ, JSAQ and WAS again at the end of the study as well as record disruptive behaviours throughout the study. During the course of the study the researcher acted as a participant-observer. A copy of the research timetable is given in Appendix K.

Table 3

Overall Design and Procedure

Setting	Pre-Study Measures	During Study Measures
School	CSAQ,JSAQ, WAS	CSAQ, JSAQ,WAS (after 10 weeks) Disruptive Behaviour Measure (throughout)
Day Treatment	CSAQ,JSAQ, WAS	CSAQ, JSAQ,WAS (after 10 weeks) Disruptive Behaviour Measure (throughout)
House A	CSAQ,JSAQ, WAS	CSAQ, JSAQ,WAS (after 10 weeks) Disruptive Behaviour Measure (throughout)
House B	CSAQ,JSAQ, WAS	CSAQ, JSAQ,WAS (not readministered due to closing of setting) Disruptive Behaviour Measure (throughout)
House C	CSAQ,JSAQ, WAS	CSAQ, JSAQ,WAS (after 5 weeks) Disruptive Behaviour Measure (throughout)

Data collection began April 2 and continued for the following ten weeks. A more detailed description of the actual data collection is given in Appendix L. Staff were requested to complete the measures during specific times that were arranged in order that they would be convenient for all of the staff and the researcher. Completed questionnaires and daily behaviour checklists were submitted by staff to their liason person in the setting. Generally, the researcher collected the data directly from the liason person, although provision was made to place all completed data in a pick-up area in each setting. Whenever any staff member expressed a query or concern involving one of the measures the researcher contacted the individual promptly. Most staff concerns were raised and dealt with in the first two weeks of the study.

Participant-observer impressions are summarized in Appendix N.

RESULTS

For each setting a weekly mean acting-out score was calculated by summing the number of incidents and dividing the total by the number of children and number of days. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) then determined if the five research settings differed on rates of acting-out behaviours. Means and standard deviations for the ANOVA are given in Table 4.

Table 4

Means* and Standard Deviations for Frequency of Acting-Out Across all Settings

Week of Study		School N=48	Day Treatment N=16	House A N=10	House B N=8	House C N=11
1	$\bar{x}$	1.25	5.60	.90	7.00	
2	$\bar{x}$	.79	1.44	1.20	3.13	
3	$\bar{x}$	.81	2.00	2.30	.75	
4	$\bar{x}$	.67	2.75	1.50	1.00	
5	$\bar{x}$	.29	1.75	.90	.50	
6	$\bar{x}$	.65	1.88	.40		1.80
7	$\bar{x}$	.46	.38	.50		1.27
8	$\bar{x}$	.65	.81	.30		2.18
9	$\bar{x}$	1.15	2.75	1.10		2.72
10	$\bar{x}$	1.08	.44	.30		4.00
Total	$\bar{x}$	.78	1.98	.94	2.48	2.39
	S	.30	1.53	.63	2.74	1.04

*incidence per resident per day

A significant $F(4,35)=2.96$ $p<.05$ was found (Table 5)

Table 5

One-Way ANOVA on the Frequency of Acting-Out Behaviours Across All Settings

Source	SS	df	MS	f
Between	20.03	4	5.01	2.96*
Within	59.31	35	1.69	
Total	79.34	39		

Subsequently, a Neuman-Keuls multiple comparison test failed to detect any specific differences between pairs of settings (Table 6)

Table 6

Neuman-Keuls Comparison of All Pairs of Settings*

	School	House A	Day Treatment	House C	House B
School		0.16	1.24	1.64	1.71
House A			1.08	1.48	1.56
Day Treatment				0.40	0.48
House C					0.08
House B					

*for ranks 2,3,4,5 respective critical values are: 1.41, 1.70, 1.87, 2.00

Total acting-out incidence is given in Appendix S.

Three one-way ANOVAs were conducted to determine if staff across the settings differed in terms of

education, experience and age.

The first ANOVA determined if the staff across the settings were different in terms of post-secondary education. Means and standard deviations are given in Table 7. A summary ANOVA table, with $F(4,41)=30.18$ $p<.01$ is given in Table 8. A Neuman-Keuls multiple comparison of staff education, where the School staff were found to be significantly higher on education than all other settings ($p<.05$) is given in Table 9.

A second ANOVA determined if the staff across the settings were different in terms of years of applied experience. Means and standard deviations are outlined in Table 10. A summary ANOVA table, with $F(4,41)=6.64$ $p<.05$, is given in Table 11. A Neuman-Keuls multiple comparison of years of applied staff experience, where the School staff were found to be significantly more experienced than all other settings ($p<.05$) is given in Table 12.

A third ANOVA determined if the staff across the settings were different in terms of age. Means and standard deviations are given in Table 13. A summary ANOVA table, with $F(4,41)=6.0$ $p<.05$ is given in Table 14. A Neuman-Keuls multiple comparison of staff age, where the School staff were significantly older than staff in all other settings ($p<.05$) is given in Table 15. No other differences were significant.

Table 7

Means and Standard Deviations for Staff Education Across all Settings

	School	Day Treatment	House A	House B	House C
$\bar{x}$	4.9	2.0	2.1	2.0	2.1
S	1.5	.2	.5	.7	.6
N	12	9	9	7	12

Table 8

One-Way ANOVA on Staff Education Across all Settings

Source	SS	df	MS	f
Between	74.07	4	18.52	30.18*
Within	27.00	41	.61	
Total	101.07			

Table 9

Neuman-Keuls Comparison of Staff Education [a]

	Day Treatment House B	House A House C	School
Day Treatment/House B		.1	2.9*
House A/House C			2.8*
School			

[a]for ranks 2,3 respective critical values are: .73; .88.

Table 10

Means and Standard Deviations for Years of Applied Staff Experience Across All Settings

	School	Day Treatment	House A	House B	House C
$\bar{x}$	8.3	2.9	2.0	3.4	1.4
S	5.6	2.5	1.4	4.0	.8
N	12	9	9	7	12

Table 11

One-Way ANOVA on Years of Applied Experience Across All Settings

Source	SS	df	MS	f
Between	343	4	85.75	6.64*
Within	530	41	12.92	
Total	873			

Table 12

Neuman-Keuls Comparison of Years of Experience[a]

	House C	House A	Day Treatment	House B	School
House C		.6	1.5	2.0	6.9*
House A			.9	1.4	6.3*
Day Treatment				.5	5.4*
House B					4.9*
School					

[a] for ranks 2,3,4,5 respective critical values are: 3.35, 4.09, 4.44, 4.73.

Table 13

Means and Standard Deviations for Staff Age Across All Settings

	School	Day Treatment	House A	House B	House C
$\bar{x}$	32.6	24.1	23.0	24.7	21.1
S	8.6	8.2	4.5	7.7	5.9
N	12	9	9	7	12

Table 14

One-Way ANOVA on Staff Age Across All Settings

Source	SS	df	MS	f
Between	517	4	129.25	6.0*
Within	947	41	21.52	
Total	1464			

Table 15

Neuman-Keuls Comparison of Staff Age[a]

	House C	House A	Day Treatment	House B	School
House C		1.9	3.0	3.6	11.4*
House A			1.1	1.7	9.5*
Day Treatment				.6	8.4*
House B					7.8*
School					

[a] for ranks 2,3,4,5 respective critical values are: 4.32, 3.43, 5.73, 6.05

Test-retest reliability, over a period of 10 weeks, was calculated for all 29 variables with staff from all settings combined. Twelve of the 29 variables were found to be reliable (Table 16)

Table 16

Test-Retest Reliability of All Variables

Variable (type)**	Correlation
Spontaneity (SC)	.75*
Suppression of Problems (A)	.66*
Problem Orientation (SC)	.64*
For Control (A)	.63*
Staff Control (SC)	.61*
Independence (A)	.58*
Involvement (SC)	.52*
Strictness (A)	.47*
Status (A)	.44*
Authority (A)	.40*
Harshness (A)	.39*
Suppression of Affect (A)	.39
Equality (A)	.38
Program Clarity (SC)	.37
Autonomy (SC)	.35
Anger (SC)	.30
Work (A)	.30
Traditional Control (A)	.29
Support (SC)	.27
Aggressiveness (A)	-.25
Defensiveness (A)	.24
Order (SC)	.21
Withholding Affection (A)	.21
Practical Orientation (SC)	.20
Distance (A)	.16
Achievement (A)	.15
Discussion (A)	-.10
Breaking Will (A)	-.09
Passivity (A)	-.03

N=26

** SC- social climate
A - attitude

* $p < .05$

Variable reliabilities were also examined within each setting (Appendix R).

Four discriminant function analyses, using the settings as the criterion variable, were conducted. In the initial analysis all settings were examined using the 10 social climate and 19 attitudinal subscales as discriminating variables. Of the four functions only the first was significant ($p<.002$) based upon the chi-squared conversion of Wilks-Lambda. The characteristics of the canonical discriminant functions that were derived are given in Table 17.

Table 17

Characteristics of the Canonical Discriminant Functions for the First Discriminant Analysis

Function	Eigen-value	% of Variance	Cann. Corr.	Wilks-Lambda	Chi-sq.	df	Sig. Level
1	3.75	43.36	.888	.013	163.6	116	.002*
2	2.81	32.52	.859	.064	104.3	84	.065
3	1.35	15.68	.758	.244	53.4	54	.494
4	.73	8.44	.649	.577	20.8	26	.749

Table 18 gives the scores of each research setting on the significant function. A function score is the average score of a setting on

the newly created function (i.e., the mean of all staff scores).

Table 18
Function Scores

Setting	Score
School	3.28419
House C	-0.45480
House B	-0.80328
Day Treatment	-1.10415
House A	-1.56222

Two methods might be applied to determine which variables are important in the first analysis. One method would involve an examination of the canonical discriminant function coefficients for each variable. As some of the variables were correlated this approach would not be appropriate. A second method for determining variable importance involves examining the correlations between the canonical discriminant functions and the discriminating variables (Appendix O). This involves an examination of the correlations between the variables and the four functions. An arbitrary cut-off point of .35 was selected for the variables on the significant function: Staff Control (.40) and Spontaneity (.35)

were correlated with the function at a level equal to or greater than the cut-off point. Both of these variables were positively related to the function and were reliable ($p < .05$). The function was labelled "Maintenance of Order with Encouragement of Expression of Feelings".

When conducting discriminant analyses it is inappropriate to examine the individual means and standard deviations of the variables involved. The discriminant analysis takes into account and adjusts for intercorrelations among the variables (i.e., an examination of means would not involve any correction for multicollinearity and resultingly would be misleading). For purposes of comparison means and standard deviations for all variables are given in Appendices P and Q.

In discriminant analysis the squared value of the canonical correlation indicates the amount of variance in group membership accounted for by the function. In the first analysis 77.4% of the variance was accounted for.

The number of staff which could accurately be predicted as belonging to each of the settings is given in Table 19.

Table 19

Prediction of Staff Membership to Each Setting Based Upon the Results of the First Analysis

Actual Membership		Predicted Membership			
	N	School	Day Treatment	House A	House B	House C
School	13	12			1	
Day Treatment	8		8			
House A	14			14		
House B	7			1	6	
House C	14	1			1	12

N=56

93% of staff were correctly classified

In summary, this first discriminant analysis, which was conducted in a direct manner, allowed a global assessment of all variables and settings. A stepwise approach was not utilized due to limited availability of computer core space. To avoid this problem pairwise comparisons were conducted in a stepwise manner, which corrects for variable intercorrelations that can result in artificially low variable weightings. This second analysis, using all variables, was conducted on two settings, the

School and House B, which were least similar on acting-out incidence (although a Neuman-Keuls indicated that these settings were not significantly different) and also dissimilar on staff age, training and experience. House C was not selected as a comparison as it opened up during the course of the study. The derived function was significant ($p<.001$). The characteristics of the canonical discriminant function that was derived are given in Table 20.

Table 20

Characteristics of the Canonical Discriminant Function for the Second Discriminant Analysis

Function	Eigen-value	% of Variance	Cann. Corr.	Wilks-Lambda	Chi-sq.	df	Sig. Level
1	8.37	100.00	.945	.107	32.4	7	.001*

Canonical discriminant function coefficients, indicating the weighting of each variable associated with the derived function, are listed in order of magnitude in Table 21. Variables are designated as either attitudinal or social climate in terms of origin.

Table 21

Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients for the Second Discriminant Analysis

Variable (type)*	Weighting
Authority (A)	-3.93449
Involvement (SC)	-3.68039
Achievement (A)	3.51253
Order (SC)	2.69807
Aggression (A)	-2.25461
Work (A)	1.57950
Control (A)	1.18595

*A-attitude
SC-social climate

Table 22 gives the scores of the School and House B on the derived function.

Table 22

Setting Scores on the Function

Setting	Function Score
School	2.01399
House B	-3.74027

The function was labelled "Task Orientation". From this table it is apparent that the School scores relatively higher on the function than House B. An examination of the variables composing the function reveals that Authority, an attitude measure, had the highest weighting and was negatively related to the function. The next strongest variable, Involvement, was a social climate measure and was negatively related to the function. The third variable in the function, Achievement, an attitude measure, was positively related to the function. The next strongest variable, Order, a social climate measure, was positively related to the function. Of the remaining three attitude variables Work and Control were positively related to the function, while Aggression was negatively related.

Of the seven variables Authority, Involvement and Control were reliable ($p < .05$).

The function accounted for 88.6% of the variance in group membership. The number of staff which could accurately be predicted as belonging to one of the research settings is given in Table 23.

Table 23

Prediction of Staff Membership to Each Setting Based Upon the Results of the Second Discriminant Analysis

Actual Membership		Predicted Membership	
	N	School	House B
School	13	13	
House B	7		7

N=20

100% of staff were correctly classified

To extract the role of situational variables the two settings, the School and House A, which were least similar in terms of situational variables (in that the School staff were older, had more training and experience) and which were similar in terms of acting-out, were compared. It was found that the derived function was significant ($p<.001$) . The characterisitcs of the canonical discriminant function that was derived are given in Table 24.

Table 24

Characteristics of the Canonical Discriminant Function for the Third Discriminant Analysis

Function	Eigen-value	% of Variance	Cann. Corr.	Wilks-Lambda	Chi-Sq.	df	Sig. Level
1	4.79	100.00	.906	.173	41.3	3	.001*

Canonical discriminant function coefficients, indicating the weighting of each variable associated with the function, are given in Table 25.

Table 25

Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients for the Third Discriminant Analysis

Variable (type)*	Weighting
Order (SC)	-1.32040
Program Clarity (SC)	0.87707
Staff Status (SC)	-0.37844

*SC-social climate

Table 26 gives the scores of the School and House A on the derived function.

Table 26

Setting Scores on the Function

Setting	Function Score
School	-2.18552
House A	2.02941

The function was labelled "Task Dominance". From this table it is apparent that the School

scores relatively low on the function compared to the house. An examination of the variables that form the function reveals that the function was composed of three social climate variables. Order and Staff Status were negatively related to the function while Program Clarity was positively related to the function. Of the three variables Staff Status was reliable ($p < .05$).

The function was found to account for more than 81% of the variance in group membership. The function discriminated on a basis other than acting-out, as the settings were similar on acting-out, suggesting that the effects of situational variables must be further considered.

The number of staff which could accurately be predicted as belonging to the appropriate setting is given in Table 27.

Table 27

Prediction of Staff Membership to Each Setting Based Upon the Results of the Third Discriminant Analysis

Actual Membership	N	Predicted Memebrship School	House A
School	13	12	1
House A	14	1	13

N=27

93% of staff were correctly classified

A fourth discriminant analysis, using all attitude and social climate variables, was conducted on two settings, Houses A and B, which were the least similar of the houses in terms of acting-out incidence, but did not differ significantly on situational variables as the settings were very similar in terms of staff age, training, experience and resident diagnosis. The derived function was significant ($p<.001$). The characteristics of the canonical discriminant function that was derived are given in Table 28.

Table 28

Characteristics of the Canonical Discriminant Function for the Fourth Discriminant Analysis

Function	Eigen-value	% of Variance	Cann. Corr.	Wilks-Lambda	Chi-Sq.	df	Sig. Level
1	1.45	100.00	.769	.408	16.1	2	.001*

Canonical discriminant function coefficients, indicating the weighting of each variable associated with the function, are given in Table 29.

Table 29

Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients for the Fourth Discriminant Analysis

Variable (type)	Weighting
Spontaneity (SC)	-1.83725
Program Clarity (SC)	1.53416

Table 30 gives the scores of House A and House B on the derived function.

Table 30
Setting Scores on the Function

Setting	Function Score
House A	0.81039
House B	-1.62079

The function was labelled "Task Rigidity". From the preceding table it is apparent that House A scores relatively high on the function compared to House B. An examination of the variables that constitute the function reveals that the function was composed of two social climate variables: Spontaneity, which was negatively related to the function and Program Clarity which was positively related to the function. Of the variables involved Spontaneity was reliable ($p<.05$). The function accounted for 57.8% of the variance in group membership.

The number of staff which could accurately be predicted as belonging to one of the settings is given in Table 31.

Table 31

Prediction of Staff Membership in Each Setting Based Upon the Results of the Fourth Discriminant Analysis

Actual Membership	N	Predicted Membership House A	House B
House A	14	14	
House B	7		7

N=21

100% of staff were correctly classified

In summary, the final discriminant analysis, conducted on not significantly different settings, in terms of situational variables, yet least similar of the houses in acting-out incidence, suggests that Spontaneity and Program Clarity are related to acting-out behaviours.

Table 32 briefly summarizes the results of the four discriminant analyses.

Table 32

Summary of All Discriminant Analyses

Analysis	Variables[c]	Function	Significance
All groups	+Staff Control[d] +Spontaneity[d]	Maintenance of Order	.001
School/House B max. ACT[a] dissimilar SV (when all settings are considered)	-Authority[d] -Involvement[d] +Achievement[d] +Order[d] -Aggression +Work +Control	Task Orientation	.001
School/House A min.ACT max. SV[b] (when all settings are considered)	-Order[d] +Program Clarity[d] -Status[d]	Task Dominance	.001
House A/House B max. ACT min. SV (when only the houses are considered)	-Spontaneity[d] +Program Clarity[d]	Task Rigidity	.001

[a] acting-out
[b] situational variables
[c] listed in order of weighting
[d] social climate variables

DISCUSSION

For five treatment settings resident's acting-out rates, staff scores on 19 attitude and 10 social climate measures and staff descriptive measures were examined.

Scores on the acting-out measure were significantly different across the settings, although individual settings could not directly be compared as they were not significantly different from each other.

In differences other than acting-out behaviours it was found that the School scored higher on the dimensions of staff education, applied experience and age than all other settings. None of the other settings differed significantly on these variables. It was also observed that the School, which scored highest on these variables, had the lowest rate of acting-out behaviours, although this was not statistically verified.

One major advantage in the utilization of a global analysis of acting-out behaviours is that it allows a statement to be made concerning broader behavioural dimensions. An analysis based upon discrete types of behaviour may give an erroneous view in that the entire context of behaviour has not been examined.

Several advantages stem from conducting a

discriminant function analysis. This statistical procedure can handle relatively large numbers of variables in combination, select the most important variables and suggest which variables are not contributing to the discriminating function. No information is lost when conducting a discriminant analysis as all of the variables contribute to the derived functions, although some receive higher weightings than others. Additionally, when variables are highly intercorrelated the discriminant analysis adjusts for suppression effects which results in functions that are more easily interpretable than the original variables. In fact, in many cases, interpretation of the original variables would be misleading. Discriminant function analysis derives a function that is actually a unique combination of variables that must be treated as a new variable. These derived functions cannot be clearly related to research that has examined individual variables. The newly created "conglomerate" variable is a more accurate depiction of the setting.

In the discriminant analysis methodology it is crucial to attend to the function, as this is what discriminated the settings, not the individual component variables. The present study utilized an

extraction process, in that four successive discriminant function analyses were conducted to determine what functions maximally discriminated the treatment settings in the institution.

The following logic was applied in the utilization of the four discriminant analyses. The objective of the first analysis was to include all of the available information into the analysis and determine the discriminating power of the variables. One difficulty with the approach utilized was that it did not take the intercorrelations of the variables into account. Limited computer space did not allow a stepwise analysis to be conducted which would have lessened the intercorrelation problem. To circumvent this problem a second analysis was conducted, in a stepwise manner, to adjust for intercorrelations. This pairwise analysis was aimed at determining the differences between the two settings that were the least similar on acting-out incidence (the School and House B) and which were dissimilar in terms of situational variables (staff age, experience and training).

Although differences were found it was possible that situational variables were exerting an effect. To determine the impact of situational variables a third analysis was conducted between the two

settings ,the School and House A , that were least similar in terms of situational variables and most similar in terms of acting-out behaviours. The result was a group of variables which discriminated on a basis other than acting-out, as the settings were similar on acting-out, suggesting that the effects of situational variables must be further considered. A fourth analysis was conducted on two settings, Houses A and B, which were the least similar of the houses in terms of acting-out incidence, but which did not differ significantly on situational variables. The objective of the fourth analysis was to determine on what dimensions the two settings differed when situational variables were held constant.

In the discussion of each analysis definitions are given for each of the significant subscales. When the subscales are defined the original designer's description for each subscale is used. Some of the distinctions between the various subscales are very fine and it is worth noting that although some of the labels of the subscales are similar or identical they may not be equivalent. The discriminant analyses, in their combining of variables into functions, have created new variables that are not directly comparable to the originals.

The first function, derived utilizing all five settings, was labelled "Maintenance of Order with Encouragement of Expression of Feelings", and consisted of two social climate variables. A high score on Staff Control, defined as the extent to which it is necessary for staff to restrict residents, would indicate a staff imposed restriction of residents while a high score on Spontaneity, defined as the extent to which residents are encouraged to act openly, would indicate a staff encouragement of the residents to act in that manner. These variables had the highest weightings of the 29 variables involved in the analysis. Both of these measures were reliable.

In terms of the first analysis it is noteworthy that the two variables that contributed most to the function were social climate variables as these two variables, in conjunction with 27 other variables, accounted for 77% of the variance in group membership.

As Lane (1977) has noted it is time for context in psychological research to be reconsidered. If present studies were to be analyzed it would be apparent that most involve an examination of discrete variables while few (one example being

Lubeck and Empey's 1969 study that investigated the interaction of resident and institution variables) involve a contextual gestalt approach. Lane suggests that it would be more appropriate to conduct psychological inquiry on a broader approach, rather than focussing on isolated individual factors.

The second analysis compared the two settings, School and House B, which were least similar in acting-out (although not significantly) and dissimilar in terms of situational variables.

The derived function was labelled "Task Orientation". The analysis revealed a function with seven variables, three of which (Authority, Involvement, Control) were reliable. All variable scores were examined, as all of the variables contributed to the function, although more weight was placed on the reliable variables.

The function consisted of the following variables in respective order of weighting: Authority, defined as the extent to which a supervisor was dominant and responsible, which was a negatively related attitude variable; Involvement, defined as how active and energetic residents are, which was a negatively related social climate variable; Achievement, defined as rewarding

hard work before play, which was a positively related attitude variable; Order, defined as how important appearance and organization are, which was a positively related social climate variable; Aggression, defined as the belief that the resident should be capable of self-defense, which was a negatively related attitude variable; Work, defined as an emphasis on physical activities, which was a positively related attitude variable and Control, defined as the extent to which staff control is established more than friendship, which was a positively related attitude variable.

It was found that the School, relative to House B, scored higher on the function suggesting that the School emphasizes: low authority, low involvement, high achievement, high order, low aggression, high work and high control.

Sinclair (1971) and Martin (1977) have used the same attitude measure as the present study (Sinclair used the Jesness while Martin used the Cawson) and for this reason these reasearchers will frequently be used as a comparison in terms of findings.

Sinclair (1971), in a single variable type approach (in that functions were not examined) found Authority to be related to reduced acting-out.

Martin (1977) found Strictness to have no relation to acting-out. Martin's approach was also one that could best be described as univariate. In the present study it was found that a Task Orientation function discriminated the two settings that were least similar in terms of acting-out incidence and dissimilar in terms of situational variables. The setting with the least acting-out scored the highest on the function. Although this may appear to support Sinclair's finding the result may have been confounded by the uncontrolled effects of situational variables. In the present study Authority was found to be important, but only as a component of a function, not independently. This finding again stresses the importance of context.

Martin (1977) found no relation between Control and acting-out although in the present study Control was a component of the Task Orientation function. Perhaps an examination of the Control variable in isolation would reveal a relation dissimilar from the one obtained in the present study.

To investigate the possibility that differences obtained were due to the effects of situational variables a third analysis was conducted. To test the hypothesis that social climate and attitude variables may differentiate settings on a basis

other than acting-out the School was compared with House A, where these settings were most similar on acting-out incidence and least similar in terms of situational variables. By removing the variable of acting-out the settings should be non-discriminable unless the research variables are sensitive to situational effects.

The derived function was labelled "Task Dominance". The function contained three variables, one of which, Staff Status, defined as a clear role of adult superiority, was reliable. The function consisted of the following variables in respective order of weighting: Order, defined as how important appearance and organization are, which was a negatively related social climate variable; Program Clarity, defined as the extent to which the resident knows what to expect in the day to day routine, which was a positively related social climate variable and Staff Status, which was a negatively related social climate variable.

It was found that the School , relative to House A, scored lower on the function suggesting that the School emphasizes high order, low program clarity and high staff status compared to House A.

Martin (1977) found staff status to be related to reduced acting-out. The present study found

that this variable was discriminating on what appeared to be a basis other than acting-out, as the settings examined were most similar in terms of acting-out incidence.

This third analysis underlined the necessity of comparing two settings least similar in terms of acting-out incidence and most similar in terms of situational variables, if any relation between the research variables and acting-out incidence was to be established.

Accordingly, a fourth discriminant analysis was conducted on two settings , Houses A and B, that were the least similar of the houses in terms of acting-out incidence and most similar in terms of situational variables.

The derived function was labelled "Task Rigidity". The function consisted of two variables, one of which, Spontaneity, was reliable. In respective order of weighting the function consisted of Spontaneity, defined as the extent to which residents are encouraged to act openly, which was a negatively related social climate variable and Program Clarity, defined as program predictability, which was a positively related social climate variable.

It was found that House A, which had the lowest rate of acting-out of the houses, scored high on the function relative to House B, which had the

highest rate of acting-out of the houses. This indicates that House A, compared to House B, emphasizes low spontaneity and high program clarity.

Hartshorne and May (1928) found that decreased supervision, or a tolerance of spontaneity (one of the variables contained in the Task Rigidity function) lead to increased acting-out. The results of the present study suggest that Task Rigidity is related to reduced acting-out. It is important to note that it is not just the presence of Spontaneity that contributes to reduced acting-out, but the presence of Spontaneity combined with Program Clarity.

Sinclair (1971) found that increased authority (i.e., less spontaneity) contributed to reduced acting-out. This was in combination with warmth, willingness to discuss problems and high staff agreement. It must be pointed out that Sinclair's study involved an examination of individual variables, not functions. The present study found low Spontaneity , in combination with high Program Clarity to be related to reduced acting-out. More accurately, the present study found a new variable, Task Rigidity, to be related to reduced acting-out.

Martin (1977) found no relation between strictness, or lack of spontaneity, and acting-out. It is possible that Spontaneity is related to acting-

out only in combination with other variables.

The results indicate that the Task Rigidity function was able to differentiate two settings that were very similar in terms of situational variables, yet least similar in terms of acting-out behaviours, suggesting a relation between the function Task Rigidity and acting-out behaviours.

It is possible that an examination of all four analyses will reveal a trend or pattern. Table 33 lists the significant functions for each analysis.

Table 33
Significant Functions for All Analyses

Analysis	Function
All groups	Maintenance of Order with Encouragement of Expression of Feelings
School/House B	Task Orientation
School/House A	Task Dominance
House A/House B	Task Rigidity

Clearly the functions, which are newly created variables, suggest a trend in the findings. Throughout all analyses it appeared that discrimination occurred on a basis that might be described as a traditional instructive approach. The overall

theme is one of standard "old school" educational practices.

The present study was able to state those functions that maximally discriminated treatment settings. The study has demonstrated the importance of social climate variables. In terms of a contextual study of acting-out behaviours discriminant function analysis was a useful procedure that derived functions that are more appropriate to the study of a complex behaviour than individual variables. This analytic technique allowed the researcher to deal with a large number of variables, although if a factor analysis was conducted prior to the study this would have lessened the number of variables and made the analyses more specific. One of the major strengths of discriminant analysis is that it allowed the researcher to examine interaction effects of variables within functions, something that could not have been done in a univariate approach.

Any study that involves the collection of a great deal of data must consider staff involvement and cooperation if the data gathered is to be accurate and meaningful. In the present study it was necessary for the researcher to have extensive staff involvement in both the design and operation of the study.

Any approach examining a wide array of variables requires continual monitoring by the researcher. In the present study the researcher visited the treatment centre several times each week and became actively involved in all settings. This gave the researcher greater control in the conducting of the study and resulted in an increased understanding of the institution, its staff and residents.

Although reliability was somewhat of a problem this may have been due to the relatively small sample size or simply due to the variables changing over time.

Data collection itself was important in terms of documenting entry into settings and their description. The actual entry into the settings and the recording of their description required a great deal of the researcher's time. Actual entry into the research setting involved several months of planning and discussion with individuals in the setting. In the absence of documentation describing the settings it is difficult to assess the comparability of settings and variables.

In summary, this research demonstrated that the derived functions had great discriminating power and suggested that broad contextual factors should be examined. Not surprisingly, Moos measure of

social climate was crucial in discriminating the settings. An examination of the sequence of analyses revealed a common core suggestive of a trend. It was found that what could best be described as a traditional approach discriminated the settings.

References

Barker, R., and Gump, P. Big School Small School. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1964.

Cawson, P. and Perry, J. Environmental correlates of attitude among residential staff. British Journal of Criminology, 1977, 17, 141-156.

Clarke, R.V.G. and Martin, D.N. Absconding from approved schools. London: H.M.S.O., 1971.

Clarke, R.V.G. and Martin, D.N. A study of absconding and its implications for the residential treatment of delinquents. In Varieties of Residential Experience. Eds., J. Tizard, I. Sinclair and R.V.G. Clarke. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975.

Davids, A. Personality and attitudes of child care workers, psychotherapists and parents of children in residential treatment. Child Psychiatry and Human Development, 1970, 1, 41-50.

Gripp R. and Magara, P.A. A token economy program evaluation with untreated control ward comparisons. Behavioural Research and Therapy, 1971, 9, 137-139.

Jesness, C.F. The Fricot Ranch Study. California Department of the Youth Authority, 1965.

Lane, M.K. A reconsideration of context. American Psychologist, 1977, 32, 1056-1058.

Leviege, V. Group Relations: Group therapy with the mentally retarded offender, M.A. thesis, Fresno State College, 1969.

Lubeck, L.T. and Empey, S.G. Mediatory versus total institution: the case of the runaway. Social Problems, 1969, 16, 243-259.

Martin, D.N. Disruptive behaviour and staff attitudes at the St. Charles Youth Treatment Centre. Journal of Child Psychiatry and Psychology, 1977, 18, 221-228.

Maslow, A. and Mintz, N. Effects of esthetic surroundings. Journal of Psychology, 1956, 41, 247-254.

Mischel, W. Personality and Assessment. New York: Wiley, 1968.

Moos, R.H. Evaluating Treatment Environments: A Social Ecological Approach. New York: Basic, 1973.

Moos, R.H. and Houts, P. Assessment of social atmospheres of psychiatric wards. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1968, 73, 595-604.

Pace, R. College and University Scales:Technical Manual, second edition, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J. 1962.

Saunders, J.T., Reppucci, N.D. and Sarata, B. An examination of impulsivity as a trait characteristic of delinquent youth. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1973, 43, 788-795.

Sinclair, I.A.C. Hostels for Probationers. London: H.M.S.O., 1971.

Sinclair,I.A.C. and Clarke, R.V.G. Acting-out behaviour and its significance for the residential treatment of delinquents. Journal of Child Psychiatry and Psychology, 1975,14, 283-291.

APPENDIX A

JESNESS ATTITUDE SUBSCALES

1. Authority - A high score shows a preference for a single line of authority, with the supervisor dominant and responsible for keeping the residents in order.

2. Distance - The items suggest a preference for tight limits and avoidance of permissiveness. A high scorer approves in principle of strictness in dealing with children.

3. For Control - The items emphasize a need for control. Establishment of order is given priority over friendship or play.

4. For Breaking the Will - The items give emphasis to the forcing of compliance. A high scoring individual believes that children need to be broken of rebelliousness and that pressure toward conformity is essential for their development.

5. For Harshness - The scale reflects the belief that physical punishment is necessary and/or desirable. Such disciplinary measures as spanking are believed to lead to positive results.

6. For Forcing Independence - A high scorer on this scale believes that young children should be discouraged from dependency on adults, should make their own decisions and solve their own problems.

7. For Aggression - The items reflect an opinion that a resident should be capable of self-defense, and a very high scorer believes that aggression against others is at times healthy and desirable.

8. For Achievement - Here there is reflected the opinion that rewards should be given only for achievement and that hard work is more beneficial than play.

9. Withholding Affection - This scale shows a belief that a resident can be spoiled by too much affection and that a show of warmth should be withheld except for special occasions.

10. Suppression of Affect - These items idealize a stoic toughness and ability to withstand frustration without revealing emotion.

11. For Equality - This scale suggests the democratic orientation that a resident should be treated with respect, on an equal basis with adults, and that his opinions should be taken into account.

12. For Discussion of Problems - This scale emphasizes open discussion and one-to-one counseling by staff.

13. Defensiveness - These items present common situations ordinarily irritating and frustrating to staff. The extent to which a staff member is willing to admit his irritation gives an estimate of his test-taking attitude while completing the opinion survey.

APPENDIX B

JESNESS ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE

Staff Attitude Questionnaire

On the following pages are 143 items designed to determine staff opinion on a number of issues, some of which are specific to this setting and others which are more general. There are, of course, no right or wrong answers to the statements. As a matter of fact, there is considerable disagreement about most of the issues which are raised.

Please make your opinion known on each item, even though there may be a few in which you feel in doubt. It is better to respond to the items quickly and spontaneously rather than to deliberate over the answers for very long.

3 means you strongly agree

2 means you agree on the whole

1 means that you agree a little

-1 means that you disagree a little

-2 means that you disagree on the whole

-3 means that you strongly disagree

All answers will be coded and maintained in strictest confidence. Thank you for your time and assistance.

Denis A. Belicki

Name:_____

Participant Code: (please leave blank)_____

House Number:_____

1. Residents should be allowed to complain about institution rules.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
2. A good staff member should shelter the resident from life's little difficulties.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
3. Some individuals are so bad that they must be taught to fear adults for their own good.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
4. Punishing a resident immediately for getting into mischief is the best way to stop it.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
5. It is much easier to interact and play with residents than it is to maintain good control.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
6. Staff should adjust to residents somewhat, rather than always expecting the residents to adjust to them.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
7. Residents who are trouble makers have most likely been spanked too much.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
8. There are too many things that a resident has to learn in life that there is no excuse for sitting around with time on his hands.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
9. A resident should be taught to avoid fighting except in extreme instances.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
10. A resident will be grateful later on for strict training now.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
11. The idea of permissiveness has no place in the rehabilitation of the kind of residents were have here.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
12. Working alone and without help is often a very satisfying experience for a resident.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
13. A resident who can keep calm on the surface, no matter what happens, will do well in life.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
14. The residents should be taught to enjoy what they have and not expect to get much more.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
15. Individual counselling should have priority over recreational activities.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
16. Residents must often be taught to do certain things by just being left on their own.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3

17. Staff should ask for the resident's opinions and take them into account when something which directly concerns them is being decided.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
18. A staff member should do his best to avoid disappointments for the residents in his care.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
19. It is frequently necessary to drive the mischief out of a child before he will behave.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
20. If children refuse to obey they should be spanked for it.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
21. It is better to trick a resident into something he doesn't want to do rather than insist on his doing it.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
22. Sometimes it is necessary for a worker to stand up in order to get his rights.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
23. Staff must earn the respect of the residents by they way they act.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
24. Physical punishment makes a child fear adults and this is the worst thing that can happen to a child.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
25. Residents who don't try hard for success will feel later on that they missed out on things.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
26. A resident who is messy should clean up by himself.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
27. Residents should be allowed to see supervisory personnel whenever they want.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
28. A resident should be taught to come to the staff rather than to fight when he is in trouble.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
29. There is nothing that upsets a person more than a bunch of noisy kids.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
30. Strict discpline develops a fine, strong character.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
31. It is the staff's duty to see that residents do what they know is best.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
32. Too much affection will make a resident "soft."	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
33. Most of the problems a resident has will go away by themselves if they are left alone.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3

34. A resident should be taught never to depend on others for anything he can do himself.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
35. A resident should never be allowed to curse the staff.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
36. A resident will do better if he learns that showing hurt feelings just makes things worse.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
37. A resident should not be pampered by help from staff with chores.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
38. A resident has a right to his own point of view and should be allowed to express it.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
39. A resident should be protected from jobs which might be too tiring or hard for him.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
40. A wise staff member will teach a resident early just who is boss.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
41. Spanking a resident immediately when he is angry and nagging is better than letting him get into the habit of acting like that.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
42. Residents this age are too immature to profit from talking about their problems.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
43. What children don't know won't hurt them.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
44. A resident who loses a comb or some such article should be taught a lesson by letting him go without it for awhile.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
45. In recreation it is much more important for the residents to enjoy themselves than it is for them to learn skills.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
46. Residents are too often asked to do all the compromising and adjusting.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
47. Spanking a child makes it impossible for him to love and respect his parents.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
48. It is good for a resident to have lots of attention.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
49. There is no good excuse for one resident hitting another.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3

50. There is no excusing someone who upsets the confidence a child has in the staff's way of doing things.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
51. It is no wonder residents reach their boiling point when, as soon as they co-work, they run into problems.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
52. The residents here can learn more and benefit from organization and structure than from free play.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
53. Children who are held to firm rules grow up to be the best adults.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
54. There always must be a boss.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
55. Residents who are taught never to be satisfied with what they have done are the ones who get ahead.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
56. Most of these residents have too much confidence, rather than too little.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
57. It is poor policy to encourage residents to pester you with all their little upsets.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
58. Residents should be trained to be independent by leaving them entirely alone at their own work.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
59. The resident's idea should be seriously considered in making house decisions.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
60. Many residents need some of the natural meanness taken out of them by force.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
61. If you are not careful from the start most of the residents will think they can get away with anything.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
62. Military drill is helpful in teaching self-control.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
63. A wise parent will hesitate before spanking a child to teach him to change ways.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
64. There are some things which just can't be settled by a mild discussion.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
65. As much as is reasonable, a staff member should try to treat a resident as his equal.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
66. Most good staff members would never even consider striking a resident for bad behaviour.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3

67. If the residents know the staff like them and are always for them, they do what they are told without a fuss.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
68. Residents should be encouraged to learn to box.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
69. Being permissive with these residents is like asking for trouble.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
70. It's best for the residents if they never get started wondering whether the staff's views are right or not.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
71. There will be times when any staff member gets to the points where he feels he can't stand his group a moment longer.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
72. Most children should have stricter discipline than they get.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
73. The house in which the structure is clear and the limits tight is best for everyone.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
74. If supervisors have fun with the residents in their care the residents are more apt to take their advice.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
75. "Matter of fact" treatment of residents is better than letting them see how you feel about things.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
76. Staff who allow the residents to get the idea that other people will often help them just encourages them to become failures.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
77. When a resident is in trouble he ought to know he won't be punished for talking about it with house staff.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
78. It is sometimes necessary for a parent to break the child's will.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
79. Residents who are always breaking rules will remember them after a good spanking.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
80. With these residents a wise staff memberwill establish firm control before trying to act friendly.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
81. There is not reason for house staff to have their own way all the time.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
82. Spanking a child should be avoided by all means because it may break the child's spirit.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3

83. The best way to get a resident to behave is to make him feel he is wanted and needed.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
84. It is very bad policy to let a resident begin to have doubts about what the staff have told him.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
85. A staff member may need to blow his top at the residents, once in a while, just to clear the air a bit.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
86. Residents are actually happier under strict training.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
87. The trouble with giving attention to resident's problems is that they usually take advantage of you.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
88. Residents in a house must be taught to jump to an order immediately.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
89. The best attitude for a resident to learn is to take things as they are.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
90. When in doubt about interfering, it is best to tell a resident to fight his own battle.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
91. Group punishment never needs to be used with residents this age.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
92. The residents should be encouraged to express their opinions about anything that involves them.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
93. It is actually easier to run a well-controlled, disciplined house than it is to form close relationships with the residents.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
94. Many children, like horses, must be broken to be trained.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
95. Residents who lie to staff should be punished so they will stop it.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
96. Trying to be completely honest with the residents here is just doing things the hard way.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
97. The biggest problem in a house is maintaining control.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
98. Supervisors should treat the residents with as much consideration and respect as they show to other staff.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
99. Only a cruel person would use physical punishment on a boy.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3

100. Group pressure should never be used for control, even though a boy is way out of line.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
101. One of the main goals of treatment in an institution like this is to teach residents to respect authority	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
102. Most of the residents could benefit from much more sympathy than they are given.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
103. A person who thinks he can maintain control of a group without strict limits will soon learn differently.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
104. House staff who are easy with the residents will never be respected by them.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
105. Residents should be taught to hit back if someone their size hits them.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
106. A resident should never question the orders of house staff.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
107. Strict discipline is essential for the training of children.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
108. House staff who give their residents a lot of affection without being careful about it may find that the residents don't mature as they should.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
109. Staff members who start a resident talking about his worries don't realize it is usually better to leave well enough alone.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
110. You should never let a resident get the idea that what he is doing is good enough, because then he won't try harder.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
111. Houses that have problems in control are usually those in which the residents don't know their place.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
112. A person can be very helpful to a resident by teaching him how to keep from showing it when he is boiling inside.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
113. A resident who grows up with the idea that he will have to do almost everything for himself gets much farther in life.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3

114. House life is better if the supervisor makes the residents feel they are free to say whenever they are thinking about anything.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
115. Staff should try to prevent most of the difficulties which make a resident unhappy.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
116. If a resident isn't really trying he shouldn't be rewarded.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
117. A good spanking now and then never hurt any child.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
118. A boy deserves to be punished when he talks back to his parents.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
119. A resident who offends a staff member should never be allowed to get away with it.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
120. It actually seems that a knowledge of psychological theory is of very little help in dealing with groups of residents.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
121. If you are not firm with a group of residents they will almost always tend to get out of control.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
122. A resident who never learns to fight will never really mature.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
123. It seems rather silly to give a home leave to a resident who has not worked hard for it.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
124. Residents like the ones here are too often treated with kid gloves in ways that do not do them any good.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
125. A good child doesn't fight with other children.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
126. Parents should respect the wishes of children just as much as they expect children to respect their wishes.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
127. A resident's trust in the supervisor should be safeguarded better by not having so many people with different ideas talking to him.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
128. Residents should be allowed to disagree with staff if they feel their own ideas are better.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
129. Firm enforcement of rules never really hurts a child.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3

130. The ideal house is one in which it is clear to all that the supervisor is in charge and not the residents.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
131. Staff should be playful rather than dignified with the residents.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
132. Tender treatment of residents should be kept within limits, if the residents are to develop properly.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
133. It would be a mistake to allow a resident to disagree with a staff member in the presence of other residents.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
134. To keep from getting into trouble a resident should have a healthy fear of adults.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
135. A good spanking is often the only way to convince children that you mean it when you tell them something.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
136. Residents have a right to an explanation when staff ask them to do somethings.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
137. It is better for a resident to be a little too ready to fight than to be unwilling.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
138. It is natural for a staff member to blow his top when the residents are demanding and selfish.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
139. Staff members who enjoy playing games with their residents usually have more trouble with them.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
140. If you let the residents talk about their troubles, they end up complaining even more.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
141. In dealing with these residents, it is best to leave theory alone and face the many problems with common sense.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
142. It is best to reserve the use of praise for those times when a resident really tries his best.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
143. A staff member who wants to maintain discipline will have a much easier time if he avoids playing with the boys.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3

Comments?

Thank you.

APPENDIX C

CAWSON ATTITUDE SUBSCALES

1. Traditional Control - High scorers place an emphasis on maintaining a high level of control by traditional methods such as restrictions on freedom and contact with relatives, constant supervision and similar "penal" techniques.

2. Work - High scorers accept the traditional philosophy that being made to work hard will save the residents from future delinquency.

3. Passivity - High scorers wish to avoid when possible open confrontations or emotional outbursts, resulting in an overprotective, "laissez-faire" approach to residents.

4. Strictness-High scorers perceive the residents as a hostile, abnormal group whose approaches to the staff should be regarded with suspicion.

5. Suppression of Problems - High scorers prefer to avoid a counseling relationship and do not encourage discussion of resident's problems.

6. Staff Status - High scorers believe that staff should maintain a front of adult superiority, rather than a relationship of equality with the residents.

APPENDIX D

CAWSON ATTITUDE MEASURE

Here are 100 statements about adolescent residents and the ways in which they can be helped. They cover many different points of view and there are no right or wrong answers. We would like you to indicate how far you agree or disagree with the statements by circling the appropriate number.

3 means you strongly agree
2 means you agree on the whole
1 means that you agree a little
-1 means that you disagree a little
-2 means that you disagree on the whole
-3 means that you strongly disagree

Please answer all questions even if some appear somewhat unrelated to your present duties. All answers will be coded and maintained in strictest confidence. Thank you very much for your participation and cooperation.

Denis A. Belicki

Name: _____

Participant Code: (Please leave blank) _____

House Number: _____

1. One of the things residents need is a chance to express their feelings without being punished.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
2. A resident who is insolent to the staff should not be allowed to get away with it.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
3. It is unfair to add to a resident's emotional burdens by involving him with staff.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
4. We can try but it is difficult to understand the peculiar behaviour of delinquents.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
5. Children's institutions should be organized to that the children feel as much as possible as if they were living at home.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
6. The residents here are too immature to be allowed much say in how the school is run.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
7. Giving the residents good work standards is an important way of helping them to come to terms with society.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
8. Delinquents should never be treated in the same institutions as non-delinquents.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
9. One of the main advantages of sending an adolescent to a treatment centre is that he can forget about troubles at home.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
10. It is important to give the residents encouragement to put what they learn here into practice when they leave.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
11. Residents who are allowed to get away with misbehaviour will never learn to get along with bosses or foremen at work.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
12. One of the aims of a setting like this is to keep the emotional temper down.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
13. Delinquents are ruled by their emotions, ordinary people by their reason.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
14. If a resident does not like some of his assignments he should usually be allowed to change them.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3

15. Resident's complaints about the rules usually have something in them.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
16. It is best not to tell a resident anything in his background which might upset him.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
17. Residents returning from leave should be searched for forbidden items.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
18. When a resident has a problem or worry it is best for him not to think about it but to keep him busy with more pleasant things.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
19. There is something about delinquents which makes it easy to tell them from ordinary boys.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
20. The staff should be as friendly with the residents as they are with one another.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
21. Most of the residents here have quite unrealistic ideas about how the school should be run.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
22. A resident's sense of achievement from a piece of work well done is one of the things which will help him most to settle down.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
23. If residents are allowed to keep transistor radios and similar items in school it is more trouble than it's worth.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
24. When residents are worried about their family it is best to try to keep their minds off it.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
25. Once the residents start to see other people's problems they start to see their own.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
26. Staff should maintain order at all times, otherwise the residents would tend to get out of control.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
27. Staff who get very involved with the residents tend to be those with personal problems.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
28. Residents who cause the least trouble are the ones most likely to get on well after discharge.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
29. Residents here will make a mess of most things they organize.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3

30. One of the valuable contributions an institution can make is to give the residents standards of self-discipline and responsibility in their work.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
31. It is best to prevent the more delinquent boys from sharing rooms with the less delinquent.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
32. Staff should think twice before promting a resident to talk about his problems and anxieties, as it may stir up emotions the resident can't deal with.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
33. One of the most helpful things in treatment is for a resident to realize that he is not the only one with problems.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
34. Running away should be accepted as a means of coping with serious tension.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
35. Most residents here cannot be friends among themselves, let alone with adults.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
36. Although some residents seem just like other boys, it is dangerous to forget for a moment that they are delinquent.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
37. Within limits boys should be allowed to grow.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
38. Staff should be more honest with the residents and not hide so much behind a mask.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
39. Residents often improve when they make a good relationship with one or two members of staff.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
40. It is a mistake to try to suppress misbehaviour in the house or school, since it will only appear later.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
41. Home leave should never be stopped as punishment.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
42. There are many occasions on which it is wise to turn a blind eye to breaches of the rules.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
43. A resident should be protected from jobs which might be too hard or tiring for him.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3

44. In an institution it is not possible to give the residents any say in things like meal times and bed times.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
45. The formal education and training we give residents is less important for treatment than the experience of living with other people.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
46. If staff see residents fighting they should stop it immediately.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
47. Most residents here can't make decisions, even on everyday things.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
48. It's no good having rules if you don't apply them strictly.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
49. If a resident loses his temper with staff, it's always best to leave him to cool down, rather than make an issue of it.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
50. Staff who insist on an outward show of respect from residents are often more concerned with their own position than the resident's needs.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
51. Whatever may be appropriate in primary schools, with residents of this age schools should concentrate on work, not on play centre methods.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
52. If the residents are left to their own devices in their recreation time they are likely to get into mischief.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
53. Residents will be helped most by people they can see as individuals rather than as professional workers.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
54. The aim of a centre such as this is to encourage the residents to accept responsibility for their actions.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
55. With immature residents like these it is important not to make demands or put pressure on them.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
56. One of the main aims of an institution like this is to teach the residents respect for authority.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
57. If the residents can be taught that authority is important, then they are improving.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
58. Most of the residents here need fairly close supervision to keep them from getting into trouble.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3

59. Residents who are allowed to use staff Christian names or nicknames will usually have little respect for them.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
60. Delinquency is a consequence of emotional deprivation rather than innate badness.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
61. It is silly to welcome misbehaviour as a means of learning about a resident's needs.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
62. The trouble with giving too much attention to the residents is that they usually want to take advantage of you.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
63. It helps to realize that staff aren't perfect and can also have difficulties.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
64. Home leaves, as a rule, should only be given to residents showing a genuine effort to improve their behaviour.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
65. Staff should not normally refer to each other by their Christian names in front of the residents.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
66. Most of these residents have lost the ability to make warm relationships.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
67. If a resident is disrupting a whole group by disturbed behaviour he should be stopped for the sake of the others.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
68. With residents who are disobedient or aggressive to staff it is best to leave them to themselves until they come around.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
69. It is a mistake to expect delinquents to behave as if they were normal.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
70. If residents don't want to work, it is better to let them relax rather than put pressure on them.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
71. It is unrealistic to expect the kind of residents we have to take responsibility for running school activities.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
72. The real purpose of workshops and classrooms in an institution should be to help residents to understand themselves rather than teach them trades or school subjects.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3

73. Practical experience is more important for staff than theoretical knowledge.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
74. Modern practice in institutions is tending to become too permissive.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
75. Although these residents seem friendly it is usually only skin deep.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
76. The difference between delinquents and ordinary boys have been exaggerated.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
77. Residents should be kept away from jobs which might be discouraging.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
78. A rule that the residents don't think is sensible should usually be reconsidered.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
79. Residents should not be allowed out without supervision until they have really proved themselves.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
80. If a resident is encouraged to keep on talking about his worries it will only reinforce his anxiety.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
81. Staff being too friendly with residents makes for poor discipline.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
82. More delinquency is due to brain damage than is commonly thought.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
83. It is better to try and trick a resident into doing something than to make an issue out of it.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
84. Most of the residents we have here lack the ability to occupy themselves sensibly in their free time.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
85. It's usually advisable to humour a disturbed child rather than challenge him.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
86. Residents should receive an allowance only as a reward for good work or behaviour.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
87. If a resident seems to want to keep his troubles to himself, it's best to leave him alone, and not try to get him talking.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
88. One of the most important things is for residents to learn how other people feel.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3

89. Misbehaviour should be welcomed as a necessary part of the treatment process.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
90. If a resident is friendly to the staff he is probably trying to get his own way about something.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
91. As far as possible residents should be placed in a group where most others are like them in age and temperament.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
92. The residents need to learn that adults often know what is good for them.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
93. Learning good work habits is one of the main benefits residents receive from their training.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
94. Some of these residents need to be made to fear adults for their own good.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
95. It is risky for inexperienced members of staff to delve too deeply into a boy's problems.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
96. Resident's relationships in school are often similar to relationships in the house.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
97. Residents should be shown that running away is an unacceptable behaviour.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
98. Many residents are here for such a short time that it is dangerous for them to get emotionally involved with staff.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
99. With few exceptions, delinquents lack the ability to tell right from wrong.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3
100. A disturbed resident should not be required to conform to the standards of behaviour which we would expect of more stable individuals.	3	2	1	-1	-2	-3

Any additional comments?

APPENDIX E

SCHOOL SOCIAL CLIMATE SCALE

SCHOOL SOCIAL CLIMATE SCALE

INSTRUCTIONS

There are 100 short statements in this booklet. They are statements about residential houses and schools. Please decide which statements are true of your work setting and which are not. If a statement applies to a work setting other than your own, please answer the statement from your point of view.

On the attached sheets, mark T (True) when you think the statement is true or mostly true of your house; mark F (False) when you think the statement is false or mostly false. Please be sure to answer every statement and to fill in your name and the other information requested. All answers will be maintained in strictest confidence.

Thank you.

Denis Belicki.

NAME:_____

DATE:_____

PARTICIPANT CODE: (please leave blank)_____

	True	False
1. Students put a lot of energy into what they do around here.	T	F
2. Teachers have very little time to encourage residents.	T	F
3. Students tend to hide their feelings from one another.	T	F
4. The teachers respond to student suggestions.	T	F
5. New teaching approaches are often tried in this school.	T	F
6. Students hardly ever discuss their personal lives.	T	F
7. Students often gripe.	T	F
8. Student's activities are carefully planned.	T	F
9. The residents know when certain teachers will be in the classroom.	T	F
10. Teachers very rarely punish students by restricting them.	T	F
11. This is a lively school.	T	F
12. Teachers know what the students want.	T	F
13. Students say anything they want to the teachers.	T	F
14. Very few students are given responsibility in the school.	T	F
15. There is very little emphasis on making residents do more practical things.	T	F
16. Students tell each other about their personal problems.	T	F
17. Students often criticize or joke about the teachers.	T	F
18. This is a very well organized school.	T	F
19. Teachers don't explain what treatment is about to students.	T	F
20. Students may interrupt a teacher when he is talking.	T	F
21. The students are proud of this school.	T	F
22. Teachers are interested in following up discharged students.	T	F
23. It is hard to tell how students are feeling in this school.	T	F
24. Students are expected to take leadership in the school.	T	F
25. Students are encouraged to plan for the future.	T	F
26. Personal problems are openly talked about by the students.	T	F
27. Students in the school rarely argue.	T	F
28. The teachers make sure that the school is always neat.	T	F
29. If a student's instruction is changed, his teacher always tells him why.	T	F
30. Students who break the school rules are punished for it.	T	F
31. There is very little group spirit in the school.	T	F
32. Teachers are too busy to encourage students.	T	F
33. Students are careful about what they say when teachers are around.	T	F
34. Students are encouraged to be independent.	T	F

	True	False
35. There is very little emphasis on what students will be doing after they are discharged.	T	F
36. Students are expected to share their personal problems with each other.	T	F
37. Teachers sometimes argue with each other.	T	F
38. The school sometimes gets very messy.	T	F
39. School rules are clearly understood by the students.	T	F
40. If a student argues with another student, he will get into trouble with the teacher.	T	F
41. Nobody ever volunteers around here.	T	F
42. Teachers spend more time with some students than others.	T	F
43. Students set up their own activities without being prodded by the teachers.	T	F
44. Students can leave the school whenever they want to.	T	F
45. There is very little emphasis on making discharge plans for students.	T	F
46. Students talk very little about their pasts.	T	F
47. Students sometimes play practical jokes on each other.	T	F
48. Most students follow a regular schedule each day.	T	F
49. Students never know when a teacher will ask to see them.	T	F
50. Teachers don't order the students around.	T	F
51. Students are pretty busy all of the time.	T	F
52. The better-adjusted students in this school help the others.	T	F
53. When students disagree with each other they keep it to themselves.	T	F
54. Students can wear what they want.	T	F
55. This school emphasizes training for new kinds of jobs.	T	F
56. Students are rarely asked personal questions by the teachers.	T	F
57. It's hard to get people to argue around here.	T	F
58. Many students look messy.	T	F
59. In this school everyone knows who is in charge.	T	F
60. Once a schedule is arranged for a student, the student must follow it.	T	F
61. The school has very few social activities.	T	F
62. Students rarely help each other.	T	F
63. It's okay to act silly around here.	T	F
64. There is no student government in this school.	T	F
65. Most students are more concerned with the past than the future.	T	F

	True	False
66. Teachers are mainly interested in learning about student's feelings.	T	F
67. Teachers never start arguments in group meetings.	T	F
68. Things are sometimes very disorganized around here.	T	F
69. If a student breaks a rule, he knows what will happen to him.	T	F
70. Students can call teachers by their first name.	T	F
71. Very few things around here ever get people excited.	T	F
72. The teachers help new students get acquainted in the school.	T	F
73. Students tend to hide their feelings from the teachers.	T	F
74. Students can leave the classroom without saying where they are going.	T	F
75. Students are encouraged to learn new ways of doing things.	T	F
76. The students rarely talk about their personal problems with other students.	T	F
77. In this school teachers think it is a healthy thing to argue.	T	F
78. The teachers set an example for neatness and orderliness.	T	F
79. People are always changing their minds here.	T	F
80. Students will be asked to leave the school if they don't obey the rules.	T	F
81. Discussions are pretty interesting in this school.	T	F
82. Teachers sometimes don't show up for their appointments.	T	F
83. Students are encouraged to show their feelings.	T	F
84. Teachers rarely give in to student pressure.	T	F
85. Teachers care more about how students feel than about their practical problems.	T	F
86. Teachers strongly encourage students to talk about their pasts.	T	F
87. Students here rarely become angry.	T	F
88. Students are rarely kept waiting when they have appointments with teachers.	T	F
89. Students never know when they will be transferred from this classroom.	T	F
90. It's not safe for students to discuss their personal problems around here.	T	F
91. Students often do things together on the weekends.	T	F
92. Teachers go out of their way to help students.	T	F
93. The school always stays just about the same.	T	F
94. The teachers discourage criticism.	T	F
95. Students must make discharge plans.	T	F

	True	False
96. It's hard to get a group together for card games or other activities.	T	F
97. A lot of students just seem to be passing time in school.	T	F
98. The school is often messy.	T	F
99. Teachers tell students when they are getting better.	T	F
100. It's a good idea to allow people to know that they are in charge.	T	F

Some of these questions may have been hard to answer. Would you like to make some comments about any of the questions? Are there any issues that you feel these questions do not adequately address?

APPENDIX F

DAY-TREATMENT SOCIAL CLIMATE SCALE

SCHOOL AGE DAY-TREATMENT STAFF

SOCIAL CLIMATE SCALE

INSTRUCTIONS

There are 100 statements in this booklet. They are statements about residential centres for children. Please decide which statements are true of your work setting and which are not. If a statement applies to a work setting other than your own, please answer the statement from your point of view.

On the attached sheets, mark T (True) when you think the statement is true or mostly true of your work setting; mark F (False) when you think the statement is false or mostly false. Please be sure to answer every statement and to fill in your name and the other information requested. All answers will be maintained in strictest confidence.

Thank you.

Denis Belicki.

NAME: _____

DATE: _____

PARTICIPANT CODE: (Please leave blank) _____

		True	False
1.	Children put a lot of energy into what they do around here.	____	____
2.	Staff have very little time to encourage the children.	____	____
3.	Children try to hide their feelings from one another.	____	____
4.	The staff respond to children's suggestions.	____	____
5.	New staff approaches towards children are often tried in Day Treatment.	____	____
6.	Children hardly ever discuss their personal lives.	____	____
7.	Children often complain.	____	____
8.	Children's activities are carefully planned.	____	____
9.	The children know when certain staff members will be present.	____	____
10.	The staff very rarely punish children by restricting them.	____	____
11.	Day-Treatment is a lively setting.	____	____
12.	Staff know what the children want.	____	____
13.	Children say anything they want to the staff.	____	____
14.	Very few children at day-treatment are given responsibility.	____	____
15.	There is very little emphasis on making children do more practical things.	____	____
16.	Children tell each other about their personal problems.	____	____
17.	Children often criticize or joke about the day-treatment staff.	____	____
18.	Day-treatment is very well organized.	____	____
19.	Staff do not explain what treatment is about to the children.	____	____
20.	Children may interrupt a staff member when he is talking.	____	____
21.	The children are proud of day-treatment.	____	____
22.	Staff are interested in following up successfully discharged children.	____	____
23.	It is hard to tell how children are feeling in day-treatment.	____	____
24.	Children are expected to take leadership in day-treatment.	____	____
25.	Children are encouraged to plan for the future.	____	____

		True	False
26.	Personal problems are openly talked about by the children.	____	____
27.	Children in day-treatment rarely agree.	____	____
28.	The staff make sure that day-treatment is always neat.	____	____
29.	If a child's program is changed he is always told why.	____	____
30.	Children who break day-treatment rules are punished for it.	____	____
31.	There is very little group spirit in day-treatment.	____	____
32.	Staff are too busy to encourage children.	____	____
33.	Children are careful about what they say when staff are around.	____	____
34.	Children are encouraged to be independent.	____	____
35.	There is very little emphasis on what children will be doing after they are completely discharged.	____	____
36.	Children are expected to share their personal problems with each other.	____	____
37.	Staff sometimes argue with each other.	____	____
38.	Day-treatment sometimes gets very messy.	____	____
39.	Day-treatment rules are clearly understood by the children.	____	____
40.	If a child argues with another child, he will get into trouble with the staff.	____	____
41.	Nobody ever volunteers around here.	____	____
42.	Staff spend more time with some children than others.	____	____
43.	Children set up their own activities without being prodded by the staff.	____	____
44.	Children can leave day-treatment whenever they want to.	____	____
45.	There is very little emphasis on making future plans for children.	____	____
46.	Children talk very little about their pasts.	____	____
47.	Children sometimes play practical jokes on each other.	____	____
48.	Most children follow a regular schedule each day.	____	____
49.	Children never know when a staff member will ask to see them.	____	____

		True	False
50.	Staff don't order the children around.	____	____
51.	Children are pretty busy all of the time.	____	____
52.	The better-adjusted children in day-treatment help take care of the other children.	____	____
53.	When children disagree with each other, they keep it to themselves.	____	____
54.	Children can wear what they want.	____	____
55.	Day-treatment emphasizes skills training.	____	____
56.	Children are rarely asked personal questions by the staff.	____	____
57.	It's hard to get people to argue around here.	____	____
58.	Many children look messy.	____	____
59.	In day-treatment everyone knows who is in charge.	____	____
60.	Once a schedule is arranged for a child, the child must follow it.	____	____
61.	Day treatment has very few social acitivities.	____	____
62.	Children rarely help each other.	____	____
63.	It's O.K. to act silly around here.	____	____
64.	Children's opinions about the operation of day-treatment are not very important.	____	____
65.	Most children are more concerned with the past than the future.	____	____
66.	Staff are mainly interested in learning about children's feelings.	____	____
67.	Staff never start arguments in group meetings.	____	____
68.	Things are sometimes very disorganized around here.	____	____
69.	If a child breaks a rule he know what will happen to him.	____	____
70.	Children can call staff by their first name.	____	____
71.	Very few things around here ever get people excited.	____	____

	True	False
72. The staff help new day-treatment children get acquainted.	____	____
73. Children tend to hide their feelings from the staff.	____	____
74. Children can leave day-treatment without saying where they are going.	____	____
75. Children are encouraged to learn new ways of doing things.	____	____
76. The children rarely talk about their personal problems with other children.	____	____
77. Day-treatment staff think it is a healthy thing to argue.	____	____
78. The staff set an example for neatness and orderliness.	____	____
79. People are always changing their minds here.	____	____
80. Children will be transferred from day-treatment if they don't obey the rules.	____	____
81. Discussions are pretty interesting in day-treatment.	____	____
82. Staff sometimes don't show up for their appointments.	____	____
83. Children are encouraged to show their feelings.	____	____
84. Staff rarely give in to children's pressure.	____	____
85. Staff care more about how residents feel than about their practical problems.	____	____
86. Staff strongly encourage children to talk about their pasts.	____	____
87. Children here rarely become angry.	____	____
88. Children are rarely kept waiting when they have appointments with the staff.	____	____
89. Children never know when they will be transferred out of day-treatment.	____	____
90. It's not safe for children to discuss their personal problems around here.	____	____
91. Children often do things together on the weekends.	____	____
92. Staff go out of their way to help children.	____	____
93. Day-treatment always stays just about the same.	____	____

		True	False
94.	The staff discourage criticism.	____	____
95.	Children must make plans for the future.	____	____
96.	It's hard to get a group together for card games or other activities.	____	____
97.	A lot of children just seem to be passing time in day-treatment.	____	____
98.	The day-treatment centre is often messy.	____	____
99.	Staff tell children when they are getting better.	____	____
100.	It is a good idea to allow people to know that they are in charge.	____	____

Some of the questions may have been hard to answer. Would you like to make some comments about any of the questions? Are there any issues that you feel these questions do not adequately address?

Thank you.

APPENDIX G

HOUSE SOCIAL CLIMATE SCALE

HOUSE SOCIAL CLIMATE SCALE

INSTRUCTIONS

There are 100 short statements in this booklet. They are statements about residential houses. Please decide which statements are true of your house and which are not. If a statement applies to a work setting other than your own, please answer the statement from your point of view.

On the attached sheets, mark T (True) when you think the statement is true or mostly true of your house; mark F (False) when you think the statement is false or mostly false. Please be sure to answer every statement and to fill in your name and the other information requested. All answers will be maintained in strictest confidence.

Thank you.

Denis A. Belicki.

NAME:_____

DATE:_____

PARTICIPANT CODE: (please leave blank)_____

	True	False
1. Residents put a lot of energy into what they do around here.	T	F
2. Staff have very little time to encourage residents.	T	F
3. Residents try to hide their feelings from one another.	T	F
4. The staff respond to resident suggestions.	T	F
5. New staff approaches towards residents are often tried in this house.	T	F
6. Residents hardly ever discuss their personal lives.	T	F
7. Residents often complain.	T	F
8. Residents' activities are carefully planned.	T	F
9. The residents know when certain staff members will be in the house.	T	F
10. The staff very rarely punish residents by restricting them.	T	F
11. This is a lively house.	T	F
12. Staff know what the residents want.	T	F
13. Residents say anything they want to the staff.	T	F
14. Very few residents are given responsibility in the house.	T	F
15. There is very little emphasis on making residents do more practical things.	T	F
16. Residents tell each other about their personal problems.	T	F
17. Residents often criticize or joke about the house staff.	T	F
18. This is a very well organized house.	T	F
19. Staff do not explain what treatment is about to residents.	T	F
20. Residents may interrupt a staff member when he is talking.	T	F
21. The residents are proud of this house.	T	F
22. Staff are interested in following up discharged residents.	T	F
23. It is hard to tell how residents are feeling in this house.	T	F
24. Residents are expected to take leadership in this house.	T	F
25. Residents are encouraged to plan for the future.	T	F
26. Personal problems are openly talked about by the residents.	T	F
27. Residents in this house rarely agree.	T	F
28. The staff make sure that the house is always neat.	T	F
29. If a resident's program is changed he is always told why.	T	F
30. Residents who break the house rules are punished for it.	T	F
31. There is very little group spirit in this house.	T	F
32. Staff are too busy to encourage residents.	T	F

	True	False
33. Residents are careful about what they say when staff are around.	T	F
34. Residents are encouraged to be independent.	T	F
35. There is very little emphasis on what residents will be doing after they are discharged.	T	F
36. Residents are expected to share their personal problems with each other.	T	F
37. Staff sometimes argue with each other.	T	F
38. The house sometimes gets very messy.	T	F
39. House rules are clearly understood by the residents.	T	F
40. If a resident argues with another resident, he will get into trouble with the staff.	T	F
41. Nobody ever volunteers around here.	T	F
42. Staff spend more time with some residents than others.	T	F
43. Residents set up their own activities without being prodded by the staff.	T	F
44. Residents can leave the house whenever they want to.	T	F
45. There is very little emphasis on making discharge plans for residents.	T	F
46. Residents talk very little about their pasts.	T	F
47. Residents sometimes play practical jokes on each other.	T	F
48. Most residents follow a regular schedule each day.	T	F
49. Residents never know when a staff member will ask to see them.	T	F
50. Staff don't order the residents around.	T	F
51. Residents are pretty busy all of the time.	T	F
52. The better-adjusted residents in this house help take care of the other residents.	T	F
53. When residents disagree with each other, they keep it to themselves.	T	F
54. Residents can wear what they want.	T	F
55. This house emphasizes training for new kinds of jobs.	T	F
56. Residents are rarely asked personal questions by the staff.	T	F
57. It's hard to get people to argue around here.	T	F
58. Many residents look messy.	T	F
59. In this house everyone knows who's in charge.	T	F
60. Once a schedule is arranged for a resident the resident must follow it.	T	F
61. The house has very few social activities.	T	F

	True	False
62. Residents rarely help each other.	T	F
63. It's okay to act silly around here.	T	F
64. There is no resident government in this house.	T	F
65. Most residents are more concerned with the past than the future.	T	F
66. Staff are mainly interested in learning about residents' feelings.	T	F
67. Staff never start arguments in group meetings.	T	F
68. Things are sometimes very disorganized around here.	T	F
69. If a resident breaks a rule he knows what will happen to him.	T	F
70. Residents can call staff by their first name.	T	F
71. Very few things around here ever get people excited.	T	F
72. The house staff help new residents get acquainted in the house.	T	F
73. Residents tend to hide their feelings from the staff.	T	F
74. Residents can leave the house without saying where they are going.	T	F
75. Residents are encouraged to learn new ways of doing things.	T	F
76. The residents rarely talk about their personal problems with other residents.	T	F
77. In this house staff think it is a healthy thing to argue.	T	F
78. The staff set an example for neatness and orderliness.	T	F
79. People are always changing their minds here.	T	F
80. Residents will be transferred from this house if they don't obey the rules.	T	F
81. Discussions are pretty interesting in this house.	T	F
82. Staff sometimes don't show up for their appointments.	T	F
83. Residents are encouraged to show their feelings.	T	F
84. Staff rarely give in to resident pressure.	T	F
85. Staff care more about how residents feel than about their practical problems.	T	F
86. Staff strongly encourage residents to talk about their pasts.	T	F
87. Residents here rarely become angry.	T	F
88. Residents are rarely kept waiting when they have appointments with the staff.	T	F
89. Residents never know when they will be transferred from this house.	T	F

	True	False
90. It's not safe for residents to discuss their personal problems around here.	T	F
91. Residents often do things together on the weekends.	T	F
92. Staff go out of their way to help residents.	T	F
93. The house always stays just about the same.	T	F
94. The staff discourage criticism.	T	F
95. Residents must make discharge plans.	T	F
96. It's hard to get a group together for card games or other activities.	T	F
97. A lot of residents just seem to be passing time in the house.	T	F
98. The living room is often messy.	T	F
99. Staff tell residents when they are getting better.	T	F
100. It is a good idea to allow people to know that they are in charge.	T	F

Some of the questions may have been hard to answer. Would you like to make some comments about any of the questions? Are there any issues that you feel these questions do not adequately address?

APPENDIX H

SOCIAL CLIMATE SUBSCALES

1. Involvement: measures how active and energetic residents are in the day to day social functioning of the ward, both as members of the ward as a unit and as individuals interacting with other residents. Resident attitudes, such as pride in the ward, feelings of group spirit, and general enthusiasm are also assessed.

2. Support: measures how helpful and supportive residents are toward other residents, how well the staff understand resident needs and are willing to help and encourage residents, and how encouraging and considerate professionals are toward residents.

3. Spontaneity: measures the extent to which the environment encourages residents to act openly and to freely express their feelings towards other residents and the staff.

4. Autonomy: assesses how self-sufficient and independent residents are encouraged to be in their personal affairs and in the relationships with staff; how much responsibility and self-direction residents are encouraged to exercise; and to what extent the staff is influenced by resident suggestions, criticism and other initiates.

5. Practical Orientation: assesses the extent to which the resident's environmnent orients him towards preparing himself for release from the centre and for the future. Such things as training for new kinds of jobs, looking to the future and setting and working toward practical goals are considered.

6. Personal Problem Orientation: measures the extent to which residents are encouraged to be concerned with their feelings and problems, and to seek to understand them through openly talking to other residents about themselves and their past.

7. Anger and Aggression: measures the extent to which a resident is allowed and encouraged to argue with residents and staff, to become openly angry and to display other expressions of anger.

8. Order and Organization: measures how important order is on the ward in terms of residents (how they look), staff (what they do to encourage order) and the ward itself (how well it is kept); also measures organization, again in terms of residents.

9. Program Clarity: measures the extent to which the resident knows what to expect in the day-to-day routine of the setting and how explicit the rules and procedures are.

10. Staff Control: measures the extent to which it is necessary for staff to restrict residents and the measures taken to keep residents under effective controls.

APPENDIX I

DAILY BEHAVIOUR CHECKLIST

Daily Behaviour Checklist

Date: _____

Name: _____

Code (please leave blank): _____

Please check off each of the following disruptive behaviours whenever they occur during your daily work shift. Circle the frequency number each time the behaviour occurs. Also, note the approximate time that each behaviour occurs. Please use one sheet per day. Submit a blank dated sheet if no disruptive behaviours occur.

Behaviour		Frequency					Approx. time of each occurrence
staff-resident fight	___	1	2	3	4	___	
resident-resident "	___	1	2	3	4	___	
fire-setting	___	1	2	3	4	___	
verbal argument	___	1	2	3	4	___	
furniture upheaval or damage	___	1	2	3	4	___	
defiance	___	1	2	3	4	___	
passive-aggression	___	1	2	3	4	___	
leaving the classroom or house	___	1	2	3	4	___	
entering the classroom or house	___	1	2	3	4	___	
other (please specify)	___	1	2	3	4	___	

Any other interesting observations or comments? They would be appreciated! (These may include such things as: does it appear that the events occur only with specific groups of kids? Do events occur more often at certain times? Does contagion occur? Is the behaviour related to any environmental factor such as visitors, day of week, etc.?). Thank you.

APPENDIX J

DESCRIPTION OF DAILY BEHAVIOUR CHECKLIST

Daily Behaviour Checklist

Explanation

Perhaps initially I should briefly explain the purpose of the enclosed daily behaviour checklist. This form will allow a comparable recording of disruptive behaviours across several settings within Thistletown. It will be possible to make some comparisons as each setting will utilize the same form. The behaviour checklist will be most accurate and useful if the behaviours are recorded as soon after they happen as possible.

The objective of this form is to outline a record of each behaviour that clearly disrupts the harmony of a setting. Please use this criteria (disruption of harmony or continuity) when deciding whether or not to check off a behaviour. For example, if some furniture damage happened but this did not create a significant disruption then this would not be recorded as a disruptive behaviour. Each category of disruptive behaviour has been made as distinct and clear as possible. Please keep the following definition information near at hand throughout the study as it will be useful in helping you to determine if observed behaviours should be scored or not.

Definitions of Disruptive Behaviours listed on the Daily Behaviour Checklist

staff-resident fight - any physical altercation between staff and residents that clearly disrupts the smooth operation of the setting.

resident-resident fight - any physical altercation between two or more residents that clearly disrupts the setting.

fire-setting - any obvious attempt or accomplishment of fire-setting that noticeably upsets the activities of the setting.

verbal argument - any verbal argument that noticeably disrupts the setting.

furniture upheaval or damage - any furniture movement or damage that significantly upsets the continuity in a setting.

defiance - any act of disobedience that disrupts the setting. You may wish to specify the behaviour.

passive-aggression - any behaviour that disrupts the setting which can unambiguously be characterized as passive-aggressive (e.g., not talking).

leaving the classroom or house - any departure from the setting that disrupts the continuity of the setting.

entering the classroom or house - any entrance to a setting that disrupts the continuity of the setting.

other - please specify any behaviour that clearly upsets the setting that is not adequately covered by any of the above terms.

Please feel free to exercise your discretion. If a behaviour clearly disrupts your setting then record it. If a behaviour does not disrupt the setting do not record it unless you want to comment on it. Throughout the study I will be available to discuss these behaviours with you and will be very interested in your perceptions and comments. The checklist will be collected on a weekly basis.

The following page is a copy of the Daily Behaviour Checklist.

APPENDIX K

TIMETABLE FOR STUDY

Timetable for Acting-Out Study

Starting Date: Monday, April 2,1978

Week #1- Staff were requested to complete the 100 item attitude questionnaire and the social climate scale. Staff recorded a daily acting-out measure.

Week #2- Staff completed the second 143 item questionnaire during this week. Staff continued to record daily acting-out.

Week #3- Staff recorded daily acting-out.

Week #4- Staff recorded daily acting-out.

Week #5- Staff recorded daily acting-out (House B closed).

Week #6- Staff continued to recomplete measures.

Week #7- Staff recorded daily acting-out.

Week #8- Staff recorded daily acting-out.

Week #9- Staff recorded daily acting-out.

Week #10- Staff recorded daily acting-out and recompleted measures.

Completion Date: Friday, June 8,1978.

APPENDIX L

DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

Data Collection Procedures

School: Data collection began at the School April 2 and continued for 10 weeks. Staff were requested to complete their measures during specific times they were assigned (during which supply teachers were brought in to take over their classes). Completed questionnaires and daily behaviour checklists were submitted on a weekly basis to the liason person in the School.

Generally, the researcher collected the data directly from the liason person on a weekly or more frequent basis. If the liason person was unavailable the data was then placed in a mailbox at the School set up for the use of the researcher.

Whenever any staff member placed a query or concern about one of the measures the researcher contacted the individual as soon as possible. Most staff concerns were raised and dealt with in the first two weeks of the study.

In the School,and in all other settings, provision was made for the data to be submitted in a confidential manner. Data was submitted on an exceptionally reliable basis. At no time was there any need to "encourage" staff to complete the questionnaires. An examination of the completed measures revealed that the staff had carefully

completed the measures.

Day Treatment: Data collection began at Day Treatment April 2 and continued for 10 weeks. Staff were requested by the researcher and the liason person to complete the measures as soon as possible and either submit them to the liason person or leave them for the researcher in a mailbox located in Day Treatment.

Data was generally collected directly from the liason person. Any concerns that the staff expressed about the measures were dealt with immediately. In general, few concerns were raised.

Initially, submission of data was prompt, but after several weeks submission became noticeably sporadic. The researcher talked with several of the staff about their missing questionnaires and they assured him that they would be promptly submitted. Still, some individuals were negligent in submitting their data. At this point the researcher talked with the liason person who ensured him that she would make sure that the questionnaires were submitted. Also, the researcher made a point of attending a staff meeting and stressing the fact that the quality of the final research report, and its usefulness, would in part depend on obtaining

all of the data from all of the participants. Staff appeared to appreciate the importance of this and promised to be prompt in data submission. For the rest of the study data submission was very prompt.

House A: House A data collection started April 2 and continued for 10 weeks. Staff had been requested to complete the measures at their earliest convenience and submit them to the house Coordinator (the liason person). Data was generally collected from the liason person although some staff did submit data personally to the researcher. Many staff members wrote comments on the measures but few expressed any questions that they wanted the researcher to answer. Those who did were contacted by the researcher during his next visit to the house.

Initially, data was submitted quickly and appeared to have been completed conscientiously, Data continued to be submitted regularly but it was necessary for the researcher to continually check with staff about "how it was going" to encourage staff to hand their data in. During the seventh week data collection slowed somewhat. After this problem was discussed with staff later submissions became prompt.

House B: Data collection at House B began April 2 and concluded five weeks later due to the

closing of the house. The researcher informed the liason person and the staff that it was important to submit data as soon as possible. Generally, staff submitted the completed measures to the liason person. Staff concerns, as expressed on the measures, were all dealt with during the first week of the study. Very few concerns were expressed.

Throughout the entire five weeks data collection was problematic. Although initially several staff handed in measures quickly virtually every staff member had to be contacted and recontacted about incomplete data. Staff ensured the researcher that they were working on the data but very often it still did not appear. The researcher discussed this difficulty with the liason person but this did not improve data submission. In order to ensure that the data was completed it was necessary for the researcher to continually encourage, if not "badger", staff to hand materials in. Even at the end of the five week time period data was still outstanding and it was necessary for the researcher to track down transferred staff in order to obtain the required data.

Due to the fact that the house closed down at the mid-point of the study it was not possible to have the staff recomplete the measures as was

previously planned.

House C: Data collection started at House C one week after House B closed and continued for five weeks. The staff were requested to complete the measures as soon as they could and submit them to the house liason person.

The researcher collected all of the data directly from the liason person. As the length of the study in this setting was only five weeks staff were required to complete the three principle measures during the first week and again during the fifth week to allow a maximum amount of time between completion and recompletion of the measures.

For the duration of the study data was submitted in a highly regular fashion. All staff concerns were addressed during the first week of the study. The submitted data appeared to have been very conscientiously and carefully completed. Overall, data collection was trouble free.

APPENDIX M

DESCRIPTION OF ENTRY INTO THISTLETOWN AND EACH OF THE INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH SETTINGS

Description of Entry into Thistletown and
Each of the Individual Research Settings

Thistletown: When the design of the study neared completion in November, 1977, it was described by the researcher to the Chief of In-Patient Services at Thistletown. He made several suggestions concerning the design and implementation of the study (e.g., he suggested initiating the study by examining fewer settings). He mentioned that the study would require the approval of the Research Evaluation Committee at Thistletown. While the study was being examined for approval the researcher described the details of the project to the staff at the School, Day-Treatment and House B. At a later time the study was described to the House A and House C staff. Access to examine clinical data was negotiated after the proposal was accepted.

Prior to further meetings with the individual research settings the researcher was required to sit in on a treatment team meeting and a Therapeutic Program Coordinator's meeting. The purpose of the researcher's involvement in these meetings was to obtain feedback about the design and implementation of the study.

Next, specific meetings were set up with each individual setting involved in the study. The initial meeting at the School involved the School Principal.

The first meeting at Day-Treatment was with the Psychologist supervising the program although later meetings were with a senior Child Care Supervisor. The initial meeting at House B was with the House coordinator. The later meetings at Houses A and C were also with the House cordinators. In general, the meetings were with the senior staff member in each setting. A detailed description of entry into each of the five settings follows.

School: The School was contacted by the researcher several months before the study was scheduled to begin. At an initial meeting with the principal the study was approved in principle, with the understanding that the researcher would have to convince the staff of the worth of the study. A second meeting with the Principal involved an explanation of the measures to be used and the Principal was presented with a set of summary sheets describing the measures, their application and their reliability and validity.

The Principal indicated that she was very interested in having the study conducted and she suggested that the researcher work with the Vice-principal, as she would have more time to act as a liason and help with scheduling.

The Principal, Vice-Principal and the researcher set up two additional meetings at which time the researcher met with the Junior and Senior School staff.

The meetings with the teachers involved the researcher describing the study and requesting design ideas and feedback from the staff. The staff offered numerous useful ideas and one teacher aided the researcher in the design of a social climate measure to be used with the students, although later this did not prove to be viable. The researcher was careful to inform staff that all data obtained would remain confidential and would be coded to ensure anonymity. Staff were told that they could have access to their data at any time. Staff received copies of all measures that would be used and the measures were explained carefully and in considerable detail. A standard desription of the measures was used across settings. The participants were told that no deception was involved in the study. They were also told that if they felt the study was unjust, unethical or they simply did not want to be involved, they should mention this and they would be exempt from participating.

A strong attempt was made to have staff feel that the study was not being forced upon them. The researcher encouraged staff to act as consultants in the design and implementation of the study. For example, the School staff, as well as staff from the other settings, were actively involved in the design of the acting-out measure. No attempt was made to have staff make a decision about participation on the spot. The researcher notified the staff that he would contact them at a later time when they had reached a decision.

It was noticed that some staff were somewhat reluctant about participating in the study. When this was raised it was found out that the staff had been involved in a study one year ago that they felt was unfair, as they did not receive feedback and were asked to do things for the researchers that were not fully explained. The present researcher assured all staff that he would be present in the setting several times a week and promised that each participant would receive a summary of the results. They were told that a complete copy of the research would eventually be available from the library at Thistletown Regional Centre. A specific written contract, outlining the researcher's

expectations about staff involvement and stating the researcher's committment to be available to the setting, was negotiated with the Principal.

Day-Treatment: The researcher's initial contact with Day Treatment involved describing the details of the study to the person in charge of the out-patient service. She suggested that the researcher return and describe the study to the Day Treatment staff after the proposal received acceptance by the Evaluation Committee. The researcher contacted Day Treatment after the proposal was accepted but the individual in charge was absent due to illness. The researcher then described the study to the Psychologist affiliated with Day Treatment who suggested that the researcher outline the study to the staff.

When the study was described to the staff numerous constructive comments (e.g., information concerning various operating aspects of Day Treatment) were offered. There was a marked note of enthusiasm toward the study by the staff.

Sample copies of the measures to be used were distributed to the potential participants. The measures were described in the same manner in which they were previously described at the School. Again, a strong attempt was made to make staff

feel like research associates, not mere participants. Confidentiality and access to data were ensured. The researcher promised to be available to Day Treatment several times a week. Staff were told not to decide about participation in the study right away. It was decided that if the staff wanted to participate the researcher would work with a senior Child Care Worker in the setting to implement the study.

Upon hearing that the Day Treatment staff were interested in participating the researcher organized a meeting with the staff that would be directly involved. The measures were redescribed and the objectives of the study were outlined. This final explanatory meeting was held several weeks before the study was scheduled to commence. A specific written contract, similar to the one negotiated at the School, was designed.

House A: The researcher contacted the Therapeutic Program Coordinator of the House to discuss the liklihood of involving the setting in the study. He recommended that the researcher attend a Therapeutic Program Coordinator's meeting. At the meeting the researcher would describe the study to those present, who would determine if the study would be viable and/or useful. Those present

included a Psychiatrist, Psychologist, Social Worker, Psychiatric Resident, Nurse and House Coordinator. Copies of the measures were distributed and explained. Some concern was raised regarding the wording of the Cawson Questionnaire which contained numerous colloquial British terms. The researcher ensured the individuals present that the phrases would be substituted with Canadian approximations. In general, the people at the meeting were quite interested in the project and offered suggestions, concerning implementation and time frame, to the researcher. It was decided that the Coordinator would be contacted to find out the group's decision concerning the support of the project.

When the Coordinator was contacted he stated that House A would be interested in participating. He suggested that the researcher attend a staff meeting where he could describe the study to those who would be involved.

At the staff meeting the study was described as it had been previously outlined for the other settings involved. Confidentiality and access to data were ensured and the researcher agreed to involve himself in actual House operations during the ten weeks of the study. Participants were treated as intelligent consultants, not as "subjects". Copies of all measures were

distributed and staff were told that they should take their time before committing themselves to the project, although the researcher did want to initiate the project quickly.

Later contact with the staff indicated that they did want to participate. The measures, and staff concerns about them, were reexamined prior to commencing data collection. The Coordinator was established as the liason person for the setting and a specific contract was negotiated.

House B: Initial contact was with the Therapeautic Program Coordinator. It was suggested that the study be described at a team meeting. After discussing the study at the team meeting it was decided that the researcher should attend a staff meeting at the house in order that the study could be described to the staff.

The format of the staff meeting was similar to the previous meetings. Staff were ensured that their data, if they decided to participate, would be coded and remain confidential. The researcher indicated that he would be available several days per week during the course of the study. Samples of the measures were distributed and feedback was encouraged. Although the scheduled starting date of the project was more than six weeks away the staff and the Coordinator seemed highly interested and enthusiastic. Staff were informed that they had several weeks to decide

about participation.

The staff decided that they would be interested in participating in the study. The researcher did not meet again with staff until about two weeks before the collection of data was to begin. At this meeting the measures were carefully reexplained. Staff expressed some concern about having to complete the Cawson, Jesness and Moos measures twice. The researcher explained why he felt this was necessary and the staff appeared to be accepting of the rationale. The Coordinator acted as the liason person and a specific contract was negotiated with her.

House C: House C was contacted five weeks into the study (due to an unforeseen closing of House B). The house Psychologist suggested that the researcher discuss the study with the Coordinator.

An initial meeting involved only the Coordinator and the researcher. All aspects of the study were explained and copies of the measures were left for examination. The Coordinator appeared genuinely interested and suggested that a second meeting be held with the staff present.

A meeting was held with staff one week later. The study was described to staff as previously outlined. They were told that the study in the house would only be conducted for five weeks, instead of ten as in the other settings, due to time

constraints. Staff were also told that the researcher would appreciate a decision as soon as possible,

Several days later the staff agreed to participate and the study was redescribed to the staff. A specific written contract was negotiated with the Coordinator.

APPENDIX N

PARTICIPANT-OBSERVER IMPRESSIONS AND RESEARCHER INVOLVEMENT IN EACH SETTING

School

Visiting Schedule: Throughout the ten weeks of the study the researcher was present at the School several times per week. This approach allowed a good sampling of the activities and events in the School.

Researcher Perceptions of Staff: In general, the staff at the School were very friendly and interested in the research, but there appeared to be a general attitude of defensiveness. Although the researcher had ensured the staff that the data would be confidential it appeared that some of the staff were somewhat uncertain about what was to be done with the data (perhaps in part because they realized that the data would remain at Thistletown and might be subject to additional analyses by Thistletown researchers).

It was the researcher's perception that the staff were very professional and intensely interested in assisting their students. Throughout the study all interactions with the School staff were very pleasant.

Researcher Perceptions of Students: Resident's behaviours in the School seemed considerably different than the same resident's behaviours in the houses. By the end of the study the researcher

knew many of the residents and noticed on several occaisions that children that were generally very disruptive and aggressive in the houses were very different in the School setting (i.e., quieter, more responsive and maturer).

Although many of the residents claimed that they did not want to go to School they appeared to enjoy many aspects of the School, especially the varied curriculum and strong teacher involvement.

Environmental Perceptions: The School, a modern building (1976) has an exceptionally rich environment. The decor bears little resemblance to a "typical" school. The walls are painted bright colours, staff are very dynamic and facilities are omnipresent. Each classroom is very distinctive and the rooms contain dozens of plants, acquariums and things of interest. The environment of each classroom had a striking resemblance to a classroom set up for gifted children that the researcher had observed in a different setting. Children had access to a pool, gym, woodworking shop,ceramics area and many interesting programs. In summary, the School environment appeared to be very conducive to growth in children, both intellectual and emotional.

Researcher Involvement: Throughout the study the researcher was involved in more than ten classes at the School. Initial involvement was limited to observation but after several weeks, when the researcher was a more familiar figure, involvement became more interactive.

Generally, the researcher functioned as a Teaching Assistant. Some activities involved helping the senior students with Mathematics and Geography and assisting the junior students with Ceramics and Art. Overall, the researcher tried to be sensitive as to when the best time to become involved occurred. At times the teacher was obviously engaged in a specific growth promoting activity with a student and it was not appropriate for the researcher to become involved.

At times the researcher felt somewhat inadequate when he observed the sophisticated ways in which the teachers taught the residents. The teachers were sensitive to this and encouraged the researcher to become involved.

Every time the School was visited notes were made on perceived staff attitudes and social climate using the subscales of the attitude and social climate measures as a framework. The researcher recorded what he observed as disruptive

behaviours and later compared these observations with the staff records.

Day-Treatment

Visiting Schedule: During the study Day-Treatment was visited an average of twice per week. As often as possible the visits were made on different days to obtain as broad a sampling of activities and behaviours as possible.

Researcher Perceptions of Staff: Day Treatment staff, primarily a young group of people, were very interested in the study. Staff were genuinely interested in the welfare of the children and throughout the time the setting was visited it was apparent that the staff were very conscientious about their tasks and they were continually trying to think of ways of improving their performance . During staff conferences it appeared that many of the staff disagreed on what might be the best approach for each child, but the senior Child Care Supervisor did not allow the disparity to remain unresolved. She acted as a mediator and a catalyst to bring staff to a point of mutual agreement over the disposition of each child. Overall, staff were very energetic and happy in their work. Staff acted as good role models for the children.

Researcher Perceptions of Residents: Children in Day-Treatment were a different population than the children in the other four settings in that they were out-patients. Most of the children seemed well adjusted and reasonably within the norms of expected behaviour, given their diagnoses. It was readily apparent that the children enjoyed this setting considerably and they appeared to have formed close constructive bonds with the staff.

Environmental Perceptions: The Day-Treatment building itself is a rather old administrative type structure. It appears more like a typical institution than, for example, the School. Although the physical framework is rather plain the staff have brightened it up with the addition of mobiles, plants and things that the children have created. Although there is somewhat of a paucity of physical "niceties" this is easily offset by the young, dynamic staff who were the most important component of the children's environment.

Researcher Involvement : Throughout the study the researcher was involved in many of the activities children experienced while at Day-Treatment (e.g., various games, baseball, gym, etc.) including classroom involvement in the Day-Treatment

classes.

Involvement was very easy at Day-Treatment as the staff and children encouraged the researcher to participate. The children were very easy to relate to, in that their disorders were of a mild nature.

Whenever any incident of major importance occurred (e.g., a Day-Treatment child climbed on the roof of the School) the researcher tried to "tag along" and observe how the situation was handled. Also, during each visit the researcher recorded how he perceived staff attitudes, social climate and children's acting-out rates.

House A

Visiting Schedule: House A was generally visited once a week, although if something unusual was scheduled the number of visits was increased. Visits were made on differing days at different times and occaisionally the researcher would stay for the duration of a work shift to obtain as broad a sample of behaviours as possible.

Researcher Perceptions of Staff: House A contained a number of staff whose views towards treatment of a specific resident were often diametrically opposed. At times, attempts were made at reconciliation, but often the staff members retained, and implemented, their differing views.

Staff were very friendly and did not appear openly defensive about the study. They were continually interested in when results would be available. Staff, on the whole, acted as good role models for the children. They attempted to instill appropriate manners in the children, especially at mealtime, when the staff became excellent models of etiquette. Staff were always careful to explain why privileges were removed and made sincere efforts to ensure that the residents understood what was happening. Staff tolerated minor verbal abuse, but severe verbal abuse was quickly discouraged and physical violence was dealt with instantly and concernedly. Some residents had a tendency to sit around and do nothing but staff continually tried to get these residents to explain why they were feeling depressed and staff tried numerous ways to increase the motivation of residents. The researcher's overall impression of the staff in House A was that they were a competent, mature group of individuals, although they did differ in some basic treatment outlooks.

Researcher Perceptions of Residents: Many of the residents in House A appeared somewhat confused, although this may have been due to medication effects.

The residents were very accepting of the researcher's presence in the house and did not appear to show any concern about the study. One common complaint in the house was a strong dislike of the School and a marked ambivilance towards the house. Many of the residents seemed to be just "putting in time" and were not actively involved in any activities.

Environmental Perceptions: House A, like all of the other houses at Thistletown, is a very modern, homelike unit. The interior is brightly furnished and spacious although the house shows numerous damaged areas where the children have gone out of control. Although the setting is modern, it appears somewhat lacking in "homey" items. The eating area, although modern, was bereft of any decoration, except for one or two plants. The house was set in a small attractive park-like setting, with easy access to playing fields. The overall impression is one of a modern, somewhat sterile, setting.

Researcher Involvement: The primary involvement of the researcher consisted of talking to the residents and staff. Although staff encouraged the researcher to become involved it was difficult as the researcher was unaware of many of the restrictions that were placed on the residents. Conversations

with the residents and staff were very easy and enlightening. Residents were very frank about how they felt about the setting and at times how they felt about themselves. The extent of researcher involvement was somewhat limited in that he had to be careful not to find himself in a legally uncomfortable situation, as he was not a trained staff member.

House B

Visiting Schedule: House B was visited two or three times per week, although more frequently as data collection problems increased. The researcher arranged to visit as many different times as possible in order to obtain a broad sampling of house behaviours and activities.

Researcher Perceptions of Staff: The first impression that the researcher received concerning House B staff was that they were friendly, enjoyed their jobs and were feeling somewhat harried. Eventually, this perception changed to one of a state of mild to moderate confusion. Often when the house was visited staff did not know where other staff were or what was scheduled to happen during the day. Staff were highly interested in the care of the residents although it was apparent that each staff member had his own treatment approach. The

researcher did not observe any effort to reconcile these differing approaches. Staff appeared mildly defensive. The staff used modeling as a technique although they were often inconsistent in their requests of residents. It was interesting to find out that staff were willinging to tolerate severe verbal abuse and even severe physical abuse. On several occaisions the researcher was present when staff had to go home or to the hospital to be treated for injuries. There seemed to be a reluctance to act strongly and quickly to suppress the physical attacks of residents. Overall, staff appeared friendly, yet somewhat leniant and inconsistent.

Researcher Perceptions of Residents: House B residents were not concerned about the research that was being conducted and they were an easy group to talk to. Most of the residents displayed considerable hostility that was directed towards the house staff. The residents asserted that they did not enjoy the School or the house. Many of the children were quite lethargic although this may have been due to medication. Overall, the residents were upset with their forced stay at Thistletown.

Environmental Perceptions: House B, which was basically the same design as the other houses, appeared somewhat more"crowded". Many miscellaneous items were often strewn about the house and it appeared disorgamized. The staff room was very cluttered and staff had difficulty in retreiving information. The house had considerable evidence of physical damage that had not, or could not, be repaired.

Researcher Involvement: Most of the researcher's interaction involved discussion with the residents and staff, having meals with those present, escorting residents to School and joining in on other house activities. During the second week of the study the researcher was able to assist in a major way in the finding and returning of a runaway resident to the setting. The researcher hoped that this extent of involvement would convince staff that he was interested in the operation of the house and was willing to assist. It appeared that staff were pleased with the researcher's involvement. The last several weeks of involvement were mainly concerned with data collection. Staff did encourage researcher involvement but were not consistent in suggesting what should or should not be done.

House C

Visiting Schedule: House C was generally visited once a week during the study. Visiting times were staggered to allow observations at as many different times as possible.

Researcher Perceptions of Staff: House C appeared to be staffed by a bright, competent group of people that did not appear to be defensive about any aspect of the research. The staff had a great deal of respect for their Coordinator who was a strong, dynamic person. The staff were very involved with the residents and shared a common treatment philosophy. Staff acted as good models for the children. Minor verbal abuse was tolerated but stronger verbal abuse and physical attack were quickly handled. Whenever a resident did something that was not appropriate staff were quick to explain why the behaviour was not allowed.

Researcher Perceptions of Residents: House C residents, which included some House B residents who had been transferred when House B closed down, did not appear concerned about the study. The residents were very similar to those in the other houses studied.

Environmental Perceptions: House C, although somewhat "crowded", had been decorated with some items that the residents had made. Physically, the structure was the same as the other houses.

Researcher Involvement: Most of the researcher's time was spent talking with the residents and staff. Staff were quick to encourage the researcher to become involved and were in general very positive. Much of the researcher's time was spent in the recording of perceived staff attitudes and social climate perceptions.

APPENDIX O

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN CANONICAL DISCRIMINANT FUNCTIONS AND THE DISCRIMINATING VARIABLES FOR FIRST DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS

Variable	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3	Function 4
Control-S	.40	-.37	-.03	-.17
Spontan.	.35	-.34	.04	-.05
Status	.24	.07	.04	.12
Strictness	.11	.0	.02	.0
Achievement	.10	-.09	-.09	.0
Order	.36	-.42	.07	-.17
Anger	.28	-.42	.14	-.07
Involvement	.18	-.41	.14	-.04
Support	.31	-.37	.11	-.13
Practical	.27	-.34	.17	.0
Problem	.20	-.29	.17	-.05
Discussion	.10	-.24	.0	.05
Suppression A	.13	-.22	-.02	.11
Defensive	.11	-.21	.0	-.03
Control	.15	-.21	.06	.0
Authority	.05	-.17	-.05	.12
Harshness	.13	-.17	.0	.05
Independence	.09	-.16	.0	.08
Distance	.12	-.15	-.02	.09
Aggression	.10	-.15	-.03	-.10
Break Will	.14	-.14	.0	.07
Suppression P	.05	.13	.11	.11
Autonomy	.20	-.31	.35	.0
Equality	.0	-.07	-.19	.08
Work	.20	.06	.01	.20
Passivity	.08	.04	.10	.19
Trad.Control	.13	.03	.02	.19
Affect	.07	.08	.03	.13
Pr.Clarity	.04	-.02	-.03	-.05

APPENDIX P

ATTITUDE AND SOCIAL CLIMATE MEANS FOR EACH SETTING

Settings

Variable	School	Day Treatment	A	B	C	Total
Harshness	80.3	64.0	42.5	77.1	75.5	66.9
Discussion	34.4	30.5	17.2	37.0	36.8	30.5
Independence	60.1	51.6	36.0	63.8	59.4	53.1
Break Will	17.9	13.0	8.2	16.5	15.5	14.0
Defensive	39.0	33.7	19.6	37.7	42.4	34.1
Distance	26.3	20.3	14.5	26.5	24.4	22.0
Aggression	19.3	15.1	11.3	16.1	20.7	16.6
Achievement	29.6	19.8	19.4	27.0	28.0	24.9
Affect	19.9	14.0	12.2	13.8	14.0	14.9
Authority	47.3	41.7	31.2	59.5	52.3	45.3
Suppression A	51.3	40.1	24.2	55.4	50.4	43.2
Control	42.1	36.0	17.9	37.4	39.7	34.0
Equality	10.5	7.6	9.3	14.4	12.3	10.7
Trad.Control	38.1	28.8	27.7	33.7	25.2	30.4
Work	29.3	19.5	19.6	23.1	17.5	21.6
Passivity	28.5	26.1	23.0	26.5	19.6	24.3
Status	34.4	19.6	18.7	21.0	16.7	22.3
Strictness	23.1	19.2	19.9	20.2	15.9	19.6
Suppression P	15.3	14.5	14.2	12.5	9.9	13.2
Involvement	6.0	6.1	2.0	5.8	6.0	5.0
Support	7.7	5.7	3.1	5.1	7.0	5.3
Spontaneity	6.6	4.0	2.8	4.4	5.5	4.2
Autonomy	4.3	5.0	2.5	3.2	3.7	3.1
Practical	6.6	5.5	2.8	5.0	5.7	4.5
Personal	5.0	4.7	3.0	3.8	4.7	3.6
Anger	6.7	5.6	2.8	5.2	6.5	4.8
Order	7.0	4.7	2.7	4.5	6.5	4.7
Pr. Clarity	8.3	5.8	6.0	6.2	8.2	7.1
Control-staff	5.5	2.6	2.3	3.1	4.7	3.3

APPENDIX Q

ATTITUDE AND SOCIAL CLIMATE
STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR EACH SETTING

Settings

Variable	School	Day Treatment	A	B	C	Total
Harshness	37.5	39.8	45.9	35.0	33.0	40.3
Discussion	18.0	19.5	18.6	17.9	16.7	19.1
Independence	28.8	32.6	37.8	29.4	25.7	31.9
Break Will	11.7	10.1	11.4	10.3	7.3	10.5
Defensive	21.7	22.1	22.4	20.5	20.3	22.4
Distance	13.3	14.8	15.7	12.8	11.6	14.0
Aggression	11.0	10.2	12.7	11.7	10.4	11.5
Achievement	14.4	14.1	21.1	12.9	12.7	15.9
Affect	11.9	11.9	19.8	7.0	7.5	13.0
Authority	27.9	27.7	34.7	27.8	25.2	29.6
SuppressionA	25.7	26.1	27.7	27.0	24.5	27.8
Control	21.9	24.6	21.7	17.4	17.5	22.2
Equality	5.7	5.1	18.4	7.4	6.6	10.5
Trad.Control	11.1	13.0	21.0	15.1	17.1	16.4
Work	3.5	8.3	13.4	10.3	11.8	10.9
Passivity	9.2	11.1	13.7	12.4	14.0	12.4
Status	21.0	8.6	12.5	10.2	12.2	15.2
Strictness	8.7	10.6	13.4	9.4	11.6	11.0
Suppression P	4.7	6.6	9.5	6.7	7.3	7.3
Involvement	2.6	3.9	2.6	4.2	2.5	3.7
Support	2.5	3.7	2.9	4.0	2.3	3.8
Spontaneity	2.2	3.0	2.4	3.0	2.1	3.2
Autonomy	1.8	3.1	1.5	2.3	2.0	2.6
Practical	2.3	3.6	2.2	3.6	3.0	3.5
Personal	2.3	3.3	2.6	2.9	2.0	2.9
Anger	2.3	2.6	2.3	3.7	2.2	2.5
Order	2.3	3.7	1.8	3.3	2.1	3.5
Pr.Clarity	2.7	4.6	4.4	4.3	2.5	3.3
Control-staff	2.2	2.2	1.3	2.6	1.8	2.7

APPENDIX R

TEST-RETEST RELIABILITIES OF ALL VARIABLES WITHIN SETTINGS

Variable	Settings: School[a]	Day Treatment	House A	House C
Harshness	.75**	-.91**	.69*	-.15
Discussion	.53*	-.30	.95**	-.70
Independence	.30	.13	.72**	-.19
Break Will	.0	.80**	-.80**	-.82*
Defensive	.83**	-.90**	.20	-.56
Distance	.13	-.94**	-.89**	-.06
Aggression	.68*	-.83**	-.45	-.10
Achievement	.33	.54	-.99**	-.20
Affect	.42	-.36	.76**	-.25
Authority	.56*	.95**	.95**	.40
Suppression A	.58*	-.90**	.71**	.81*
Control	.58*	-.70*	-.63*	.48
Equality	.05	.89*	.63*	-.03
Trad.Control	.51	.31	-.02	.28
Work	.17	.43	-.28	.49
Passivity	-.37	-.08	.84**	.69
Status	.43	.60	-.21	.28
Strictness	.53*	.89**	-.54	.25
Suppression P	.46	-.75*	-.73**	.73*
Involvement	.67*	.90**	.65**	-.37
Support	.90**	.13	.80**	-.53
Spontaneity	.66*	.61	.73**	.91**
Autonomy	.28	-.30	.50	-.54
Practical	.69*	.76*	-.27	-.61
Personal	.62*	.80**	.86**	.58
Anger	.57*	.99**	.75**	-.28
Order	.54*	-.60	-.02	.52
Pr. Clarity	.31	.90**	-.33	.19
Control-staff	.83**	.85**	.0	-.19

[a]based on 10 weeks for School, Day Treatment, House A and five weeks for House C.

APPENDIX S

TOTAL INCIDENCE OF EACH CATEGORY OF ACTING-OUT FOR EACH SETTING

Settings

Behaviour	School	Day Treatment	A	B	C	Total
VA*	122	114	25	25	47	333
DF	63	88	23	21	46	241
PA	51	27	5	15	13	111
OT	64	5	7	18	2	96
LS	23	25	15	5	5	73
RR	14	29	3	4	3	53
FU	10	17	4	8	4	43
SR	3	10	9	1	11	34
ES	16	3	1	0	1	21
FS	1	2	0	2	0	5
Total	367	320	92	198[a]	264[a]	1010

[a] days of study in these settings were only half that of the other settings, therefore the sum scores were pro-rated to equalize number of days of study

* VA-verbal argument
DF-defiance
PA-passive-aggression
OT-other
LS-leaving setting
RR-resident/resident fight
FU-furniture upheaval
SR-staff/resident fight
ES-entering setting
FS-fire setting