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This research was designed to investigate the outcomes of foster care placements involving delinquent youth placed by a juvenile court in regular foster family homes and more specialized treatment group homes (TGH). Forty predictor variables were identified through a survey of probation officers and a review of the literature. The major research question was to determine which of these variables were significantly associated with outcome of foster care placements. A second research question was to determine whether there were different variables related to foster family placement outcomes as compared to TGH placement outcomes.

The case records of 233 youth removed from foster family (n = 132) and TGH (n = 101) placements between 1980-1984 comprised the sample for this study. Stepwise multiple regression analysis of the data, using the .05 level of significance, was employed with the total data set and the foster family and TGH samples separately to identify variables most strongly associated with placement outcomes.

Among the study's central findings: (1) placement outcomes appeared most strongly related to the ability of court staff and foster parents to handle the day-to-day problems of youth in foster care in a timely and effective manner; (2) successful outcomes occurred more often in cases where the probation officer invested more
energy to support the foster parents which appeared based, in part, on higher levels of rapport between the foster parents and court personnel; (3) the relative absence of aggressive and impulsive behavior by youth was related to outcomes in foster family homes whereas the youth's ability to form positive peer relationships appeared more important in TGH outcomes. Additional findings are reported in the dissertation.

An additional goal of the study was to develop regression equations which would yield a predicted outcome of foster care. Based on the analysis of pre-placement variables related to the delinquent youth and family, four Predictive Index Scales, incorporating the regression equations, were developed for use as one tool in the assessment process.

Future research is suggested to study the hypothesis that there may be a relationship between placement outcome and a critical level of rapport and cooperation between foster parents and court personnel which varies according to the type of child.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Juvenile delinquency has been a problem among most societies since the beginning of recorded history. McMicking (1982) noted that "delinquent" behavior by those considered juveniles in their society "can be traced back at least 4,000 years when the Code of Hammurabi (2270 B.C.) stated 'If a son strikes a father, one shall cut off his hands" (p. 51). Juvenile law violators did not fare much better, according to McMicking, under Old English Law which permitted the execution of individuals over the age of twelve years who were found responsible for the theft of over 12-pence. Fortunately, our methods of handling delinquents have changed dramatically over the ensuing years. With the creation of the juvenile court system in the late nineteenth century, growing as it did out of the concerns and aspirations of social reformers (Isenstadt & Sarri, 1976), there was a shift from an emphasis on punishment to one of treatment. In spite of progress made, or perhaps because of a lack of it, the problem of delinquency and the treatment of delinquents remains as urgent today as any time in the past.

The Juvenile Code in Michigan (Michigan Act 54, PA 1944 as amended) states that the child who comes "within the jurisdiction of the court shall receive such care, guidance and control, preferably in his own home, as will be conducive to the child's welfare and the best interest of the state" (§ 712A.1). In compliance with the
Code, juvenile courts have traditionally sought to keep youth who become delinquent wards of the court in their own homes if at all possible. If there is a need for placement of the child outside of the parents' home, the Code instructs the court "that when such child is removed from the control of his parents the court shall secure for him care as nearly as possible equivalent to the care which should have been given to him by them" (§ 712A.1). This moment of decision represents a convergence of three major goals to which the court must attend: due process for the offender, community protection, and the provision of social services to rehabilitate the delinquent child. It is at this point that the question arises concerning assessment and recommendation of the best possible placement for a particular child while also considering the needs of the community.

This research was designed to determine if there are identifiable factors which distinguish children who can benefit from and successfully complete a court-ordered foster family or treatment group home placement from those who fail to do so. The incidence of placement breakdowns involving delinquent youth placed in foster family or group home care by a juvenile court in a west Michigan county was identified. Factors which appeared to contribute to these placement breakdowns, the unplanned removal of children from a court-ordered out-of-home placement, as well as factors hypothesized to be associated with successful placement experiences were identified and examined. It was believed that the results of this investigation would contribute to the identification of reliable and objective factors that could be assessed routinely to determine those children
who are most likely at risk for placement failure and to identify factors which might increase the chance of placement success.

Background of the Problem

A number of authors (Briar, 1963; Fanshel, 1963, 1976; Paquin, 1977; Sarri, 1981; Stone & Stone, 1983) have discussed the complexity of the process whereby youngsters are referred for assessment and recommendation of out-of-home placement. Perhaps, as Briar (1963) argued, "no decisions . . . pose more awesome responsibilities for the caseworker and are more far reaching in their potential consequences for the client than those involved in the placement of children in foster care" (p. 161). In spite of the "absence of any reliable or objective data" (Stone & Stone, 1983, p. 12) for use in assessing appropriate placements and the minimal empirical data known about this decision-making process (Paquin, 1977), caseworkers and probation officers are, nonetheless, required to make placement decisions on an almost daily basis.

The juvenile court that was studied is fortunate to have a number of options available when considering out-of-home placement for delinquent court wards. Until a few years ago, placement decisions were relatively easy to make. Options were limited to foster homes, private institutions, and commitments to Michigan State Department of Social Services (SDSS) wardship. Consistent with the concept of "minimal penetration" (Sarri, 1981) which emphasizes that "youth should experience the least possible penetration into the increasingly severe sanctions of the correctional system" (p. 41),
placements were viewed as being on a continuum with the least restrictive placement, foster care, preferred before other, more restrictive placement options such as institutional placements or commitment to state wardship were utilized. Delinquent youth were most often initially placed in family foster care if it was determined that they could not remain in their natural parents' home.

When the court which was studied added the Treatment Group Home (TGH) program in 1977 and the Youth Camp for delinquent males in 1979, the decision of which out-of-home placement to use became more complicated. The traditional practice suggested that out-of-home placement should begin with foster care, the least restrictive option in terms of limiting the physical freedom of youth and their access to the community. Foster family placements could be followed, if necessary, with subsequent placements of increasing restrictiveness such as the Youth Camp or public or private institutions which typically provide more secure settings than open community-based foster or group homes. Exceptions were usually based on the severity of the crime or the past criminal history of the youth.

This practice is being replaced at least partially with an emphasis on the use of the most appropriate setting, as opposed to simply the least restrictive, for initial placements when children must be removed from their parents' home. The appropriateness of a given type of placement for a particular child is determined ideally by the individualized assessment of the child's needs and the complementary matching with the strengths of the placement (Kadushin, 1980). It is understood that, at times, the "appropriate" setting
will also be a "restrictive," highly structured setting to provide external controls over the behavior of violent, acting out youth. This emphasis confronts probation officers with a more complex decision-making process regarding the placement of delinquent youth. It calls for the consideration of a larger number of factors in making more discriminative placement recommendations to the judge.

Statement of the Problem

There is not a standardized psychological instrument or procedure that can assess all the variables within the child, family, and environmental situation which must be considered in determining the appropriate out-of-home placement of a delinquent youth. Therefore, a juvenile court's past experience of placing children was examined as a basis for developing criteria which will be proposed as useful in future cases of child placement determination. This researcher investigated foster home and treatment group home placements which are the two foster family care options available to the court studied. A review of the annual reports from the five years covered in this study indicated that the highest rate of placement failures occurred in these options.

These same records revealed that between 88-94% of the male delinquents placed at the Youth Camp successfully completed the goals of the program and were removed according to the treatment plan established by the child's probation officer. Of the 142 boys discharged from the Youth Camp during the period studied, only 12 were counted as failures, i.e., removed from the camp because of the
child's disruptive behavior. Considering a success rate of this magnitude, there was little need to try to identify variables which differentiated successful versus unsuccessful placements at the Camp. The minimal number of "failed placements" obviously precludes a meaningful comparison between the two groups of children.

The first problem addressed by this investigator was to identify which factors related to: (a) the nature of the delinquent's offense, (b) characteristics of the natural parents and family, (c) characteristics of the delinquent youth, (d) characteristics of the treatment program, and (e) characteristics of the probation officer are significantly associated with placement outcomes for delinquent youth in a foster family home or a treatment group home. A second problem was to examine the foster home and the treatment group home samples separately to determine if there are different variables associated with the outcome of foster home placements as compared with placement outcomes in the treatment group home program.

A review of selected literature indicated that there are few empirical studies which have attempted to specify variables which differentiate successful versus unsuccessful foster care placements of delinquents. The majority of studies regarding delinquents have

1 The Youth Camp was included in the survey of probation officers completed for this study (see Appendices A–J) at the request of the in-service training committee of the court studied. Results of the survey were used in training sessions for probation officers and placement staffs.
examined placements in institutions rather than foster family care or group homes. The theoretical literature, on the other hand, identifies a wide variety of factors associated with delinquency in general, but remains rather general with regard to recommendations for out-of-home placements. This suggested that a comprehensive, exploratory research approach aimed at including a wide variety of potentially predictive variables would be most heuristic.

There is a growing body of literature in the field of juvenile justice related to case classification and decision support models (Baird, Storrs & Connelly, 1984; Brundage, 1984; Chein, 1976; National Center for Juvenile Justice [NCJJ], 1984; Smith, Black & Weit, 1980). The basic assumption underlying the development of these models has been explained by Baird et al. (1984) as follows:

Not all offenders require the same level of supervision or exhibit the same problems; therefore, most experienced probation and aftercare officers utilize an intuitive system of classifying offenders into different treatment and surveillance modes usually based on their judgments of client needs and their perception of the client's potential for continued unlawful behavior. (p. 5-6)

Two major trends affecting juvenile courts nationwide are creating a particularly strong need for improved methods of classification and management of juvenile offenders. These are an increasing pressure for control versus treatment of delinquents and a pressure for lower costs without sacrificing the effectiveness of correctional programs. It is clear that a given classification, or risk assessment, instrument may not predict accurately on an individual basis given the multiple factors related to recidivism that are specific to each case. Baird et al. (1984) found, though, that "several risk
assessment instruments have demonstrated reasonably accurate estimates for aggregate populations" (p. 11) yielding information which is extremely valuable and can be used to help allocate agency resources to work with subsets of the offender population identified as more likely to recidivate or fail in placement. The current research draws upon classification instruments developed in other court jurisdictions and extends the model to the area of foster family care in particular.

The forty-one variables included in the study were identified through two sources: (1) a review of the relevant literature, and (2) a survey of probation officers employed at the court which was studied. The final list of variables is grouped into five major categories:

1. Nature of the problem(s) leading to placement request: for example, number and seriousness of current offense(s), past criminal record of youth.

2. Characteristics of the natural parents and family: for example, parenting skills, quality of parent-child relationships, parents' desire to have child home.

3. Characteristics of the delinquent youth: for example, age, sex, race, school behavior and achievement, degree of aggressive behavior by child, child's attitude about remaining home.

4. Characteristics of treatment program: for example, rapport of the foster parents with the court, competency of foster parents.

5. Characteristics of probation officer: for example, contact and rapport building with natural and foster parents and youth.
The complete list of variables can be found in the Research Questions section of this chapter. The operational definitions are described in Chapter 3. The problem, then, was to identify which of these variables are significantly associated with the outcomes of foster care placements of juvenile delinquents.

Rationale for the Study

A central assumption of the investigator was that if and when a child is removed from the home of his/her parents, the overriding goal in all but the most serious cases is to prepare that child for the eventual return to his or her own family. This emphasizes the need to identify those features that can be most effectively used to place the child in a setting which will meet his/her needs and achieve the goal of return to the family. To the extent that factors which influence the worker's clinical judgments and treatment activities have been illuminated, they may help broaden the probation officer's knowledge and augment his/her intuitive judgments about placement decisions as well as improve the prognosis for successful placement.

Stone and Stone (1983), in their study of the foster placement of neglected and abused children, noted that "breakdowns, the unplanned removal of children from foster care, may be the least discussed yet most pervasive and damaging condition" (p. 11) among those discussed by authors who have drawn attention to the potential damage to a child who has been separated from biological parents and placed in foster care. As is true of neglected and abused children,
there are few if any base rate data available on the incidence of placement breakdown for juvenile delinquents.

Versluis (1964) reasoned twenty-two years ago in his study of institutional placements of delinquents that if significant differences can be distinguished between the children who successfully complete a court-ordered placement and those who do not:

conceivably, this could be an additional aid which might be influential in saving a child from experiencing another failure, the probation officer from some needless effort, and the court from some needless expense. (p. 5)

His reasoning remains relevant today. Wilson and Prentice-Dunn (1981) reminded us that in spite of the problems inherent in clinical predictions, "prognostic statements are continually made, either explicitly or implicitly" (p. 123) whenever placement decisions are made. To the extent that objective variables have been found for use in those prognostic statements, this research will have value for not only the court under study, but possibly other juvenile courts as well.

Significance of the Study

During the five years which were covered in this study, 1980-1984, approximately 300 children were placed in foster homes and 170 youth were placed in treatment group homes in this particular jurisdiction. A review of the Annual Reports (Kent County Juvenile Court, 1980-1984) of those years indicated that between 31-57% of the children placed in foster care were not returned to their natural families but "went to other court ordered out-of-home placements" (1983,
Discussions with the court director and coordinators of the Treatment Group Home program indicate their concern about failures in this program also.

Increased ability to differentiate the appropriateness of a given placement based on reliable and objective factors which might also help predict placement success will be of tremendous value to probation officers and the court. The effective implementation of any placement program depends on the professional's ability to make accurate discriminations and prognostications at the critical point of intake. Prentice-Dunn, Wilson, and Lyman (1981) highlighted the need for research which illuminates pre-treatment factors and components of treatment in evaluating treatment outcomes. They pointed out a major significance of such research which is applicable to the current study:

Neither clients nor treatments are unitary phenomena, individual differences in both must be assessed and utilized in statistical and decision-making models. . . As measures of outcome and treatment elements are refined and as replications with larger samples are conducted, the external validity of such results should improve. Both individual treatment programs and the child intervention research literature might benefit from the increased use of a research model in which measures of client characteristics, treatment components, and treatment outcome are continually refined and their interrelationships assessed. (p. 190-197)

None of the variables included in this study are new to anyone who has worked in the juvenile justice system. As Brundage (1984) concluded about a study of similar research design regarding juvenile recidivism in the Calhoun County (Michigan) Juvenile Court, the value of this type of research is found in identifying specific combinations of variables which may be weighted and applied to each case to
yield a probability of recidivism, or placement failure. If a child can thus be maintained in foster care through the support of more intensive services, perhaps subsequent placement in an institutional setting with its potentially greater negative consequences for the youth (Sarri, 1981) can be avoided.

The results of this study may contribute to the theoretical base used in a number of areas such as individual assessment, the impact of family dynamics on individual children, and the role of school experiences in the treatment of juvenile delinquents. Factors which were studied were drawn from various levels of data, for example, individual, family, and institutional or social. The hypotheses included may lend support to or question at least some of the theoretical propositions often cited in the recommendations for particular placements. For example, aggressive, acting-out youth who have not developed internalized control over their impulses and who have limited interpersonal skills and inadequate coping skills when under stress are, theoretically, best suited for placement in an institutional setting which offers greater external controls over the youth. One would expect this type of youth to experience greater difficulties at home, in school, and possibly be a more frequent law violator. These variables, among others, were included in the study to examine their relationship to successful outcome in foster family care.
Research Questions

The major research question addressed by this study was to determine whether there are variables significantly associated with the outcomes of foster care placements for juvenile delinquent youth which distinguish successful from unsuccessful placements. It was believed that there are factors related to the delinquent child, his or her natural family and the treatment providers which distinguish successful foster family and treatment group home placements from those in which the child fails to complete the treatment plan and is involved in the unplanned removal from a foster or group home. It was also believed that it might be possible to identify those variables which are most significantly related to successful placement and those which alert the probation officer that a child may be at increased risk for placement failure.

A second research question was to determine if there are different variables associated with placement outcomes in the foster family home sample as compared to outcomes in the treatment group home (TGH) sample. This question was based on differences in the programs themselves. There are two probation officers assigned full-time to provide casework services to the youth in the treatment group homes in addition to the child's probation officer who remains involved in the case. The program is designed to provide more intensive services and a more structured home environment than the regular foster care program.

When a teen is found to be appropriate for the treatment group
home (TGH) program and is placed in one of the homes, he or she becomes a vital member of the treatment team which includes the teen, the natural parent(s), the probation officer, the group home parents, and the group home caseworker. The group home parents are selected because of their experience in dealing with troubled youth and a demonstrated commitment to and concern for teens in their care. All TGH parents have prior experience as regular foster parents. The TGH program is a community-based program utilizing resources within the community to complement the individualized treatment plans which include individual and group counseling for the teen, family therapy when appropriate, and natural parent in-service meetings.

In order to ascertain the answers to the two research questions noted above, 41 predictor variables were identified for inclusion in this study to determine their relationship to the outcome of foster family and group home placements. These variables are listed below under the general categories noted on page 8. Variable 33 had to be dropped from the study because data thought to be available initially were missing from the files of the foster and group home parents. Variables marked with an asterisk (*) indicate that they were identified by probation officers in the survey completed for this study as important to consider when making recommendations for out-of-home placement of delinquent youth.

**Predictor Variables Included In Study**

**Nature of Problem(s) Leading to Placement Request**

*1. Seriousness of current offense(s) (i.e., offenses leading to
the court hearing at which foster placement was ordered).

*2. Number of current offenses (leading to foster placement).

*3. Past criminal record of the delinquent child.

Characteristics of Natural Parents and Family

*4. Quality of the parent-child relationship.

*5. Parents' ability to set limits and establish reasonable rules for their children.

*6. Parents' ability to enforce consequences for rule violations by their children.

*7. Parent's ability to provide adequate supervision.

*8. Parents' ability to accept responsibility for handling problems.

*9. Past physical/sexual abuse or neglect of the delinquent child. (see Appendix K for definition and discussion of child abuse and neglect)

*10. Current physical/sexual abuse or neglect of the delinquent child. (see Appendix K for definition of child abuse and neglect)

*11. Cooperation of parents with treatment plan of the court prior to placement of their child in foster care.

*12. Parents' desire to have their child remain at home with them.

*13. History of interpersonal problems in the family.

14. Parental visiting with their child during the first two months of foster care placement.
Characteristics of the Delinquent Youth

15. Age of the child at time of placement.
16. Race of the child.
17. Sex of the child.
18. School behavior.
19. School achievement.
*20. School truancy during most recent nine months of school prior to foster placement.
*21. Cooperation of the child with parents prior to foster care.
*22. Compliance of the child with rules in the parents' home.
*23. Child's cooperation with the treatment plan prior to placement in foster care.
*24. Degree of aggressive behavior by the child.
*25. Degree of impulsive behavior by the child.
*26. Child's attitude about remaining home with his/her parents.
*27. Child's ability to form relationships with adults in authority.
28. Child's relationship with peers.
29. Drug/chemical abuse by the child.
30. Alcohol abuse by the child.
*31. Child's ability to accept responsibility for problems.
Characteristics of the Treatment Program

32. Rapport between foster/group home parents and the court staff.
33. Competency of foster parents.
34. Ability and motivation of foster mother.
*35. Input of probation officer in treatment planning and intervention.
*36. Daily behavioral problems in the foster home dealt with effectively.
37. Placement in the recommended versus an "available" home.

Characteristics of Probation Officer

38. Degree of contact, active rapport building and energy expended by the probation officer (PO) with the child's natural family.
39. Degree of contact, active rapport building and energy expended by the PO with the foster parents.
40. Degree of contact, active rapport building and energy expended by the PO with the treatment group home parents.
41. Degree of contact, active rapport building and energy expended by the PO with the delinquent child.

Definition of Terms

Before proceeding further, it is necessary that several terms be defined.
Juvenile delinquency. A delinquent is considered a child under the age of 17 years who is referred to the court for violation of a city, state, or federal law including status offenses, misdemeanors, and/or felony offenses, on whom a legal petition is filed, and who is adjudicated a delinquent and made a temporary ward of the court.

Status offense. Acts that are considered illegal only if committed by a juvenile, for example, running away from home, incorrigibility (refusal to obey the lawful and reasonable commands of his/her parents), or school truancy.

Felony offense. Offenses that would be punishable by a year or more in a state prison if the offender was an adult.

Misdemeanor offense. Those law violations not included in the above definitions of status and felony offenses.

Regular foster home. Private homes in the community licensed and supervised by the juvenile court to be used "when in the court's judgement, a youngster can be more adequately cared for, guided, and controlled in a family setting other than his or her own home" (Annual Report, 1983, p. 21). This is substitute care in a family setting for a planned period of time (Kadushin, 1980). Generally only one foster child is placed with a family at any given time.

Treatment group home. A community-based specialized foster home that is owned by the foster parents who contract with the court to provide care for two to six youngsters who would otherwise probably be placed in institutional settings. Each group home caseworker has the primary responsibility of supervising the operation of three or four homes, developing individual treatment plans, and providing
individual, group and family counseling as needed. The probation officer provides additional support, but is not the primary worker.

Limitations of the Study

The sample for this study consisted of case records of children selected from a juvenile court located in a mixed urban-rural area of western lower Michigan. Case records from the years 1980-1984 of delinquent youth who were removed from an initial foster home or treatment group home placement comprised the population from which the sample was drawn. The initial limitation of the study related to the degree of clarity and thoroughness of the records essential for the reliable classification of placement success or failure. The completeness of the records was crucial to the identification of specific factors leading to the recommendation for a particular placement. Incompleteness of a majority of data on the various forms or the absence of forms from particular files necessitated removal from the study of any case that could not be fully coded. The availability of records was another determinant of whether the potential total number of children identified for inclusion in the study could be accounted for and whether the incidence of initial out-of-home placements could be identified for the years which were included in the study.

It was expected and found that the case notes completed by probation officers would vary in the inclusion of relevant data. Cohn (1963), for example, in his study of probation officers' recommendations to the juvenile court judge, found that case records
tended to omit "the more subjective, broader criteria: the various personal relationships in the family, the personalities of the parents and especially of the child" (p. 274). In a similar vein, case records varied in the degree to which probation officers documented the amount of contact and time spent on individual cases. A code indicating missing data was included for each variable to account for this "missing" information. This raises a general question of validity: To what degree did the recorder (probation officer) actually do what was stated in the case record?

An issue related to the clarity and thoroughness of the case records is the manner in which variables were coded for this study. Coding variables through a review of case files involves making judgments of others' judgments. There is no reason to assume that the judgments of probation officers are similar across all the staff members of the court studied. The reason to use these judgments is clear though: "Kids get placed on them." The probation officers' supervisors and the judges use these written data to make judgments affecting the placement of youth on a daily basis.

The availability of various placement options and the finances to place children are limited in general, but for any given child, they may be very limited. Recommended placements are not always available when a child is ordered into placement necessitating the use of other choices which may not meet the needs of the child as fully. Another issue of validity, then, was the degree to which the probation officer changed recommendations, that is, made a specific recommendation because it was the only placement available at a given
time, not necessarily because it was considered the "best" placement for a particular child. Attempts were made to control for this variable by coding recommended versus actual placements in all cases.

The correlational design of this study presents a limitation in and of itself in that correlation does not indicate causation. But while factors identified as significantly related to outcome cannot be said to specifically "cause" that outcome, the results may certainly point to causality. These factors can then be used in future research which tests causal statements regarding outcome.

The issue of inter-rater reliability was controlled for by having this researcher alone code all the cases which were reviewed in this study. Any bias present in the ratings, then, will be in the same direction for all cases. Data used as a basis for the ratings will be available for review of their validity.

Finally, the youth included in such a sample may have characteristics dissimilar from other delinquent youth and will not represent a true random sample. This will, therefore, limit the generalizability of any findings. These limitations will undoubtedly leave many questions unanswered. This study, though, represents an initial effort in the area of predicting the outcome of foster placement for delinquent youth.

**Summary**

This research was proposed to determine if there are identifiable factors which distinguish children who successfully adjust to and complete a court-ordered foster family or treatment group home
placement from those who fail to do so. The outcomes of foster care placements involving delinquent youth placed in foster family homes or treatment group homes by a juvenile court in a west Michigan county were investigated.

It has been noted that little evidence is available regarding the actual process involved in making placement decisions concerning foster care for delinquent youth. There are few studies which have tried to explore the complex relationships between pre-treatment variables of the child, components of the treatment program and outcome of treatment with delinquents. Significant savings in the psychological, social and financial costs of placement failures may be possible through refining the assessment procedures by identifying specific variables related to successful foster care placements.

Chapter II will include a brief review of the history and environmental context within which the juvenile court operates. Various theories of delinquency will be considered before studies relating to the variables included in this dissertation are reviewed.

Chapter III will describe the research method used in this study. The survey of the probation staff will be described more fully. Case selection and review will be described as will the instrument which was used in the review of the case files. Operational definitions of the variables will be explained.

Chapter IV will describe the analysis of the data and summarize significant findings.

Chapter V will discuss the implication of these findings and suggest directions for further research.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to determine if there are identifiable factors which distinguish children who successfully adjust to and complete a court-ordered foster family or treatment group home placement from those who fail to do so. Cognizant of the psychological, social and legal variables which restrain and shape not only the decisions of the juvenile court, but also the behavior and responses of youth and their families who become the subjects of those decisions, this investigator examined factors related to: (a) the nature of the delinquent's offense, (b) characteristics of the delinquent child's natural parents and family, (c) characteristics of the delinquent youth, (d) characteristics of the treatment program, and (e) characteristics of the probation officer. More specifically, the purpose was to identify which factors, from among those commonly cited in the literature and/or rated important by probation officers, are most significantly related to successful foster home and treatment group home placement outcomes.

This review of the literature will begin with a description of the conceptual framework of the study. A brief history of the juvenile court and the environmental context within which it operates will follow. A review of common definitions of delinquency and current statistics will help delimit the "Who" and "How much" of delinquency and identify in a very broad way, the children subject to
possible placement by the court. A brief review of recent theories of delinquency will begin to illuminate the various factors which are associated with delinquency and must be considered in the treatment of delinquents. This will lead to a discussion of the need for placing some delinquents outside of their parents' homes and the difficulties inherent in this process. Finally, a review of several studies will identify variables related to the out-of-home placement of children.

Conceptual Framework

The juvenile court can be viewed from a number of perspectives (Isenstadt & Sarri, 1976). For example, it is an organization through which juveniles are processed subject to the constraints of various groups in its external environment. As is typical of many organizations, a given court can be characterized by identifiable patterns of case processing. Numerous studies (Dannefer & Schutt, 1982; Lewis, 1982; Paquin, 1977; Smith, Black, & Weit, 1980) have attempted to highlight these kinds of patterns in various courts. As an institution, it also contains organizational and structural variables which can be studied to understand their affect on case processing. This study focused on one aspect of the court's operation, the placement of delinquent youth in foster care—either regular foster family homes or more specialized treatment group homes. More specifically, the outcomes of those placements have been examined.

The above perspectives recognize that the court and its foster homes are not unitary phenomena. It must also be understood that
neither are the youth and families subject to its jurisdiction. Placement decisions and outcomes are affected by factors identified through all of the perspectives just noted. It is evident, therefore, that no single focus of observation is sufficient to encompass all of the complex and multidimensional components involved in the successful placement of children in foster care.

For the adjudicated delinquent, the juvenile court becomes a member of his/her "holding environment" (Davis & Wallbridge, 1981) in a very significant way. The child's psychosocial development now includes his or her relationship to an institution with the authority to make decisions with far reaching consequences for the child's life. To understand this process, a theoretical framework should be able to account for the interaction of the various elements within this system including the court, foster homes, the delinquent child and his or her natural parents. An investigation of these components may be limited in its scope through practical restraints, but by considering the interaction of variables chosen, a beginning can be made to understand how they combine and contribute to treatment goals.

The constructive-developmental theory of Kegan (1982) acknowledges the psychological and the social, but realizes "the distinction between the personal or psychological and the political or social is quite arbitrary, the inheritance of theories too narrowly drawn in their root metaphors" (p. 215). Kegan asserted that "meaning-constitutive evolutionary activity gives rise to both" (p. 215). The evolutionary activity Kegan described represents a process through
which the child, within the context of expanding "holding environments" (Davis & Wallbridge, 1981), gradually, and in identifiable ways, elaborates distinctions between him/herself and a world which is granted ever increasing autonomy and integrity. Kegan explored the ways in which the various holding environments, for example, the family, the school, peers, may either facilitate or hinder the child's development. Of particular importance for the adjudicated delinquent is the manner in which the court becomes involved in this process.

A developmental framework has been employed for this study which draws on concepts of object-relations theory, (Davis & Wallbridge, 1981; Guntrip, 1961; Kegan, 1982), and concepts from family systems and cybernetic theories (Bateson, 1979; Hoffman, 1981; Reiss, 1981). The notion of interaction is a major concept in these theoretical approaches. It is implicit in a central conviction of object relations theorists, "that personality development occurs in the context of interaction between the organism and the environment, rather than through the internal processes of maturation alone" (Kegan, 1982, p. 7). A systems perspective is useful to gain a cross sectional view of the individual at a given point in this process. Following Millon (1981), the personality of the developing individual may be interpreted "as being functional or dysfunctional depending on its efficiency and stability within the context of interpersonal, familial, and other social dynamics" (p. 64).

Systems theories also recognize the importance of understanding how different levels of systems interact. For example, Hoffman
(1981) explored the process of "triangulation" in which one family member, often a child, deflects tension and conflict between two other family members, often parents, through behaviors which draw attention to the child who is then defined as "sick" or "bad". This process provides an opportunity for the parents "to mask their differences by focusing on a child" (p. 151) for whom they can show enormous concern. Scheflen (1981) also took a systemic perspective in exploring how societal "lore" and definitions of schizophrenia can interact with institutional, familial, and individual factors to exacerbate and maintain the "illness" of an individual.

Regarding delinquency, it is suggested that various "levels" (Scheflen, 1981) of systems interact also in its etiology and treatment. The individual delinquent, the family, the juvenile court, and their environment are all part of the process. The interaction of variables from these "levels" is strongly influenced by "feedback processes" (Hoffman, 1981) which maintain constancy, pattern, and regularity between these individual members and their system, creating a "context" (Bateson, 1979) which confers meaning to given types of action for the individuals involved.

In this sense the organism and environment can be seen as a unified field, two interacting aspects of a whole. Our understanding of one aspect is extended when we consider the ways it is connected to and complements the other parts with which it forms a whole. By focusing on a variety of factors from different levels, it is hoped that additional information can be learned regarding the way in which these variables interact in the placement of children in foster care.
A Brief History of the Juvenile Court

Until the late 19th century, juveniles were tried and sentenced according to the standards of the adult criminal courts. Following the establishment of the juvenile court system, and the adoption of juvenile codes by the various states in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, broad guidelines which varied from state to state were established concerning what constituted acceptable and unacceptable juvenile behavior. Ryan (1981) noted that there was "no uniformly accepted definition of juvenile delinquency, and no common pattern of dealing with delinquent cases" (p. 1) for many years following the creation of the juvenile court system.

Lewis (1982) quoted a report from 1899 by a Committee of the Chicago Bar Association which described the parental role of the then newly established juvenile court. The report asserted that juvenile court law proposed a plan whereby a child may be treated as a ward of the state and given the kind of care and custody that should have been given by the parents. The initial philosophy of the juvenile court, and one that has prevailed over the years, is that the delinquent child should not be treated as a criminal, or legally charged with a crime. As we shall see, this fundamental philosophy of the juvenile court of viewing the delinquent "not as a criminal but as a person requiring care, education and protection ... not thought of as a bad man who should be punished but as an erring sick child who needs help" (Thomas v. United States, 1941), is being strongly criticized and challenged today.
The philosophy of "personalized and individualized justice" (Lewis, 1982) has been a conceptual foundation of the court. Harms (1955) stated it succinctly in discussing the treatment of juvenile delinquents: "The individual situation demands individual solution. The delinquent youth as an individual will always demand individual attention" (p. 8). Others, though, have criticized the institutional abuse and neglect of the juvenile justice system, and horror stories abound of children psychologically and physically damaged by the institutions designed to protect and help them. As early as 1949, Tappan (1949) took the "state" to task. According to Tappan:

The presumption is commonly adopted that since the state has determined to protect and save its wards, it will do no injury to them through its diverse officials, so that these children need no due process protection against injury. Several exposures to court; a jail remand of days, weeks, or even months; a long period in a correctional school with young thieves, muggers, and murderers--these can do no conceivable harm if the state's purpose be beneficial and procedure be "chancery"! Children are adjudicated in this way every day without visible manifestations of due process. They are incarcerated. They become adult criminals, too, in thankless disregard of the state's good intentions as "parens patriae." (p. 348-349)

Perhaps partly as a result of such criticism, the system began to change. Children brought before the juvenile court are now entitled to due process. The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (cited in Ryan, 1981) called for the coordination of all federal delinquency prevention and treatment programs. Juvenile justice legislation also provided "substantial incentives to states for deinstitutionalization of selected classes of offenders, for avoidance of jails, and for the development of community-based programs" (Sarri, 1981, p. 36). Many courts took the mandate of this legisla-
tion to heart, developing a variety of foster family care and "in-home" options to relieve the crowding of detention centers and the financial burden of placing delinquent children in institutions. As noted above, the Treatment Group Home Program at the court under study was developed in 1977 as an alternative to institutional placements of delinquent youth.

Environmental Context and Criticisms

"The character of the justice system is critically shaped by the attitudes and behavior of local communities. They can escalate or alleviate the problems of this system" (Sarri, 1981, p. 37). With this statement, Rosemary Sarri summarized a predominant source of influence, whether direct or indirect, on probation officers who are faced with the task of placing delinquent youth who can not remain in the home of their parents. Neighborhood groups, for example, can and have brought considerable pressure to bear regarding the disposition of cases in juvenile court. Media can focus national as well as local attention on issues regarding the courts handling of various offenses. Sarri (1981) elaborated further by reviewing data from various national studies on delinquency which suggested that "where social class, race, and educational differences are great, there tends to be less tolerance for community-based programs and more punitive responses by social control mechanisms" (p. 44).

A central focus of community influence revolves around issues of "treatment" versus punishment for juvenile offenders. Heckman, Gold and Ruhland (1983) pointed out that since the turn of the century,
the "deterrence approach to justice has gradually been replaced with the rehabilitative model" (p. 3). The underlying assumption which guided this change was that people commit crimes because of psychological or emotional illness which, if cured, will result in cessation of criminal behavior (Shawver & Sanders, 1977; Silber, 1974). From about World War II to the 1970s "rehabilitation" of the offender was acknowledged to be a major goal of corrections according to Sarri (1981) despite the fact that treatment programs were often underfunded and understaffed.

As a part of this movement toward rehabilitation, incarceration in closed institutions was gradually deemphasized, especially for juveniles. In recent years, and for reasons which are not yet fully understood, there has been a reversal in philosophy and a rather dramatic shift toward devaluation of rehabilitation and greater use of incarceration (primarily of adults). Sarri (1981) reasoned that perhaps this reflects the "American proclivity for superficial solutions to problems rather than consistent longterm strategies" (p. 31). She pointed out that concepts such as "decriminalization" and "diversion" are viewed as key program philosophies almost simultaneously with concepts such as "punishment", "deterrence" and "retribution" with little, if any, attention given to the fundamental contradiction implied by these contrasting paths.

Within this climate of contrasting ideologies, rehabilitation versus incarceration, the guiding principle of a juvenile court adjusting dispositions to the needs of the child, determined, in part, by a variety of diagnostic procedures, is coming under increas-
ing challenge. Czajkoski (1982) pointed to the "woeful uncertainty of the diagnostic procedures available" (p. 52) as a source of this criticism as well as philosophical arguments relating to what is often called "psychiatric justice". He went on to argue that confidentiality of juvenile proceedings, designed to protect the child from "debilitating stigma and self-fulfilling labels", fails to do this, evidenced in part by the frequent need to change the titles we give delinquents. It may also indirectly distort the child's self-concept in the area of accountability by protecting him/her from the incremental sanctions imposed by the corrections system.

This proposition receives at least some support from a study by Heckman et al. (1983). Using current data from the FBI Uniform Crime Reports and self-report data on adolescent delinquent behavior from an earlier study by Gold and Reimer (1975), they compared the criminal behavior of 17 year olds in states where these youth are considered juveniles versus states which treat 17 year olds as adults. They sought to determine whether "juvenile court leniency was encouraging (or not deterring) crime" (p. 4).

They reasoned that young people who know that they will be treated as juveniles rather than subjected to the punishment of the adult court system will be more likely to engage in crime than will their age-mates in states who are considered, and treated by criminal justice systems, as adults. The findings confirmed that 17 year olds are more likely to break the law in states where they are considered juveniles than where they are treated as adults. It was concluded that "general deterrence works where the threat of formal judicial
response is credible [emphasis original]" (p. 5).

It might be tempting to conclude that treatment programs have no place in the criminal justice system and reason about all delinquents as McMicking (1982) did about violent offenders that "perhaps now is the time in our lives not to look at these juvenile criminals as children in need of help, but more correctly as criminals in need of punishment" (p. 53). Before doing so, we should recall Shawver and Sanders' (1977) conclusion that "rehabilitation has not failed; social scientists have failed to specify the conditions under which it might have a chance to work" (p. 434). There is ample evidence suggesting that community-based programs can be at least as effective as institutional programs (Sarri, 1981).

The controversy about juveniles who commit violent crimes has not escaped the attention of juvenile court judges across the nation. In a recent report prepared for the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges (1984), the Metropolitan Court Judges Committee stated:

Among the most hotly debated and volatile issues addressed within the criticisms leveled at the juvenile and family courts in recent years has been the handling and treatment of the most serious juvenile offenders. (p. 1)

They also pointed out a fact overlooked by many others who decry the "rise" in violent juvenile crime that "only about 5% of juvenile delinquency adjudication in this country involves what has been labeled the 'serious violent offender'" (p. 1).

The report by the judges included 38 recommendations for dealing with the serious offender. Of relevance to this study are four recommendations which confirm both the traditional philosophy of the
juvenile court and recognize recent criticism. The recommendations are:

1. Serious Juvenile Offenders Should Be Held Accountable By the Courts
2. Individualized Treatment Should Be Considered for Every Juvenile
3. Rehabilitation Should Be a Primary Goal of the Juvenile Court
4. Social Investigations [a thorough diagnostic assessment] Should Be Used for Individualized Treatment. (p. 3)

The fundamental philosophy of the juvenile court and some of the pressures it faces from various groups within its environment have been considered. These restraints can affect the processing of cases through the court and the treatment planning of probation officers. In particular, the court must consider the seriousness of the crime and the community's need for protection and demand for punishment as well as the psychological, educational and social needs of the child when making recommendations for family foster care.

Delinquency: Who Does it and How Much

Definitions of Delinquency

It was noted earlier that there are several perspectives from which one can view the juvenile court. The same is true when attempting to define delinquency. Authors take a number of perspectives from primarily legal, to social or psychological. Jenkins (1955), commenting on the confusion related to defining delinquency, observed that it related to a tendency at that time:

to treat delinquency as though it were an entity resident within the personality of the delinquent. This is related to a failure to recognize that the patterns of behavior which the law lumps
together under the title delinquency, have little universally in common except their illegality. (p. 9)

Harms (1955), a contemporary of Jenkins, placed juvenile delinquency within a context that produces as well as defines delinquency. He stated "we are not individuals in the very real sense, but we are inter-woven into a dozen different systems of a collective social character" (p. 6). Youth born into such a world, according to Harms and many others with an interactional view, are as dependent upon what is around them as what is in them. Sabatino (1973) writing almost 20 years later contrasted the social and psychological perspectives. He stated that the delinquent child may be viewed in two ways. "First . . . as a member of and responding to a society or peer group; and secondly . . . as a person alienated from a given culture and possessing certain observable traits and characteristics" (p. 2). A sample of definitions will be reviewed below which focus primarily on one or another of these perspectives.

Legal perspective.

Verssluis (1964) and Ryan (1981) offered similar definitions which focus primarily on the legal aspect of delinquency. They each considered delinquency to be behavior which violates a local, state, or federal law. Verssluis (1964), whose study used a sample of adolescent boys placed in institutions by a juvenile court, narrowed his definition to a focus which is typically described as "official delinquency." Gold and Mann (1984) defined this type of delinquency as "that small subset of delinquent behaviors whose perpetrators are
apprehended by the police and recorded in the juvenile justice sys-
tem's records" (p. 10). Zawitz (1983) provided a general definition
of crime which would include delinquency. She defined crime as "all
behaviors and acts for which a society provides formally sanctioned
punishment" (p. 2).

Psychological perspective.

Schulman's (1955) definition reflects a psychoanalytic formula-
tion. He regarded delinquent behavior "as an adjustment effort
utilizing dissocial activity as a means of either avoiding anxiety or
keeping it at a minimum" (p. 35). While focusing on the psychologi-
cal origin of delinquency, he recognized it as a "social problem." Gold and Mann (1984) contrasted "official delinquency" with delin-
quent behavior. They offered a phenomenological definition of delin-
quent behavior as "the deliberate commission by a juvenile of an act
he knows [emphasis added] is a violation of the juvenile code which
if apprehended may result in judicial response" (p. 9). Defining
delinquency from the point of view of the actor is consistent with
the constructive-developmental approach discussed earlier. It allows
one to pay attention to the way a youngster defines his/her world
while at the same time recognizing that he/she is also defining a
relationship to that world. It is at once psychological and social,
personal and political.

Social perspective.

Harms' (1955) is the only definition offered, but it is empha-
sized that many prominent sociologists have written numerous volumes on the social determinants of delinquency. Harms stated very broadly that "delinquency is the reaction of our youth to the environmental conditions in which we force them to live and develop" (p. 5). While certainly not offered as a specific definition, Harms does convey the flavor of social definitions regarding delinquency.

In conclusion to this section, it must be emphasized again that research on the delinquent, his peer group, and the community in which he lives indicates that sociological and psychological factors all may be determinants of delinquency behavior. A number of researchers have found higher concentrations of delinquency in high-risk neighborhoods, yet as Sabatino (1973) revealed, those same researchers have sometimes found that "even brothers in the same family may differ considerably in regards to their respect for social values" (p. 16). A minister, policeman, and criminal may all come from the same family. The masculine pronouns and examples have been used specifically to illustrate a characteristic of juvenile delinquency research and theory. It has tended to focus on boys largely to the exclusion of girls. Theories have described primarily the male experience and involvement in crime. More will be said about this later.

A definition based on "official delinquency" was used in this study to delimit the sample of youth placed in foster family care. By sampling a wide variety of variables, elements of the psychological and social perspective were included also.
Predicting Delinquency

The Gluecks (Glueck & Glueck, 1934, 1950, 1970) are well known for their pioneering efforts to identify variables which might be used to alert professionals to the potential for later delinquency in young children. They reviewed several studies which have considered variables from the macro-cultural through the social, interpersonal, situational, physical, and intrapsychic levels in attempting to construct typologies of delinquents. In their own work they included factors related to social organization, delinquent subcultures, family organization, personality factors, and constitutional factors. They eventually narrowed the most significant factors predictive of later delinquency to five variables related to social background; "1. Discipline of Boy by Father, 2. Supervision of Boy by Mother, 3. Affection of Father for Boy, 4. Affection of Mother for Boy, and, 5. Cohesiveness of family" (Glueck & Glueck, 1950, p. 261).

Variations of these variables have been included in this study, (#4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 21, 22, and 26). They obviously could not be measured in the same ways that the Gluecks used since this study reviewed past case records and personal interviews were not possible. It is believed that the definitions of variables employed for the case reviews permitted the reliable identification of relevant information in the files. (Appendix L includes the variable definitions and a sample of verbatim statements from case files illustrating how the statements were rated.)

A very interesting finding, related to the prediction of later
problems in young children, was reported by Cowen, Pederson, Babigian, Izzo, and Trost (1973). In their study of early elementary children, "red-tagged" through a variety of ratings as vulnerable to later psychological problems, they found that "the ratings of 8-9 year-old peers best predicted later psychiatric difficulty (far more so than teachers, for example)" (p. 444-445). Their data suggested that young children identify troubled peers early and that the ones so identified are, in some way, aware of these perceptions.

Kegan (1982) eloquently described the importance of peers who form the "holding environment" for the school age child in the "Imperial Balance" of his developmental sequence. The child who is unready to take his/her place in this "culture of embeddedness" or who does not "fit in" is at great risk as the results of Cowen and his colleagues seem to bear out. While peer rating is not a variable that can be tapped directly for this study, we will return to it later under the discussion of Gold and Mann's (1984) theory relating school failure to delinquency.

The Statistical Picture

The statistics on juvenile delinquency are revealing, but also potentially misleading. With delinquency statistics, as is true of adult crime reporting, it is commonly acknowledged that reported crimes are only a portion of committed crimes, and those crimes leading to prosecution of the offender represent an even smaller number. On the other hand, a major difference between juvenile and adult offenders "is the importance of gang membership and the
tendency of youth to engage in group criminal activity" (Cantwell, 1983, p. 33). This can lead to an over-estimation of delinquent crime in relation to adult crime because several youngsters may be arrested for the same crime in contrast to the typically solo adult offender.

Rather than trying to report a variety of statistics which become complicated very quickly by varying with the type of reporting system and the category of offense, general statements supported by data in the 1983 Report to the Nation on Crime and Justice (Zawitz, 1983) will summarize the role of youth in crime. As is the case with adult offenders, juvenile delinquents are predominantly male. However, because of the important role played by status offenders in juvenile crime, the male/female disparity is not quite so strong (Cantwell, 1983).

Girls are much more likely to be detained and placed in an institution for status offenses than are boys. Datesman and Scarpitti (1975) concluded that the larger proportion of broken homes among female delinquents reported in most previous studies appears to represent the greater involvement of girls in running away, truancy, ungovernability and sexual misbehavior. It may be that running away and ungovernability are primarily reactions to a confused home situation, though this may vary according to race of the girl.

In contrast to status offenses, approximately 80% of the individuals referred to juvenile courts for violent personal crimes or serious property crimes are male. Of those referred for violent crimes or serious property offenses, approximately 50% are 15 years
of age or younger and have had at least one previous referral. While youth under age 15 made up 23% of the U.S. population in 1980, they accounted for only 5% of the arrests for violent crimes and 14% of property crime arrests in 1981 (Cantwell, 1983). Property crime arrests are more typical of youthful offenders, peaking at age 16 and dropping in half by age 20. Violent crime arrests, on the other hand, tend to peak at age 18.

Cantwell (1983) noted the similarity between serious juvenile offenders and adult felons because the subclass of chronic violent juvenile offenders, while small, is characterized by a strong probability of progression from serious juvenile to serious adult criminal careers. Serious juvenile offenders are predominately male, disproportionately black and Hispanic as compared to their proportion of the population, typically disadvantaged economically, likely to exhibit interpersonal difficulties and behavior problems both in school and on the job, and often come from one-parent families with a high degree of conflict, instability, and inadequate supervision. All of this makes it unlikely that they are good candidates for foster family care when subject to removal from their parent’s home. But, again, statistics talk about probabilities related to groups, not the assessment of individual delinquents.

In terms of trends in crime, the arrest rate for youths age 10-17 years rose sharply during the 1960s, but leveled off after 1974. However, between 1972 and 1981, arrests increased for violent and property crime for youth under age 18. The increases were smaller, though, than for persons over age 18—31% vs. 66% for violent crimes,
and 22% vs. 112% for serious property crimes.

Leonard (1982) reported data from studies that show no significant change during the 5-year period from 1967-1972 in per capita frequency of offenses among girls. She went on to show that violent crime among females in general "has barely changed" in the 25 years preceding 1979. Females show a greater proportion of arrests than in the past, but the increase is almost entirely within serious property crimes, particularly larceny-theft.

In summary, one can conclude that the typical delinquent is more likely to be a male, except for status offenders where the percentages are almost evenly divided between the sexes. Among status offenders, girls are more likely to be placed outside of their parents' homes than boys and, in cases involving placement, to be ordered into institutional settings more frequently than foster family settings. The violent juvenile offender and the chronic repeat offender again are predominantly male, but this represents a small subclass of youth who come before the court even though this group accounts for a large percentage of the crimes. In regard to foster care placements, the relatively rare violent offender is unlikely to be placed in a foster family home (Lewis, 1982). The fact that female status and sex offenders are over-represented in institutions suggests a low probability of successful foster care placement, a tendency on the part of courts to use more severe sanctions for these girls, or a combination of both the factors.
Theories of Delinquency

As noted above, the evidence from various studies strongly suggests that delinquency may be the consequence of a multitude of factors (Wertlieb, 1982). Before briefly reviewing various theories of delinquency, it is necessary to acknowledge two over-riding points. Sabatino (1973) described the state of our theoretical knowledge regarding delinquency which appears as valid today as it did 13 years ago. He stated:

The fact is, however, that we do not presently possess comprehensive knowledge of the causes of delinquency . . . or any good notion why children in given families respond negatively to the child-rearing practices and attitudes they experience in [their] homes. . . . Certainly, there is no single theory which offers the [emphasis original] answer. (p. 4)

While acknowledging that no comprehensive theory exists to explain crime and delinquency, Eileen Leonard (1982) made a much more telling criticism of theoretical criminology. Observing that the major theories in criminology have been "constructed by men, about men," she stated:

Theoretical criminology, carefully criticized, illustrates the blindness of social science regarding women, elucidates another example of sexism, and can make us more attuned to the position of women in a society that allows such oversights to exist and persist. (p. xiii)

Leonard is in agreement with other criminologists (Datesman, Scarpitti, & Stephenson, 1975) and with a growing number of feminist psychologists (Gilligan, 1982a, 1982b; Miller, 1976) when she pointed out "that our theories are not the general explanations of human behavior they claim to be, but rather the particular understandings of male behavior" (1982, p. xii).
Women are typically non-criminal. The share of arrests that are of females is below 13% in all Uniform Crime Report (UCR) Index Crime categories except larceny-theft where women account for 29% of the arrests made (Cantwell, 1983). In light of this fact and the inherent bias of current theories, Datesman et al. (1975) suggested that the study of female delinquency "requires, first of all, an understanding of the female role as it is embedded in the social structures" (p. 121). Leonard (1982) adds that a theory is needed which can delineate the structural and cultural factors that account for both sex roles and crime and does not simply view female crime, like so many past theories have done, as simply the result of sex roles.

Certainly one facet of understanding the female role is the description of female development and the feminine view of the world provided by Gilligan (1982a, 1982b). Women, according to Gilligan, are much more likely to view the world as comprised of "relationships" rather than people standing alone. Conflict is likely to be mediated personally, through an "ethic of care" and within the context of relationships. Males, on the other hand, have traditionally followed an impersonal model of conflict resolution wherein conflict is mediated through a system of logic and law.

It was noted earlier that Datesman and Scarpitti (1975) suggested a link between the higher incidence of broken homes among female delinquents, as compared to their male counterparts, with the finding that a higher percentage of girls who become delinquent wards of the court are typically involved in status offenses rather than criminal offenses. If, in fact, running away and ungovernability are
primarily reactions to a confused and/or conflictual home situation for a majority of these delinquent girls, then Gilligan's thesis is particularly relevant. It may be that the girl who understands her world in terms of relationships and mediates conflict with others primarily through those relationships is particularly at risk when her most important relationships, the family, are broken or severely conflicted. Further research is needed to explore the significance of family conflict as a determinant of female delinquency in general and whether there is a difference in the family histories of girls involved in status offenses versus other criminal offenses.

Through the bias of theories oriented to the male experience, women's emphasis on relationship has been too often treated as "dependency" with the attendant negative connotations attributed to female biology rather than the limitations of the theory. In a like manner, theoretical criminology has too often "explained" female patterns of crime as emerging from individual female characteristics rooted in her "nature." Questions of economic, social, or political impact can then be largely avoided because, by definition, to remedy female crime one must deal with individual adjustment.

This rather lengthy introduction serves to emphasize that none of the current theories of delinquency are complete and that most, if not all, of them are subject to an inherent limitation in conceptualization which may detract from their usefulness in explaining female crime and delinquency. Sabatino (1973) suggested that a patchwork of theories exist to explain the personal and social causes of delinquency. His categories form a basis for the review which follows.
Genetic Transmission Theories

Early naturalistic criminologists believed in inherited criminology or degeneracy, contending that behavior is biologically determined (Glueck & Glueck, 1934; Lombroso & Ferrero, 1900). This idea implied that social functioning, including criminal behavior, is dictated by physical structure. Lombroso, for example, claimed that certain male and a smaller number of female criminals are "born" with an inclination toward crime and are marked by certain physical deficiencies. The Gluecks included a number of physical traits among those they investigated for possible prediction of delinquency. This idea held for approximately two decades before being replaced by various other concepts.

Bad Parents Theory

Most criminologists have attributed delinquency, at least in part, to a lack of parental guidance and discipline (Glueck & Glueck, 1950, 1970; Harms, 1955; Williams, 1955). This factor was also identified by probation officers and rated as important to consider when making treatment plans for delinquent youth. Research has consistently shown a higher incidence of unstable homes among delinquents than non-delinquents. The emotional "distance" and personal disorganization of these homes often provides the least opportunity for the development of a firm super-ego and stable patterns of impulse control. In Kegan's (1982) terms, the delinquent child frequently will experience difficulty negotiating the transitions
between the Impulsive, Imperial, and Interpersonal stages. They are likely to act out impulsively, view the world as there to meet their needs only, and experience difficulty with interpersonal relationships.

Cantwell (1983) cautioned that while turbulent home life, lack of family ties, and poor education are often found in the backgrounds of delinquents, "these factors may or may not contribute to crime" (p. 37). It is obvious that most persons who have these experiences in their background are not criminal. This leads again to the conclusion that most likely several variables interact to produce delinquency and influence the delinquent's behavior, even after contact with the juvenile justice system.

The Economic Pressure Theory

Since most delinquent children are from poor, inner city families living in deteriorated or transitional neighborhoods, their delinquency is seen as being directly related to poverty, housing, and associated family conditions. Alex Inkeles, of Harvard University, writing in the forward of the Gluecks' (1970) text, stated that sociologists, especially those from "The Chicago School," "demonstrated the extraordinary concentration of delinquents in areas of the city in transition from residence to industry; areas characterized by various forms of social disorganization" (p. v).

Sarbin and Jones (1955) agreed that there is an association between residence, poverty and crime, but concluded that most residents of deteriorated neighborhoods don't become delinquent. Leonard
(1982) drew the same conclusion about women, especially mothers heading single-parent households who frequently live at or near poverty levels, in poor housing, and in high crime areas. The vast majority of these women do not turn to crime. Racial, economic, and social characteristics are important, but obviously do not tell the whole story.

The Delinquent Gang Theory

This theory emphasizes association with "bad boys" as a factor leading many children into delinquency. Since these gangs are generally made up of boys, this theory does not have as much application to the etiology of delinquency in girls. The argument of this theory is that social values of the gang serve to unbalance and replace the value structure of the larger society.

Jenkins and his colleagues (Jenkins, 1955, 1968; Jenkins & Boyer, 1967/68; Jenkins & Hewitt, 1944) developed a typology of delinquents which has received a favorable response in the literature and "seems to have the most solid empirical support at this time" (Gold & Mann, 1984, p. 27). Jenkins described one type as the "socialized delinquent." This is a young man who was typically given an adequate fundamental socialization by his mother. But as a result of the father's failure to provide needed support and supervision, and pressures from peers, this youth becomes "the pseudo-social boy—the loyal gang member, the good comrade of a delinquent subculture" (Jenkins & Hewitt, 1944, p. 88). The gang member is usually socialized and "adjusted" within his own group. It is only in relation to
the larger society that he can be considered maladaptive and anti-social.

The Bad Boy Theory

Grouped under this broad category are a variety of approaches such as the studies by the Gluecks and Jenkins which sought to develop typologies based on distinguishing characteristics of the delinquent youth. Other psychological studies have generally taken a psychodynamic approach. What emerges is a picture describing the delinquent child in one of two major ways. The "pseudo-social gang member" has been described above. His delinquent behavior is generally thought of as an adaptive response supported by the active social sanction of others (Jenkins, 1955). The other variation is described as the "unsocialized aggressive delinquent" (Jenkins, 1955), the "individual delinquent" (Korner, 1963), or the "antisocial" delinquent (Saklofske & Eysenck, 1980).

Common characteristics of the second type of delinquent include; an extremely low frustration tolerance, little ego strength with which to absorb disappointment, inadequate techniques of impulse control, a relative absence of guilt and an inability to profit by experience, restlessness and dissatisfaction, and an inability to concentrate in school. Several of these characteristics were identified by the probation officers participating in the survey conducted for this study. They were included among the variables tested in the present study to determine their relationship to foster care outcome.
Labeling Theory

This can be seen as a variation of the "bad boy" theory. A basic assumption is that children tend to role play within the expectations of their parents, teachers, and friends. If repeatedly told that they are bad, punished frequently, and provided positive reinforcements for certain acts, children may incorporate such a view of self and attempt to actualize or fulfill the role placed upon them.

Hill (1977) discussed the social meaning of deviance noting that it is critical for maintaining social cohesion and highlighting the desirable stereotypes, rules, and norms of a society's traditions. The deviant individual or group is pointed out as an example to a society's members of what not to become. There is also a link between deviance and power which is applicable to delinquency.

Hill stated that "those groups dominating the key positions in major institutions are best situated to disseminate . . . their versions of morality and immorality" (p. 420). The dominant group then uses various strategies to discredit competing views of the subordinate groups. Labeling theory has received much criticism as an explanation for crime, but Erikson (1980) explained a psychological cost which may result from such a process. The members of a suppressed, excluded, or exploited group, according to Erikson, may come to "unconsciously believe the evil image which they are made to represent by those who are dominant" (p. 30). At the level of the family, a child may be "scapegoated" (Hoffman, 1981) in a process which diverts attention from marital conflict. In the school, "devi-
ance" may be labeled and even maintained in a process similar to the one described next.

Recall the study by Cowen and his associates (1973) discussed earlier. They found that eight-year-old children can spot peers as "often afraid," "gets angry over nothing," etc. These peer ratings were found to have the strongest predictive value for later psychological problems in those children so identified. This implies that these peers may have behaved toward the "red-tagged" children with such perceptions in mind and will continue to do so. If peers so type and behave toward already vulnerable youngsters, a deviation amplifying process (Scheflen, 1981) is in motion whereby the identified ones may become increasingly isolated and "tagged" by their cohorts. As the child grows older, more and more is expected of him or her by family, then by the school and neighborhood. The deviance may amplify and early difficulties may be exacerbated increasing the probability of later, more severe problems. Such a process has particular relevance for the schools, a place where delinquent children often have found failure.

The School's Fault Theory

It has long been recognized that the overwhelming majority of delinquents have school problems. At one level this theory considers schools to have failed to teach appropriate values to children. Gold and Mann (1984) posited a more profound explanation for the role that schools may unwittingly play in damaging a child's self-esteem which may, in turn, lead to the development of delinquency. No other
institution in the life of the elementary aged child is in a position to label the child a "failure" like the school can (Glasser, 1969). Wertlieb (1982) pointed out the disastrous effects of a negative school experience. Gold saw this kind of experience as the source of the external realities which threaten a young person's self-esteem. Delinquent behavior is hypothesized by Gold and Mann to be defensive in that it "provides a way of avoiding, neutralizing, or counter-acting situations which endanger self-esteem (1984. p. 5).

Kegan (1982) is also instructive of the significance that schools and peers have for the child in the Imperial stage of his model (roughly the years from 7-12). The child at this stage achieves, for better or worse, "a more or less consistent notion of a me, what I am (as opposed to the earlier sense of self, that I am, and the later sense of self, who I am)" (p. 89). The kind of learning which becomes central during the primary grades "is the learning to go [emphasis original] to school, learning to live in a world of rules and roles" (p. 163).

With the capacity to take command of one's impulses, the school age child realizes "I now have something to do with what happens." Kegan emphasizes the school's importance by explaining that its sensitivity to the shame of a child's failure, especially public failure, at this age is responding to an "ultimate issue--a matter that impacts the child's very disposition toward the life project" (p. 166). The child who fails at this age, when his or her peers are so crucial to culturing further development--and so cruel to those not up to the task--is, indeed, at risk for further problems.
The history and philosophy of the juvenile court, influenced by the opinion and emotion of those in its external environment, have been considered. Various definitions of juvenile delinquency have been reviewed to illustrate the multi-determined nature of this problem—at once both psychological and social. A summary of several current theories has begun to suggest the variables which should be included in a study regarding foster care placements of delinquents. A more specific focus on the process of assessment and decision-making regarding those placements and the studies which have examined variables relevant to their success will be presented next.

The Placement Process

Whether the court chooses to focus on the delinquent behavior subject to its sanctions, the individual juvenile before the bench, or his/her social background, a suitable disposition is still required. Konopka (1962) and Martin, Pozdnjakoff and Wilding (1976) are among many who acknowledge that some families and communities are dangerous or destructive places for children to be or are inadequately prepared to deal with disturbed children and, therefore, should not be the placement ordered by the disposition of the court. This conclusion is supported by data from a study on the group care of children and the development of moral judgement. Timm (1980) reported results which suggest that mistreatment by parents may be more detrimental to the moral growth of some children than separation from those parents. Other reasons often given for placement outside the natural parents' home include; the child's behavior presents problems
which the family or community can no longer cope with, other types of
treatment have been tried and failed, and some type of residential
treatment is seen as the only remaining alternative (Wurtele, Wilson,
& Prentice-Dunn, 1983).

The decision to remove a child from his/her home is rarely a
clear matter. Briar (1963) admitted that "next to nothing" is known
about the process through which the child-placement worker arrives at
these decisions. Once a decision is made to place a child, the task
of developing a treatment plan and placement recommendation does not
get easier. There remains to be established empirically validated
criteria which establish a clear pattern of relationship between pre-
admission client characteristics and treatment outcome which would
suggest what kind of foster care is most beneficial for what type of
child (Briar, 1963; Kirgan, 1983; Meddin, 1984; Prentice-Dunn, Wil-
son, & Lyman, 1981; Simone, 1985).

Without this kind of information, placement decisions are too
often based, as Meddin (1984) noted, on "emotion or intuition" and
made in "an environment filled with uncertainty and heavily laden
with value judgements" (p. 368). Mayer, Richman, and Balcerzak
(1977) reached a similar conclusion in their study of the group care
of children noting that:

since there are no clear lines denoting which children belong in
foster homes and which in institutions, the decisions are more
often based on value judgements or ideologies rather than scient-
tific knowledge and conceptualized experience. (p. 161)

A major goal of the evaluation and placement of delinquent
children should be to determine the most appropriate setting that
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will provide a continuity of care best suited to each child's needs while also respecting the needs of the community for protection from delinquency. Kadushin (1980), summarized this process in stating:

the actual placement of a child involves the selection of a particular home from the pool of acceptable homes. It requires the individualization of the complementary needs and strengths of a particular child needing placement and a particular home selected to accept this child. (p. 375)

In contrast to this ideal, Simone (1985) noted that within the juvenile justice system during the 1970's and early 1980's, when the emphasis was on reform and community placements:

Much of the attention directed at who should go into community-based programs has been focused on the nature of the offense committed (status offense, "non-violent" offense, etc.). Relatively little attention has been paid to the offenders themselves, particularly after they get into the programs; once the initial sorting is out of the way, reform efforts seem to stop. (p. 358)

She went on to hypothesize about the probable next step for children placed in "open" foster family or group home settings primarily because they are status or "non-violent" offenders. These youngsters have characteristically responded to their problems by running away from them. "It is logical to assume that ... [they] might respond to problems they experience in open group homes by running away from these also" (p. 358). The significance of this hypothesis, demonstrated by Simone's study, was her finding that "if the case went [back] to court, the most frequently used disposition of the judges following failure [in a group home placement] was a more restrictive placement" (p. 360).

The child welfare literature is suggestive of guidelines for placing children in foster homes or institutions recommending, for
example, that the "acting out" child often will need the controls, limits and structure of the institution. Younger children, and those able to form a relationship with "surrogate" parents are often considered appropriate candidates for foster home placement (Kadushin, 1980; Konopka, 1962). Wilson and Prentice-Dunn (1981) explained that the low reliability of traditional diagnostic schemes makes this determination difficult. The major problem in these diagnostic procedures is the frequent "reliance on vague, non-operationalized constructs with rather tenuous relationship to specific treatment strategies or outcomes" (p. 123). They argued for research designs which identify specific variables related to the pre-treatment characteristics of the child and family and well defined treatment procedures which can be analyzed to identify variables most strongly related to successful outcome in various placements.

In reality, placement decisions are often dependent on the availability of placement resources, or worse yet, the race, gender, or socio-economic status of the youth (Sarri, 1981). National surveys indicate a "profound variability among and within states in terms of the characteristics of staff, of the youth who were clients, and the types of programs that were available" (p. 39).

With the above issues in mind, a review of variables commonly identified as criteria for placement decisions or related to successful outcomes of treatments is presented next. These will be grouped in the categories identified earlier in listing the factors to be included in this study.

It will be evident that most of the studies cited did not exam-
ine foster family placements of delinquents specifically. Smith and his colleagues (1980) presented a review of the literature regarding case disposition and classification in the juvenile justice system which helps explain this. Their literature search took a broad approach "aimed at finding those apparent factors that influence the processing and labeling of juveniles within the official system" (p. v) from initial police dispositions through the institutional placement of children. The majority of studies located focused on the initial stages of the system, "the arrest through court disposition components" (p. 205). In contrast, they noted that "there were very few studies located on how decisions are made about processing juveniles in and out of the correctional component of the juvenile justice system" (p. 205). For the most part studies of this stage have examined placements in various institutional settings as was noted above. These findings may still be helpful, though, in identifying the kinds of variables commonly considered by courts in their processing of delinquent youth.

**Variables Related to Placement Outcome**

Some of the studies to be reported used various rating scales to measure behavioral or personality characteristics of the child and/or parent. A word of caution regarding the global type of scale, a single dimensional scale which provides a global rating of the overall disturbance of an individual, is in order. A scale frequently used for such purposes is the Global Assessment Scale (GAS) (Spitzer, Gibbon, & Endicott, 1973). The GAS is chosen because it is regarded
as the best instrument of its kind. Results of Dekker's study (1983/1984) cast doubt on the validity of the GAS and, therefore, raise a similar question for other global rating scales as well. Dekker's data suggested that "the GAS has unacceptably low validity for making judgements about individuals [in terms of severity of disturbance] on the basis of GAS scores" (p. 112).

Rather than rely on global ratings of individuals, a number of specific variables were identified for inclusion in this study following the approach of Brundage (1984), Prentice-Dunn et al. (1981), Stone and Stone (1981), Wilson et al. (1981), and Wurtele et al. (1983).

Nature of the Problem(s) Leading to Placement

Baird, Storrs, and Connelly (1984) reviewed studies related to the classification of juveniles in terms of the likelihood of recidivism, or the commission of new offenses. Several risk assessment instruments have been developed for this purpose. They concluded that the more successful scales tend to be quite similar and "provide reasonably accurate estimates for aggregate populations" (p. 11). An instrument reported by Brundage (1984), for example, was used to classify juveniles as high, medium or low risk for recidivism. Correct predictions were obtained in "73.7 percent of the cases ... in the high probability group ... [and] on the other end of the scale where a low probability of recidivism was predicted, 82.6 percent of the cases were correctly predicted not to recidivate" (p. 18). According to Brundage, the model correctly predicted "65.1 percent of
Baird et al. (1984) concluded:

Based on all of the information reviewed, the following elements seem universally predictive of continued criminal involvement for juveniles:

1. Age at first adjudication
2. Prior criminal behavior (a combined measure of the number and severity of priors)
3. Number of prior commitments to juvenile facilities
4. Drug/chemical abuse
5. Alcohol abuse
6. Family relationships (parental control)
7. School problems

Lewis (1982), in her study of the institutional placement of delinquents, found that past criminal record was the most potent variable in decisions affecting the offender's placement among a secure camp, open camp, or private facility. Smith et al. (1980) concluded from their review of the literature that "without question, the existence of a prior record is related to the severity of the disposition" (p. 162). In a situation where choices involved "discharge, probation, or institutional recommendation," Cohn (1963, p. 263) found that the seriousness of the delinquent act took on a secondary significance as compared to the probation officer's assessment of family relationships, but that it was still an item of consideration.

These studies demonstrate the consideration given by probation officers to a youth's past involvement in crime. This was confirmed by the selection of this variable by probation officers surveyed for this study. The relevance of these variables for outcome of foster family placements remains to be determined.
Characteristics of the Parents and Natural Family

Delagah (1963), Fanshel (1976), Krona (1980), and Prentice-Dunn et al. (1981) are among those who have identified parental involvement as significantly related to the success of treatment and permanence of therapeutic change, and as likely to provide the child with greater emotional support. Fanshel (1976) and Prentice-Dunn et al. (1981) reported results showing that parental visiting pattern proved to be a fairly strong predictor of return home and post-discharge adaptation.

Briar's (1963) study lends support to the ratings obtained from probation officers indicating that the natural parents' attitudes regarding placement of their child can affect the decision regarding which type of placement to recommend. Paquin (1977) found that probation officers' evaluation of parental characteristics and of the child's school behavior were most powerfully and consistently related to the severity of handling cases and placement decision at the Upstate County Family Court. The importance of an "evaluation of the mother" was also reported by Fanshel (1976) as an important variable for predicting discharge of children from foster care.

Results from the Gluecks' studies (1950, 1970) have already been noted showing the "supervision of the boy" by mother and father to be a significant predictor of future delinquency. Stone and Stone (1983) found that chronicity of problems in the family was related to placement outcomes with more acute problems associated with successful foster care experiences for younger, neglected and/or abused chil-
dren. The parents' ability to establish and enforce reasonable limits on their child's behavior and the "history of problems in the family" were items that probation officers agreed were important to the decision regarding type of placement recommendation.

**Characteristics of the Delinquent Youth**

Prentice-Dunn et al. (1981) reviewed several studies which suggested that "age at admission" is a critical factor in children's adjustment to residential treatment with younger children showing greater improvement. They reason that problems are less likely to be firmly established in younger children who are also less likely to have been involved in previous treatment.

These findings pertain to a sample of predominantly non-delinquents as do many others reported in the literature about foster children. This raises a question related to generalizability of findings and, in this case, make the findings on age questionable. As Versluis (1964) noted, children referred to the court for delinquency have often been involved in and "failed" various community treatment programs. As a rule they are older than the average neglected/abused child placed in foster care for the first time. For example, Stone and Stone (1983) reported the average age of their sample to be "eight years and nine months." It is highly unlikely, though not impossible, that youngsters of this age will be referred to the juvenile court on charges of delinquency. Though it was not identified as an important variable in the probation officer survey, "age at time of placement" was included to determine is there is a
significant relationship between age and successful foster family placement of delinquent children.

Paquin (1977) found no evidence of processing discrimination by sex, age, race, or socio-economic status in his review of 224 youth, including males and females, status offenders and delinquents, referred to a family court in Upstate County New York. This finding is supported by Lewis (1982) whose results disputed the hypothesis that a lower-class person will receive harsher punishment than his middle or upper-class counterpart. Dannefer and Schutt (1982) tested two sources of bias in the processing of cases by social agencies; 1) characteristics and procedural constraints of the agency, and 2) characteristics of their social environments. Their findings indicate that "racial bias is more apparent in police dispositions than in judicial decisions" and that the bias of police "may be compensated for, to some extent, by the courts" (p. 1113).

It was noted earlier that national surveys have identified wide variability among states regarding the number of resources available for youth and in the placement practices regarding children and adolescents. The studies noted above, while not related to outcome of care, suggest that many courts at least are not likely to base placement decisions solely on gender or racial characteristics. It remains important to determine if sex, age, and race are related to outcome of foster family care for delinquents.

What was found to be significantly related to handling and placement decisions, according to Paquin (1977), was the "youngster's support systems," his or her home and school situation in particular.
This was evident to the degree that some youth referred for serious crimes, but who had strong support systems, received less severe sanction than other youth appearing in court on less serious charges, but without similar family or environmental supports.

Sarri (1981) reported conflicting data regarding the significance of gender. She stated that "females were disproportionately processed for status offenses, and had a higher probability of being committed to an institution regardless of the offense for which they were adjudicated" (p. 42). Sex of the child will be included as a variable in this study since there are no clear findings on gender differences reported regarding delinquents in foster or group homes.

The degree of aggressive behavior is consistently found to be related to foster care success with children whose behavior is more aggressive likely to experience more failure and replacement (Fanshel, 1976; Pardeck, 1984; Stone & Stone, 1983).

Problem behaviors in school are also consistently related to foster care failure and recidivism of juvenile delinquents in general (Brundage, 1984; Pardeck, 1984; Stone & Stone, 1983). Gold and Mann (1984) suggested that "scholastic failure seems to provoke delinquent behavior not so much because of its implications for success in our society but rather because of the current distress that it arouses" (p. 24). This finding is supported by McKelvy (1977) in her survey of high school seniors which suggested that more immediate measures of success such as grades are important to high school students rather than anticipated goals or expectations of future attainment.
Characteristics of the Caseworker and Treatment Program

Stone and Stone (1983) reported that the variable most strongly related to the successful outcome of foster placement for children in their sample was the degree of contact, active rapport building, and energy expended by the caseworker.

Of particular interest to a study involving delinquent wards of the court is a finding reported by Bastien and Aldeman (1984). In contrast to what they expected, there was no significant correlation between the degree of compulsory referral and any measures of treatment attitude and progress employed in their study of court-referred vs. non-mandated clients in a residential treatment program. It seems reasonable to hypothesize in light of these two findings that a probation officer who is actively involved in developing rapport with the child and family on his/her caseload and working closely with foster parents can expect progress in treatment in spite of the compulsory nature of court-ordered foster placements.

Stone and Stone (1983) found that the foster parents' rapport with the agency, their level of competence, and the foster mother's motivation were related to successful outcome. This has direct importance for the court's interaction with its foster homes. In particular, it should alert professionals of a possible tendency to over-use "good" homes because they are successful and the foster parents easy to relate to. It also underlines the necessity of developing good relationships with the foster parents and providing them training and support.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

This research was designed to investigate the outcomes of court-ordered placements involving delinquent youth placed by a juvenile court in two community-based foster care programs. Factors were identified which appear to contribute to placement breakdowns, the unplanned removal of children from care, in regular foster family homes and a more specialized group home program. It was hypothesized that the results would lead to the identification of reliable and objective factors which distinguish children who are successful in foster care placement from those who fail to adjust to such placements and who are subject to the unplanned removal from their initial court-ordered placement.

It was noted on page five that there is not a standardized assessment instrument that can evaluate all the variables within the child, family, and environmental situation which must be considered in determining the appropriate out-of-home placement for delinquent youth. Therefore, a juvenile court's past experience in placing children was used as a basis for developing predictive criteria which may be used in future cases to help determine where a child should be placed.

Several variables were identified through a survey of probation officers employed at a juvenile court in a west Michigan county as most pertinent to foster care placement recommendation and outcome.
These variables and others identified through a review of the literature were included in the study to determine which are most strongly associated with foster placement outcome and can be used in a regression equation to predict that outcome.

Sample Selection

The sample for the study consisted of the case records of children who had been adjudicated delinquent wards of the juvenile court, who were removed from their parents' homes by the court, and whose first out-of-home placement as delinquents occurred in a foster care setting. Records were selected in which: (a) removal of the child from his or her natural parents' home was required due to the delinquency or other problems of the youth or severe conflict between the youth and parents, (b) placement was in a court-operated foster family home or treatment group home, and (c) the case could be clearly identified as a successful or failed foster/group home placement. Cases considered eligible for inclusion in the study included those youth who finished their placement, as either successful or failed, in a foster family or treatment group home placement during the five years from 1980 through 1984.

The total sample size was 233 case records of children placed in foster family and treatment group homes. There were 132 cases in the foster family sample and 101 cases in the treatment group home sample.

An initial review of court records identified 161 youth as having been ordered into a foster family home for their first out-of-
home placement as a delinquent during the target years. Further examination of the records led to the elimination of 29 cases from
the foster family sample for various reasons. There were 18 files which were unavailable for review and coding due to being lost,
expunged or incomplete. An additional 10 youth were found to have had previous out-of-home placements as delinquent wards of the court.
One child's record was eliminated from the study because removal from
the foster home was found to have occurred in 1985 rather than one of
the target years. Elimination of these records resulted in a sample
size of 132 case records for the foster home sample.

These 132 youth represented approximately one half of the total
number of foster family placements made by the court during the
target years. The remainder of the foster home placements involved
delinquent youth who had been in a previous court-ordered out-of-home
placement prior to their move into foster family care. This study
did not address the effect of prior out-of-home placement on foster
family or treatment group home placement outcome if the prior place-
ment occurred when the youth was a delinquent ward of the court.
Youth who had been subject to removal from their parents' homes as
neglect wards of the court, though, were included in the study be-
cause these placements typically occurred several years prior to the
youth entering the delinquency system and represent important assess-
ment information for a "new" worker and service delivery system to
be aware of.

The goal of the study was to identify variables associated with
the outcome of initial delinquency placements to assist probation
officers in the difficult task of recommending appropriate first-time placements. The deleterious effect of a placement failure on subsequent placements and recidivism in general is well documented (Block & Libowitz, 1983) and the intent is not to minimize this variable. There is a clear need, however, to examine factors related to the successful and failed outcomes of initial court-ordered foster care placements of delinquent youth to begin building more systematic assessment tools which may be used in the future to refine placement recommendation and, perhaps, lessen the occurrence of placement failure.

Approximately 125 children whose first out-of-home placement as a delinquent court ward in the target years was in a court-operated treatment group home were identified through an initial review of records. Further examination led to the elimination of 23 cases. The records of five children were unavailable for review and coding due to a variety of reasons. Four children were found to have had prior out-of-home placements as delinquents. Fourteen case records were eliminated because these children were removed from treatment group home placement in 1985. Following elimination of these records, there were 101 cases included in the treatment group home sample.

**Operational Definitions**

**Criterion Variable**

The criterion variable (Kachigan, 1982) of interest was the outcome of foster or group home placement which was dichotomized as
successful or failure. Following Stone and Stone (1983), a successful placement was defined as the "continued maintenance of the child in the initially selected foster placement for a period of no less than sixty days" (p. 12). Failure was defined as the "removal of the child from the foster [or group home] within one and one-half years of placement due to (1) disruptive behavior by the child or (2) noncompliance by the natural parents with the established plan" of the juvenile court (Stone & Stone, 1983, p. 12).

A foster or group home placement was defined as successful, then, in cases where the child remained in care according to the treatment plan for 60 days or more. Children who had to be removed from care for disruptive behavior of the foster child or natural parents within 18 months were classified as failures.

Children who were removed from the placement after a period of 18 months due to disruptive behavior were not considered for this study because, as Stone and Stone (1983) suggested, a breakdown after this period of time seems to more closely resemble the disintegration of a natural family rather than a failure of foster placement. Children who were removed from placement according to the planning of the probation officer prior to 60 days were not considered for this study either since it is unlikely that a placement of such short duration is sufficient to assess the adjustment of the child.

This definition of "success" is derived, admittedly, from the point of view of the agency and not necessarily from the needs of the child. It assumes that a child was not removed from care according to the treatment plan until the child's needs were met. This assump-
tion cannot be confirmed by this study because: (a) case records often are not specific in defining the needs of the child, (b) criteria which were used as a basis for identifying the child's needs may be unclear or of questionable validity, or (c) the needs of the child were not operationalized in a way which would facilitate the determination from a review of the case record of whether they were met.

**Identification of the Predictor Variables**

The predictor variables (Kachigan, 1982) were identified through a review of the literature and a survey of the probation officers in the Court which was studied and who are involved in the actual placement and supervision of delinquent youth. The survey will be described before discussing the operational definitions of the variables.

**Survey of Probation Officers**

The survey was conducted to identify the variables which probation officers rate as most important to consider when recommending out-of-home placement. The purpose and methods of the survey were reviewed with the court director who approved and supported it. He reviewed the purpose with the staff of probation officers at the November, 1984 staff meeting and also wrote a letter to the probation officers (see Appendix A) encouraging their participation. The letter was attached to the initial research material distributed to the probation officers. The survey was comprised of two phases.

**Hypothetical case study.** In the first phase, several cases of
children who were actually placed in various treatment programs of the court were reviewed so this researcher could develop a familiarity with the way probation officers write the case reports which are submitted to the judges. These case reports were used to develop a hypothetical case report describing a 15 year old, white male referred to the court by a local police department on four counts of breaking and entering.

The first draft of the report was reviewed by the court director, a Field Department supervisor responsible for the daily supervision of the probation officers completing the survey, and a probation officer. Their comments were solicited regarding format, content, and suitability of the report for use in surveying probation officer recommendations regarding disposition of this hypothetical case. Suggestions were incorporated and the final draft was again reviewed and found acceptable (see Appendix C).

Two additional hypothetical cases involving a 16 year old black male and a 15 year old white female were developed in a similar way, but without the additional review of the above mentioned staff members (see Appendices D and E). A "Case Evaluation Form" was developed which asked the probation officers four questions regarding the hypothetical cases (see Appendix B). Question 1 asked for a simple "Yes/No" reply to the inquiry, "Do you think this child should be removed from his/her parent's home?" Item 2 was an open-ended request which asked the probation officers to, "Please list the factors considered in making your decision." Question 3 asked, "In what program would you recommend this child be placed?" Finally, item 4
again requested that probation officers, "Please list the factors considered in making your recommendation."

A packet containing the letter from the court director, the Case Evaluation Form, and the three Hypothetical Case Reports was hand delivered to each probation officer with a personal statement of appreciation for their cooperation and a brief review of the directions for the survey. Packets were distributed to 17 of the 18 probation officers (PO) who have an active case load (one PO was on extended sick leave during the time of the survey). Several supervisory and administrative personnel at the court were also given packets for their information and as a courtesy, but not asked to respond.

All of the probation officers returned the information from the first phase of the survey. The results were tabulated for each case by simply adding the number of "Yes" and "No" responses to Question 1, regarding removal of the child from the parent's home, and by listing the factors identified by the probation staff as reasons to remove the child or not. Recommendations for placement with the stated reason were also listed for each case. Summaries were prepared (see Appendices F, G, and H) and returned to the probation officers with the second phase of the survey described below.

It was expected and, therefore, not surprising that there were diverse opinions regarding whether the children described in the hypothetical cases should be removed from their parents' homes. In a similar manner, the recommendations for placement of the children covered a broad spectrum from keeping the child in his/her own home.
to placement at the court's Youth Camp. The findings of the survey were consistent with similar findings in the literature (Briar, 1963; Meddin, 1984) which revealed wide variation in placement recommendations among professionals involved in the actual placement of children in foster care homes. These differences certainly reflect variations in experience as well as numerous other factors.

The purpose of the survey was to probe the experience of probation officers in an effort to identify factors used in clinical judgments rather than to focus specifically on the variation among probation officers. With that goal in mind, phase 2 of the survey was designed to narrow the list of factors mentioned by probation officers to those agreed upon by a majority of the staff as most important to consider when making placement recommendations.

Rating the identified factors. Following completion of summaries on each hypothetical case used in phase 1, a listing of factors mentioned in the cases was constructed which grouped the variables under four separate headings: (1) nature of the problems leading to placement request, (2) characteristics of the natural parent and family, (3) characteristics of the delinquent youth, and (4) characteristics of the treatment program. This list, titled "Placement Questionnaire," included 46 factors which had been mentioned by one or more probation officers (see Appendix I). The list of factors was reviewed with members of the In-Service Training Committee at the court which includes probation officers, special program coordinators, supervisors, and administrative personnel. Their comments regarding the proposed rating of the factors, use of a Likert-type
scale, and other comments were discussed. Their responses were favorable and the committee recommended completion of phase 2 of the survey.

Copies of the "Placement Questionnaire" were distributed and the probation officers were asked to rate each factor using a Likert-type scale (Anastasi, 1976) "in terms of whether you agree or disagree that it is important to you when considering a recommendation to the three Court programs listed on the attached sheet."

The Youth Camp Program was included on the questionnaire because it had been included among the placement recommendations in phase 1 of the survey and also to gather additional information at the request of the In-service training committee for use in future staff training. As explained in chapter 1, the Youth Camp was not included in the actual study of factors related to outcome of placement. Results of the second phase of the survey, based on 14 returns out of 17, are shown in Appendix J. The final list of factors includes those rated as "5" (Strongly Agree) by at least 66% of the responding probation officers, or given a "4" or "5" (Agree or Strongly Agree) by 90% of the respondents indicating its importance in consideration when making out-of-home placement recommendations. As part of the arrangement for this research, the results will be shared with the probation staff and In-service Training Committee.

As can be noted from a comparison of the factors included in the study (pages 14-17) and those rated important by probation officers (Appendix J), not all variables rated important by the probation officers were included in the study. Probation officers made fre-
quent reference in their survey responses to the child's "personality." The difficulty in defining this term operationally and the near impossibility of assessing personality from just a review of case records precluded its use in the study. Youth placed in foster care by the court which was studied are not all given a psychological evaluation and diagnosis, so even that information with its questionable reliability and validity (Wurtele et al., 1983) would not be available on enough youth to include in the study. Other factors relating to the "flexibility" of the program, the "consistency" of the treatment program, and whether the placement provides a "family atmosphere" or "effective growth" were also too vague to include. Refinement of these concepts to the degree necessary for the development of reliable operational definitions was beyond the scope of this study.

The final list of predictor variables identified for use in the study contained 41 factors, including 23 identified through the survey of the probation officers and 18 suggested through a review of the literature (see chapter 1). As noted above, variable 33 was dropped from the study leaving 40 variables which were actually used in the data analysis.

Operational Definitions of Predictor Variables

The case records included in the study were classified as successful or unsuccessful out-of-home placements according to the criteria defined on pages 68-69. These two groups were compared on 40 variables to determine which are most strongly related to placement
outcome. The 40 variables are grouped under the five major categories identified in chapter 1 and defined as follows:

**Nature of Problem(s) Leading to Placement Request**

1. **Seriousness of Current Offense.** The severity of the crime was defined in hierarchical order from least to most serious and was coded as follows: 1 = status offenses, 2 = probation violation/minor misdemeanors (e.g., trespassing, shoplifting, etc), 3 = narcotics and drug offenses, 4 = sex offenses, 5 = property crimes (do not involve the use of threat or force against an individual, e.g., larceny, burglary, and motor vehicle theft), 6 = violent personal crimes (involving the use or threat of force against another person, e.g., homicide, rape, assault).

2. **Number of current offense(s).** This item, representing the number of crimes included in the referral leading to placement, was broken down into three categories: 1 = one offense, 2 = two offenses, 3 = three or more offenses.

3. **Past criminal record of youth.** A variation of a method developed by Lewis (1982) was used to develop an index of past criminal behavior. This was determined by examining four categories of data, namely: (1) the number of previous police contacts for status or criminal offenses reported to the court and noted in the case record, (2) the number of previous petitions filed at juvenile court, (3) the severity of the crime noted in each petition, and (4) the severity of the sanction associated with each petition. Each previous police contact that did not result in a petition being filed.
received the numerical value of the crime severity noted in Variable 1. Petitions filed received the value of the crime severity associated with each petition times the numerical value of the placement resulting from that petition. The numerical value of the placements were coded as follows: 1 = probation in the parents' home, 2 = Home Detention Program, 3 = Kentfields. The numerical values were summed with a higher total indicating a greater amount of police contacts, petitions filed, more serious crimes, and more severe sanctions. (see Appendix K, page 1 of the coding booklet, "Questionnaire for Predicting Appropriate Foster Placement")

**Characteristics of the Natural Parents and Family**

4. **Quality of parent-child relationship.** This item was separated into four categories coded as follows: 1 = very poor (e.g., frequent fighting with physical confrontations), 2 = poor (e.g., frequent verbal arguments, but no physical confrontations), 3 = good (e.g., infrequent arguments, occasional demonstrations of warmth and affection), 4 = very good (e.g., frequent expression of affection, ability to solve problems together).

5. **Parents' ability to set limits.** This item was divided into six categories representing the parent's ability to establish reasonable rules for their child in several important areas of behavior. It was coded as follows: 1 = very poor (e.g., parents do not set appropriate limits with respect to all of the following areas of the child's behavior: peers, school work, household responsibilities, personal habits, social behavior), 2 = poor (e.g., parents are
overly lenient in four of these areas), 3 = average (e.g., parents are overly lenient in three of these areas), 4 = good (e.g., parents are overly lenient in two of these areas), 5 = very good (e.g., parents are overly lenient in one area), 6 = excellent (e.g., parents are not overly lenient in any area, limitations are considered appropriate for the child's age).

Indicators of leniency were defined to include criteria such as the parents neglecting to establish any rules at all regarding one or more of the areas listed above when identified as problems for their child, statements by the probation officer indicating the parents' inability to establish clear rules and/or expectation for their children, statements from school reports or other professional reports indicating "lack of parenting skills," or similar phrases, in terms of the parents' ability to establish rules, consistent daily routines, or other means of structure for their children and the operation of the household.

6. Parents' ability to enforce consequences. This item relates to the parents' ability to enforce rules established in the areas mentioned above. It was coded as follows: 1 = very poor (e.g., parents are overly punitive and over-controlling or excessively lenient regarding consequences to rule infractions with respect to all of the following areas of the child's behavior: peers, school work, household responsibilities, personal habits, social behavior), 2 = poor (e.g., parents are overly punitive etc. in four of these areas), 3 = average (e.g., parents are overly punitive etc. in three of these areas), 4 = good (e.g., parents are overly punitive etc. in two of
these areas), 5 = very good (e.g., parents are overly punitive etc. in one of these areas), 6 = excellent (e.g., parents are not overly punitive in any area, use appropriate consequences for enforcing limits).

Indicators of excessive leniency included criteria such as: (a) the parents frequently being talked out of enforcing stated consequences by their children, "giving in"; (b) evidence of parental fear of enforcing consequences, such as fear of "losing my child's friendship", fear of a spouse's reaction or criticism to disciplinary actions; (c) statements in reports from probation officers, school officials, psychological reports, and so forth, indicating parents' failure to enforce consequences of rule violations; and (d) repeated threats without action.

Indicators of overly punitive responses included actions such as: (a) excessive "grounding" of the child, or loss of privileges, for relatively normal kinds of misbehavior, for example, grounding for a month or more for coming home 15 minutes late or for minor problems in school; (b) limiting the child from most age-appropriate activities such as school functions or interaction with peers without apparent connection to rule infractions; and (c) other disciplinary actions noted as excessive by professionals involved with the family.

7. Parents' ability to provide adequate supervision. This item is closely associated with variables five and six and represents a general rating often used by probation officers in their reports. It was divided into four categories: 1 = very poor (e.g., parents frequently absent from home, overly lenient when home, and do not
enforce the few limits they set), 2 = poor (e.g., parents occasionally absent from home without arranging proper supervision of children, and are overly lenient or excessively punitive when they do try to enforce rules), 3 = good (e.g., parents or adequate substitute usually enforce reasonable limits), 4 = very good (e.g., appropriate limits and consequences consistently enforced by parents).

8. Parents' ability to accept responsibility for problems. This item evaluated the degree of agreement between the parents that a problem with their child or in their family exists and the degree of acceptance for responsibility to handle problems. It was divided into four categories: 1 = very poor (e.g., denial of problems by parents, it's not my child's fault), 2 = poor (e.g., parents admit problems, but blame child and/or others), 3 = good (e.g., parents admit problems and accept minimal responsibility), 4 = very good (e.g., parents admit problems and accept appropriate responsibility).

9. Past physical/sexual abuse or neglect. It has long been recognized that the juvenile delinquents of today were often neglected and/or abused children when they were younger. This variable was defined as the occurrence and severity of past abuse or neglect as evident in court records or the reports of family members and was coded as follows: 1 = abuse necessitated Protective Services involvement and removal of the child from the parents' home as documented in past court records or reported by the parents or child; 2 = abuse led to Protective Service involvement, but child remained in parents' home and the family was referred for treatment; 3 = no Protective Service involvement, but past abuse reported by parents and/or child;
4 = no past physical or sexual abuse. (see Appendix K for further discussion)

10. Current physical/sexual abuse or neglect. This variable was divided into three categories: 1 = current abuse/neglect warrants Protective Services referral, 2 = evidence of some abuse according to verbal reports of family members, but Protective Services referral unnecessary, 3 = no evidence of current abuse or neglect.

11. Cooperation of parents with treatment plan. This item was defined in terms of the parent's stated agreement/disagreement with the treatment plan ordered by the court, their record of keeping/missing scheduled appointments with the probation officer and/or visits with their child, their participation in various aspects of the treatment plan, such as family therapy or parenting classes, and their observed ability to follow through with suggestions developed in meetings, counseling sessions, etc. It was divided into four categories: 1 = very poor, 2 = poor, 3 = good, 4 = very good.

12. Parents' desire to have child home. Based on the stated opinion of the parents, this variable was divided into four categories: 1 = parent(s) refusal to have child home maintained from point of petition through court hearing, 2 = initial refusal by parents, then agreement (or one parent agrees, but the other maintains refusal to have child home), 3 = parents willing to have child home, only if no alternative available, 4 = parents want child home.

13. History of problems in family. This item attempts to measure chronicity of interpersonal problems between family members based on past history of family problems indicated in court records. Cri-
teria of problems included things such as past abuse or neglect of the children by the parents, older children in family were delinquent wards of the court, marital conflicts leading to separations and/or divorce(s), or other interpersonal problems of a chronic nature reported by family members. It was divided into four categories defined as follows: 1 = problems manifested in family for more than 75% of time since this child born, 2 = problems manifested in family from 50-75% of time since this child born, 3 = problems manifested in family from 25-50% of time since this child born, 4 = problems manifested less than 25% of time since this child born.

14. Parental visiting. This variable was divided into four categories based on the number of parental visits with the child during the first two months of placement. Visits were counted on a daily basis and included: (a) parent-child visits in foster home, natural parents' home, or elsewhere, (b) family meetings with a therapist or probation officer. Visits were counted whether one or both parents visited. Visits were coded as follows: 0 = no visits, 1 = one to five visits, 2 = five to ten visits, 3 = ten or more visits.

**Characteristic of the Delinquent Youth**

15. Age at time of placement. This variable was divided into three categories: 1 = twelve (12) years old or younger, 2 = Thirteen (13) through 14 years old, 3 = fifteen (15) years or older.

16. Race. This variable was broken down into two categories: 1 = white children, 2 = non-white (minority children). Non-white
children include Blacks, Native Americans, Hispanic, and others. These races were grouped together because a preliminary review of foster care placements during the years to be studied indicated that there were very few minority children other than Blacks in either the foster home or the treatment group home samples.

17. Sex. 1 = female, 2 = male.

18. School behavior. This variable considers such things as the child's marks in "conduct areas" on report cards, school reports regarding classroom behavior, responsiveness to school disciplinary actions, and number of school suspensions within the most recent nine months of school prior to foster care placement. It was coded as follows: 1 = very poor (e.g., two or more suspensions from school, three or more times sent into school's discipline system), 2 = poor (e.g., one suspension, one or two times sent into school's discipline system), 3 = good (e.g., no suspensions, occasional problems, responds well to teacher's disciplinary actions), 4 = very good (e.g., no suspensions, no reported school behavior problems).

19. School achievement. This variable was defined in terms of whether the child has been detained and is repeating a grade, is working at grade level with no history of failing a grade, or working academically above grade level according to school reports. It was divided as follows: 1 = two years or more behind grade level, 2 = one year behind grade level, 3 = at grade level (e.g., in appropriate grade and receives average grades), 4 = working academically above grade level (e.g., in "advanced class" or according to reports of school officials).
20. **School truancy.** This item was divided into four categories based on the number of days skipped within the most recent nine months of school preceding foster care placement and the response of the school. The categories were defined as follows: 1 = excessive truancy (e.g., resulting in referral to district attendance officer, suspension from school, school transfer, or more than 21% of total school days skipped), 2 = frequent truancy (11-20% of total school days), 3 = occasional truancy (less than 10% of total school days, no referral to attendance officer), 4 = no truancy reported.

21. **Cooperation of child with parents.** This item was defined in terms of the child's willingness and actual helpfulness in daily tasks as reported by family members. Categories were defined as follows: 1 = very poor (e.g., usually refuses to help in any way), 2 = poor (e.g., frequent complaints about helping, must be asked repeatedly by parents to help), 3 = good (e.g., occasional complaints, but is usually helpful), 4 = very good (e.g., no complaints reported, helpful most of the time).

22. **Compliance of child with rules of parents.** This item was defined in terms of the child's obedience to rules established by the parents in the areas described in item 5 as reported by family members or observed by the probation officer. Categories for coding were defined as follows: 1 = very poor (e.g., refuses to obey most rules), 2 = poor (e.g., frequent defiance of most rules), 3 = good (e.g., usually follows rules with only occasional defiance reported), 4 = very good (no problems reported or observed, child cooperative and helpful most of the time).
23. Cooperation of child with treatment plan. This item was defined in terms of the child's compliance with the terms of his or her court-ordered treatment plan. It was categorized as follows: 1 = very poor (e.g., repeated and/or major violations of the court order such as felony criminal offenses while on probation), 2 = poor (e.g., frequent minor violations of court order such as occasional school truancy, a misdemeanor offense while on probation, or skipping required meetings), 3 = good (e.g., usually follows the terms of probation and participates in required meetings), 4 = very good (e.g., actively contributes in various meetings with probation officer, therapist, peer groups, etc., no probation violations).

24. Degree of aggressive behavior by child. This item was defined in terms of reported/observed aggressive behavior by the child such as fights at school, in the home, or among peers, and involvement in violent crime. Categories were defined as follows: 1 = very aggressive (e.g., frequent fights, hostile attitudes, referred for violent crimes against persons), 2 = somewhat aggressive (e.g., occasional fights, referred for destructive property crimes), 3 = no problems (e.g., appropriately assertive on most occasions), 4 = passive (e.g., frequently allows others to take advantage of him or her).

25. Degree of impulsive behavior by child. This item was defined in terms of the child's ability to delay gratification of his/her impulses when such behavior would lead to problematic consequences for the child such as school discipline, police contact, or discipline by parents. It was coded as follows: 1 = very impulsive
(e.g., usually unable to control behavior even when punishment is certain), 2 = somewhat impulsive (e.g., occasionally "acts without thinking" or consideration of probable consequences), 3 = no reported problems.

26. **Child's attitude about remaining home.** This variable was defined as the child's stated attitude about remaining home with his/her parents or behavior clearly suggestive of such opinion, for example, running away from parents' home repeatedly. It was coded as follows: 1 = child displays refusal to remain with parents; 2 = child ambivalent about remaining in parents' home, 3 = child willing to stay if no other alternatives, 4 = child wants to stay with parents.

27. **Child's relationships with adult authorities.** This item was defined in terms of the child's reticence/openness in talking with the probation officer, school personnel or other authorities, his or her cooperation in answering questions and discussing problems, the degree of spontaneity in the child's behavior, and the amount of trust displayed. Categories were defined as follows: 1 = very poor (e.g., usually refuses to talk with probation officer, police or school authorities except minimal replies to direct questions, no spontaneous discussion of issues, expresses distrust of authorities), 2 = poor (e.g., displays hesitancy in all of the above, but will talk when encouraged, occasionally shows trust through agreement with authorities to handle arrangements affecting him or herself), 3 = good (e.g., child displays openness and trust appropriate for situation, usually talks about issues/problems with the probation officer,
reports of good relationships with teachers), 4 = very good (e.g., child open and spontaneous, displays high level of trust in probation officer and other court-related personnel, will seek out advice from teachers and others on problems).

28. **Child's relationships with peers.** This item was divided into three categories defined as follows: 1 = delinquent gang member; 2 = peers are a negative influence, companions are involved in delinquent behavior, child involved in frequent fights and/or has few friends, 3 = friends provide good support and influence.

29. **Drug/chemical abuse by child.** This item was divided into three categories defined as follows: 1 = chronic abuse and/or serious disruption of functioning, 2 = occasional abuse and/or some disruption of functioning, 3 = no known use or no interference with functioning.

30. **Alcohol abuse by child.** This item was divided into three categories corresponding to those in variable 29. Alcohol abuse was listed as a separate variable because of the experience of probation officers at the court studied that some youth use or abuse either alcohol or drugs, but not both. This item was defined as follows: 1 = chronic abuse and/or serious disruption of functioning, 2 = occasional abuse and/or some disruption of functioning, 3 = no known use or no interference with functioning.

31. **Child's ability to accept responsibility for his/her behavior.** Ratings for this variable were defined as follows: 1 = very poor (e.g., child denies most problems or responsibility for his/her behavior causing problems), 2 = poor (e.g., child admits there are
problems, but denies any responsibility and blames others, school, parents, police, etc.), 3 = good (e.g., child admits there are problems and accepts some responsibility for his/her behavior that is causing problems), 4 = very good (e.g., child admits problems and accepts appropriate responsibility).

**Characteristics of Treatment Program**

32. **Rapport between foster/group home parents and court.** This item was defined in terms of the rapport between the foster parents and the court as a whole, not with a specific caseworker. It was defined as follows: 1 = very poor (e.g., chronic complaints from the foster parents about the court, probation staff, etc., frequent problems with placements including tendency by foster parents to blame others), 2 = poor (e.g., occasional problems with foster parent willingness to work cooperatively with probation staff, minimal participation in court training and/or activities), 3 = good (e.g., few problems, frequent participation in court training/activities, good cooperation with probation officers), 4 = very good (e.g., leaders in foster parent activities, demonstrated ability to work effectively as treatment team with court staff).

33. **Competency of foster parents.** This item is based on the total score obtained on the Potential for Foster Parenthood Scale (PFPS). As noted on page 14, this variable had to be dropped from the study because data initially thought to be available in foster parent files was unavailable.
34. Ability and motivation of foster mother. This item was defined as the foster mother's total score on the "ability and motivation" sub-scale of the Potential for Foster Parenthood Scale. These scores were divided into four categories for coding and analysis based on norms provided in the manual for scoring this sub-scale. Scores were coded as follows: 1 = poor: 55 or less, 2 = fair: 56-65, 3 = good: 66-75, 4 = excellent: 76.

35. Input of PO. This item was defined in terms of the degree to which the probation officer (PO) participated in treatment planning, intervention, and problem solving with the youth, foster parents, and natural parents as evidenced by case notes which define a treatment plan for the child and active involvement in carrying out that plan. It was coded as follows: 1 = none (e.g., PO had very little or no input in the development or implementation of a treatment plan, treatment goals not specified, no specific placement recommendation), 2 = minimal involvement (e.g., PO helped develop a treatment plan, but foster parents, counselors or others implement, PO remains minimally involved), 3 = frequent involvement (e.g., PO developed plan and was actively involved in its implementation through frequent meetings with the youth and family, consultation with the foster parents and school officials, etc.).

36. Daily behavioral issues dealt with effectively. This item was defined in terms of the degree to which actions were taken to handle the daily problems that arise in foster care on a timely basis versus letting lengthy time intervals elapse before action is taken. It was defined for coding as follows: 1 = very poor (e.g., frequent
problems in foster home evident but responses inadequate or ineffective to resolve problems), 2 = poor (e.g., problems in the foster home mentioned, action taken to resolve problems occasionally adequate and appropriate, but problems continue), 3 = good (e.g., problem solving attempts usually adequate, appropriate, and successful), 4 = very good (e.g., problem solving attempts are dealt with in a timely and effective manner to resolve difficulties and are most often effective and successful).

37. Actual placement in program recommended. Since the placement of a particular child occasionally depends on what homes are available, rather than what is recommended, this variable was included in an effort to control for the variance attributable to limited resources to meet a child's needs. It was coded as follows: 1 = placed as recommended, 2 = placed elsewhere than recommended, 3 = probation officer did not make specific recommendation.

Characteristics of Probation Officer

38-41. Degree of energy expended by PO. These items were defined in terms of the number of visits to the natural parents (#38), foster parents (#39), group home parents (#40), and youth (#41) respectively. These included visits at the homes, meetings at court, visits at the school, counseling sessions, and other face-to-face meetings during the first two months of placement. It also included phone calls to the respective people mentioned and conferences with other professionals about the youth or family as these were documented in the case notes. These items were coded as follows: 1 =
none, 2 = very little (e.g., one visit per month or 1-2 phone calls),
3 = occasional (e.g., 2-3 visits and 1-2 phone calls per month), 4 =
frequent (e.g., 4-5 visits per month and 3-4 additional phone calls),
5 = a great deal (e.g., more than five visits per month and five or
more additional phone calls).

38. Degree of contact, active rapport building and energy expen-
ded by PO with natural family. (see above)

39. Degree of contact, active rapport building and energy expen-
ded by PO with foster parents. (see above)

40. Degree of contact, active rapport building and energy expen-
ded by PO with treatment group home parents. (see above)

41. Degree of contact, active rapport building and energy expen-
ded by PO with delinquent youth. (see above)

Data Collection

A questionnaire, or coding booklet, was developed which included
the operational definitions in abbreviated form and brief examples of
each of the above mentioned variables. The coding booklet, titled
"Questionnaire for Predicting Appropriate Foster Placement" (see
Appendix K), served as an instrument for defining and coding the
predictor variables during the review of individual cases. This
procedure is similar to methods reported by Arbuckle and Litwack
(1960), Brundage (1984), Eaker, Allen, Gray and Heckel (1983), Heckel
and Mandell (1981), Stone and Stone (1983), Versluis (1964), Westen-
dorp and Brink (1982), and Wurtele et al. (1983) in their studies of
factors associated with various outcomes or populations. This
researcher was responsible for the review of the case records which were included in the study and the coding of all variables. The coding booklet was used to determine the numerical value coded on each variable as the individual cases were reviewed. Statements from the child's court records were compared to the operational definitions and examples of the variables in the coding booklet. For each variable, the numerical values of the statements in the coding booklet which were most similar to the statements in the file was listed on the "Answer Sheet" (see Appendix K) in the blank following the variable number.

The Potential for Foster Parenthood Scale (PFPS) was completed by the three coordinators responsible for the supervision of the homes which were included in the study. These individuals who were responsible for the initial selection and on-going training of the foster parents are in the best position to complete the survey accurately.

The coefficient alpha reliability of the PFPS as reported in the Manual by Touliatos and Lindholm (1977) was "97 [for the mothers], and the fathers, was .98" (p. 2). Items included in the Scale "were based on the Standards for Foster Family Service (Child Welfare League of America, 1959)" which relates to content validity and "insures that they are representative of the domain of characteristics that need to be measured" (p. 2). Construct validity was measured in terms of internal consistency and factor analysis. The Scale was refined from an initial 64-item list to its current 54 items through item-total correlations which were equal or greater than .40.
The factor analyses "revealed clusters or subsets of items that were consonant with the Standards for Foster Family Service" (p. 2).

**Data Analysis**

The purpose of this study was primarily the identification and delineation of variables related to the outcome of foster family care placements of youth who are delinquent wards of the juvenile court. The case records of 232 youth were reviewed. Each case was coded on 40 predictor variables and then classified as a successful or unsuccessful placement outcome based on the definitions listed above.

Data gathered on each case were entered from the handwritten "Answer Sheet" into a separate system of the computer data base system in use at the court being studied. The research modules were linked to the full data base system through a common screen, but access to the research system and its "placement data" screen was limited to this researcher and the court's computer director and programmer.

Use of the data base system allowed cross tabulations of data in various ways to insure accuracy of recording variable values. Cross tabulation matrices were developed for each predictor variable showing the total number of successful and unsuccessful cases coded at each level of the predictor variable. Each of these cross tabulations was run three times: (1) for the total sample (N = 233), (2) for the foster home sample (n = 132), and (3) for the treatment group home sample (n = 101). A printout of the numerical rankings for each case was used to check the accuracy of the data against the original
hand coded Answer Sheets prior to any data analysis. Following verification of data accuracy, a computer disk file of the data was created to facilitate data transfer to the DEC-10 computer at Western Michigan University for statistical analysis.

Stepwise multiple regression analyses were run on data from the total sample ($N = 233$), the foster home sample ($n = 132$), and the treatment group home sample ($n = 101$) to determine: (a) whether there are variables common to all youth in the sample that are significantly related to foster care placement outcomes, and (b) whether there are differences in the variables related to the outcomes of foster family home placements as compared to treatment group home placements. Prentice-Dunn et al. (1981) explain this statistical analysis as follows:

A number of predictor variables are simultaneously projected onto a criterion measure, each predictor extracting maximal variance from the criterion. By examining the regression coefficients associated with each predictor, the investigator may ascertain (a) which variables adequately predict the criterion and (b) the relative strength of the predictors in comparison to one another. (p. 89)

The interrelationships between multiple client characteristics, other important variables, and outcome are so complex that a pattern of relationship between these pre-admission characteristics and placement outcome may not be discernible unless a method is used to evaluate the individual and combined effects of multiple predictor variables on the outcome of interest. Multiple linear regression is the appropriate statistical tool in these cases.

The stepwise multiple regression procedure allows the identification of "a regression equation based on relatively few predictor
variables, yet which accounts for virtually all the variance that could be explained if we used the entire set of predictor variables" (Kachigan, 1985, p. 186). In order to generate predictive equations which would have clinical utility for the probation officer having to make placement decisions, the "post-placement" treatment program variables and those related to the probation officer were discarded. Stepwise multiple regression analyses were then performed on the remaining pre-treatment variables to identify the best combination of variables with which to predict placement. Regression equations were developed from the analyses of the foster home and treatment group home samples, as well as the total sample to determine which equation would most accurately predict outcome of care in these two settings. The regression equations were used to compare predicted outcomes with the actual outcomes of placement for randomly drawn subsets of youth in the various samples to determine the accuracy of prediction.

Two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Hopkins & Glass, 1978) was to be used to test for significant interaction of predictor variables associated with successful outcome of foster care if a particular combination of variables would require further examination. For example, sex and race were included as predictor variables as was seriousness of the offense leading to placement. If these variables were found to be significantly related to placement outcome, a two-way ANOVA would clarify if there is significant interaction between them suggesting, for example, that differences in outcome for sex or race may, in fact, be related to differences in seriousness of the offense leading to placement.
A central assumption of the investigator, which provided a rationale for this study, was that if and when a child is removed from the home of his/her parents by the juvenile court, the overriding goal in all but the most serious cases is to prepare that child for the eventual return to his or her own family. The goal of the study was to identify those factors that have the greatest utility in helping to determine what type of placement will meet the child's needs, protect the community if necessary, and achieve the goal of return to the family.

The complexity of the placement process and the need to consider the interaction of pre-treatment factors with components of treatment in the investigation of treatment outcomes led to the decision to include in this study predictor variables related to several categories of pre-placement and treatment variables. These variables are referred to as predictor variables in the sense that they may be found to co-vary with the criterion variable, outcome of foster care placement, and consequently information about them can be used to predict information about the criterion variable.

Stepwise multiple regression analyses of the data, with the .05 level of significance designated for the incremental contribution of each predictor variable, were employed to achieve the following objectives: (a) to determine whether or not a relationship exists
between the various predictor variables and the placement outcome criterion, (b) to assess the relative importance of the various predictor variables in their contribution to variance in placement outcome, (c) to describe the nature of the relationships, should they exist, in the form of a mathematical equation, and (d) to assess the degree of accuracy of description or prediction achieved by the regression equations.

This chapter will include a general description of the sample to summarize a number of characteristics regarding the youth included in this study. This will be followed by a presentation of the statistical results obtained from the analysis of the total sample and various sub-samples to identify variables significantly related to successful foster care placements. Delineation of the regression equations based on analysis of pre-treatment variables only and the assessment of their accuracy in predicting the outcome of care will conclude this chapter.

General Description of the Sample

The case records of 233 youth were reviewed for this study including 132 youth who were placed in foster family homes and 101 who were placed in treatment group homes for their first out-of-home placement as delinquent wards of the juvenile court. Table 1 presents the distribution of juvenile offenders by sex and ethnicity in foster family and treatment group homes (TGH).

As can be seen from Table 1, there were 72 youth classified as non-white representing 31% of the total sample. The non-white group
Table 1
Distribution of Youth in Foster Care Placements by Sex and Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Foster Family</th>
<th>TGH Family</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>107 (81%)</td>
<td>89 (88%)</td>
<td>196 (84%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>32 (24%)</td>
<td>27 (27%)</td>
<td>59 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>75 (57%)</td>
<td>62 (61%)</td>
<td>137 (59%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>25 (19%)</td>
<td>12 (12%)</td>
<td>37 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>11 (8%)</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>13 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>14 (11%)</td>
<td>10 (10%)</td>
<td>24 (10%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

included 60 Black youth (25.8% of the total sample), six Hispanic youth (2.6%), five Native American youth (2.2%) and one youth listed as "other." The non-white children were treated as a unitary group for the purpose of statistical analysis because of the small number of other minorities represented in the sample.

Incidence of Foster Placement Breakdown

Of the 233 case records examined, 49.8% (n = 116) of the children were withdrawn from their foster family or treatment group home placement prior to the completion of the court treatment plan. In the foster family sample, 66 of 132 children (50%) were classified as placement failures. In the treatment group home sample 50 of 101 cases (49.5%) involved placement failures. In each of the 116 cases which resulted in a placement breakdown, the reason for removal noted
in the court records was actual or reported disruptive behavior by the foster child and not interference by the natural parents.

Table 2 presents the distribution of successful and unsuccessful placements by length of time in placement for the total sample illustrating at what point placement breakdowns occurred for the youth included in this study.

Table 2
Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Placements by Length of Placement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placement Length</th>
<th>Placement Outcome</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Failed</td>
<td>Successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 30 days</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-90 days</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-181 days</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182-365 days</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366-547 days</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>548 or more days</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stone and Stone (1983) reported that in their sample of younger neglected and abused foster children, "where breakdowns occurred, they occurred in most cases within the first four weeks of placement" (p. 13). In contrast, the data from the present study reveal that 38% of the placement failures occurred after the youth had been in
placement three months with 67% of the breakdowns occurring after the first four weeks. There is a clear trend in the present data, which also was reported by Block and Libowitz (1983) and Pardeck (1984), that a child's chances of successfully completing a foster care placement increase significantly the longer he or she remains in placement.

The case records of children included in this study were divided into three age groups for coding: (1) twelve years or younger (n = 15), (2) thirteen through fourteen years (n = 95), and (3) fifteen years or older (n = 123). In each age category successful and unsuccessful placements were divided nearly equally yielding approximately a 50% (range 47-53%) failure rate for children in each category.

Table 3 presents the distribution of successful and unsuccessful foster care outcomes by sex and ethnicity. Preliminary inspection of the raw data in Table 3 prior to employment of statistical analysis revealed a number of highlights. Girls had an overall failure rate nearly three times that of successful placement outcomes. This trend was even more pronounced for non-white girls, though the small sample size precludes broad generalization of findings. On the other hand, white boys were more likely to successfully complete both foster family and treatment group home (TGH) placements while it appeared that minority boys were somewhat more likely to experience placement breakdowns overall.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Placement Outcome</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Failed</td>
<td>Successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Family Homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Group Homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variables Significantly Associated With Outcome of Foster Placement

Research Question 1

The major research question addressed by this study was to determine whether there are variables which are significantly associated with the outcome of court-ordered foster care placements.
for juvenile delinquent youth. The outcomes of foster care placements, both successful and failed, for 233 youth involved in their first out-of-home placement as delinquent wards of the juvenile court were investigated. The goal of the study was to determine which predictor variables, from among the 40 included in this study, are significantly associated with the outcome of foster care placements.

**Total Sample**

With regard to the major research question of this study, ten of the forty variables assessed were found to be significantly associated with outcome of foster care placements in general when all the youth in foster family and treatment group home placements were included in the analysis. These ten variables, their respective coefficients of correlation, and the level of significance are listed in Table 4.

As evident from Table 4, the effective management of daily behavioral problems (Variable #36) of the youth while they were in placement was most strongly associated with placement success. No other variable came close to accounting for as large a share of the variance. Variable #36 was concerned with the degree to which actions were taken on a timely and effective basis by the foster or group home parents and/or the probation officer and group home case-worker to handle daily problems of the youth versus letting time intervals of days or weeks elapse before intervening.

Two other factors related to the probation officers and foster parents were significantly associated with successful placement
Table 4

Variables Significantly Associated With Successful Foster Family and Treatment Group Home Placement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment Program Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Overall rapport between foster parents and court</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Efficacy of dealing with problems on daily basis</td>
<td>.73**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Probation Officer (PO) Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Contact, rapport building and energy expended by PO with child's bio-family</td>
<td>.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Parent/Family Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Parent's ability to enforce consequences</td>
<td>.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Parents' ability to provide adequate supervision</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delinquent Youth Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Child's race</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Child's sex</td>
<td>.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Greater cooperation with prior treatment planning</td>
<td>.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The relative absence of impulsive behavior</td>
<td>.10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Positive relationship with peers</td>
<td>.16*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aN = 233. bVariable numbers refer to order of numbering in original list (see chapter 1).

*p<.05. **p<.01.

outcome. Higher degrees of contact, rapport building and energy expended by the probation officer with the child's natural family
(Variable #38) were related to successful outcome. The overall level of rapport between the foster parents and court staff (Variable #32) was related to outcome, but correlated in a negative direction suggesting that higher levels of rapport were related to unsuccessful outcomes. The raw data reveal that foster parents rated as having "good" as well as "poor" rapport with the court had higher numbers of youth removed from their homes prior to completion of the treatment plans (i.e., classified as placement failures). On the other hand, foster parents who were rated as having the highest level of rapport with court staff, "very good", had a greater number of children successfully complete foster placements in their homes (Success = 47; Failed = 38).

These data underline the importance of positive rapport between the court and its foster and group home parents as a foundation for effective teamwork in the foster care of delinquent children. The probation officer's contacts with the natural family can be viewed as establishing, promoting and supporting the parent's role as partners in the treatment plan.

Characteristics of the delinquent youth were also related to outcome. As suggested by the raw data reviewed earlier, the sex and race of the child are important factors. The positive correlation of sex (Variable #17) with outcome indicated that boys are more likely to experience successful outcomes while the negative correlation on race (Variable #16) indicated white youth are more likely to complete foster care placements according to the treatment plan. Children who are less impulsive (Variable #25), have demonstrated more cooperation
the treatment plan prior to placement in foster care (Variable #23), and who have more positive and supportive relationships with peers (Variable #28) had the greatest likelihood of remaining in the assigned placement.

Children whose parents were more able to enforce reasonable and consistent consequences to the child's rule infractions (Variable #6) were more likely to remain in placement successfully. A related variable, the parent's ability to provide adequate supervision of their children (Variable #7), was significant but negatively correlated with outcome. The raw data for Variable #7 are presented in Table 5 to help explain the apparent contradiction between the two items related to parents.

Table 5

Distribution of Placement Outcome on Ratings of Variable 7: Parents' Ability to Provide Adequate Supervision\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Rankings</th>
<th>Placement Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>66 (28.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>43 (18.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>5 (2.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to Code(^b)</td>
<td>2 (0.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^aN = 233. \(^bIn all cases where a variable could not be coded from information in the file, a code of "9" was entered. Prior to data analysis, the 9's were replaced by the average of all other ratings for that variable.
As evident in Table 5, 90.7% of the cases in the total sample were rated as "very poor" or "poor" on Variable #7. As expected, a significantly larger percentage (28.4%) of placement breakdowns as compared to successful outcomes (22.3%) occurred among children whose parents received the lowest rating. For cases coded "poor" on Variable 7, 21.5% of the youth experienced successful outcome as compared to 18.5% who failed, while outcomes for the category rated "good" are almost even. It may be that the loading of cases at the lower end of the scale where the reversal of outcomes occurs, as well as the negligible number of cases in the top two categories result in the negative correlation on this item. As will be seen later, this item does not occur in any other analysis, including those of the pre-treatment variables only which are used to develop the regression equations for predicting outcome of placement.

**Research Question 2**

The second research question addressed by this study was to determine if there are different variables associated with placement outcomes in the foster family home sample as compared to variables found to be significantly related to outcome in treatment group home placements. Tables 6-8 summarize the finding related to the second research question.

**Foster Family Home Sample**

With regard to the second research question of this study, seven variables were found to be significantly associated with outcome of
placement when data from the sample of youth placed in foster family homes was analyzed separately. These seven variables, their respective coefficients of correlation, and the level of significance are listed in Table 6.

Table 6

Variables Significantly Associated With Successful Foster Family Placement\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Program Variables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. (b) Efficacy of dealing with problems on daily basis</td>
<td>.72**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Parent/Family Variables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. History of problems in family</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Frequency of bio-parent visits in first two months of placement</td>
<td>.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent Youth Variables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Child's sex</td>
<td>.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Cooperation with prior treatment plans</td>
<td>.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. The relative absence of aggressive behavior</td>
<td>.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The relative absence of impulsive behavior</td>
<td>.04**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)\(n = 132.\) \(^b\)Variable numbers refer to order of numbering in original list (see chapter 1).

\(^*p<.05. \)**\(^*p<.01.\)

Four of the variables listed in Table 6 are found in Table 4.
also, an indication of their contribution to variance in outcome for the total sample. Variable #36, the effective management of daily behavioral problems of the youth in foster homes, again accounts for the largest share of variance in outcome. Three variables related to characteristics of the child; sex, prior cooperation with the treatment plan, and degree of impulsiveness, have already been discussed.

The correlation of Variable #24 with successful outcome suggests that children who are less aggressive, as well as less impulsive children, tend to do better in the relatively unstructured environment of a foster family setting. These results are consistent with the findings of Stone and Stone (1983) and Block et al. (1983).

Children whose parents have more contact with them during the first two months of placement (Variable #14) appear to have a greater chance of remaining in foster family homes until completion of the treatment plan. This variable accounted for only two percent of the total variance in outcome ($R^2 = .0225$), but it may be that added parental involvement, if it is supportive, can help maintain a child in the foster home through the most crucial period. Fanshel (1976) and Prentice-Dunn et al. (1981) reported results showing that increased parental visiting proved to be a fairly strong predictor of return home and post-discharge adaptation.

The negative correlation coefficient of Variable #13, history of interpersonal problems in the family, suggests that children from families where problems are of more recent origin do not do as well in foster family homes. The distribution of successful versus unsuccessful placements by coding category on this variable, as shown in
Table 7, appear to suggest the opposite in that there is a slight trend toward more successful outcomes at the higher ratings, though the relatively few cases at the higher end of the scale make conclusions very tentative.

Table 7

Distribution of Foster Family Home Placement Outcomes on Variable 13: History of Problems in Natural Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Rankings</th>
<th>Placement Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems manifested in family for more than 75% of time since child born</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-75%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-50%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 25%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to code</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a_n = 132.\)

Variable #13 did not appear in any of the regression analyses based on just the pre-placement variables related to the delinquent child, the nature of the offense(s) leading to placement and the child's natural family. The analyses of the pre-placement variables were used to generate regression equations for predicting outcome of placement.
Treatm ent Group Home (TGH) Sample

With regard to the second research question of this study, it was also found that four variables were significantly related to outcome of TGH placement. These variables, their respective coefficients of correlation, and level of significance are shown in Table 8.

Table 8

VariablesSignificantlyAssociatedWithSuccessful
Treatment Group Home Placement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Program Variables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Efficacy of dealing with problems on daily basis</td>
<td>.74**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Officer (PO) Variables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Contact, rapport building and energy expended by PO &amp; case-worker with TGH parents</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Parent/Family Variables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Parent's ability to establish reasonable rules</td>
<td>.06**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent Youth Variables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Positive relationship with peers</td>
<td>.25*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n = 101. \] Variable numbers refer to order of numbering in original list (see chapter 1).

\[ * p < .05. \] \[ ** p < .01. \]
Variable #36, efficacy of dealing with problems on a daily basis, again accounts for the largest share of variance in outcome. The negative correlation of the variable related to caseworker and probation officer energy expended with the TGH parents (Variable #39) is surprising. As expected with two professionals involved, there is, on the whole, more involvement of court staff with TGH parents. Significantly higher numbers of failed placements occurred in all categories of coding this variable except for the highest ranking which indicated five or more visits and five or more additional phone calls per month. At the highest level, successful outcomes outnumbered failures 40 to 8, a factor of 5:1. The higher incidence of placement breakdowns in all but the highest category may account for the negative correlation. This variable accounted for only one percent \((R^2=.01)\) of the variance in outcome and was discarded in the analysis of pre-treatment variables for developing regression equations.

Children whose parents demonstrated greater ability to establish reasonable rules (Variable #5) were more likely to remain in their initial TGH placement, though this variable accounted for less than one percent of the total variance. It is related to Variable #6 which was significantly associated with outcome for the total sample. Together, these variables seem to suggest that children whose parents have demonstrated greater ability to provide clear expectations and structure for their children and to consistently enforce the rules they have established are provided with an experience which is conducive to their success in another family's home when placed in foster
The only variable related to the child that was found significant was the child's relationship with his or her peers (Variable #28). Youth placed in TGH settings who were able to establish friendships that provided good support and influence were more likely to be successful in the TGH program which employs many more group related activities and interventions than regular foster family care.

In summary to this section it can be emphasized that, regardless of placement, the involvement of the foster parents and professional staff in a timely manner to deal with the daily behavioral problems that arise while youth are in placement is clearly the most important variable related to the outcome of foster placements. It was also found that the involvement of the probation officer with the natural parents of children in foster care is significant. For youth in TGH placements, professional involvement was found to be more important with the foster parents. Other differences between foster family and TGH placements relate to characteristics of the children themselves. Boys who are less aggressive and less impulsive tend to do better in foster families. For youth in the treatment group homes, their relationships with peers understandably is a significant factor related to their likelihood of remaining in care successfully. These findings will be discussed in chapter 5.

Prediction of Successful Foster Care Placements

It can be very helpful for the probation officer to know, for example, that parental visiting in the first two months following
placement is significant and that increased professional involvement with natural and foster parents can increase the chances of successful placements. Placement recommendation cannot be based on these variables, though. For that purpose, the probation officer must base clinical decisions on the assessment of the youth and family.

As noted in chapter 3, in order to generate predictive equations which would have clinical utility for the probation officer, the post-placement variables were discarded. Stepwise multiple regression analyses were run on the remaining variables related to: (a) the nature of the youth's past and present involvement in delinquent behavior and criminal offenses (Variables 1-3), (b) characteristics of the child's parents and family other than post-placement parental visiting (Variables 4-13), and (c) a number of other characteristics related to the child (Variables 15-31). The analyses were run on the total sample, foster family sample, and TGH sample again. Because sex and race were identified as significant in the initial analysis, analyses of pre-treatment variables only were also carried out on the following groups: (a) boys only, (b) girls only, (c) white youth only, and (d) non-white youth only. The goal of these analyses was to develop and test the predictive accuracy of regression equations to determine which have the greatest utility for predicting outcome of care for the above groups of children.

The regression equation from the analysis of the total sample was tested first by comparing the predicted outcome ($\hat{y}$) with the actual outcome of a randomly drawn subset of 60 youth from the total sample. This equation was labeled "Equation 1."
The equations generated by the analyses of the other samples noted above were then tested on a randomly drawn subset of appropriate youth from each sample to determine predictive accuracy. Appropriate data regarding the cases in these various subsets were also used as input for Equation 1, based on the total sample, to determine which equation was best able to predict actual outcome.

For example, a subset of 36 non-white youth was drawn from the total sample. The predictive accuracy of the regression equation generated by the analysis of all minority youth, Equation 4, was then tested on the 36 random cases yielding a predictive accuracy of 93% with only seven cases resulting in an unknown prediction. When these same 36 cases were tested using Equation 1, the accuracy dropped to 84% with definitive predictions unable to be made in 11 cases. For minority youth, greater accuracy of predicting outcome was achieved using the equation generated by the analysis of the total group of minority youth, whether they were placed in foster family or treatment group homes.

Of the seven regression equations developed, four could be used to achieve the greatest accuracy of matching predicted outcome with actual outcome. Equation 1, based on the analysis of the total sample, proved most accurate for white boys in foster family homes. Equation 2, based on the regression analysis of the TGH sample, proved most accurate for white boys placed in treatment group homes. Equation 3, based on the analysis of the 37 girls included in the study, proved only slightly more effective than Equation 1 for white girls regardless of placement. Equation 4, as noted above, proved
most effective in predicting outcome for minority youth in either
type of foster placement. The results of the regression analyses and
accuracy of predictions will be presented next.

Total Sample

Seven pre-treatment variables were found to be significantly
associated with outcome of foster placements in general. These seven
variables, their respective coefficients of correlation, and the
level of significance are listed in Table 9.

Table 9
Multiple Regression Analysis Excluding Post-placement
Variables: Total Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Parent/Family Variables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Parent's ability to enforce consequences</td>
<td>.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent Youth Variables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Child's race</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Child's sex</td>
<td>.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Greater cooperation with prior treatment planning</td>
<td>.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Desire to remain in parent's home</td>
<td>.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Alcohol abuse</td>
<td>.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Ability to recognize and accept responsibility for own behavior</td>
<td>.14*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a N = 233. b Variable numbers refer to order of numbering in original list (see chapter 1).

*p < .05. **p < .01.
Variables 6, 16, 17, and 23 are familiar from previous analyses. Additional variables indicate that children with a stronger desire to remain in their parents' homes (Variable #26), those with no problems of alcohol abuse evident in their daily functioning (Variable #30), and with greater abilities to recognize and accept responsibility for their own behavior (Variable #31) had a greater likelihood of remaining in their initially assigned placement.

The weighted regression equation based on the analysis of the total sample, Equation 1, is listed below. Each of the variables in Table 9 is designated by the letter "V" and the number of the variable. The rating that a child received on each variable was entered into the equation and then multiplied by the respective weighting. The results were summed to determine that child's predicted outcome which was then compared to his or her actual outcome.

\[ \hat{Y} = 0.238 + (0.179)(V_{23} \text{ rating}) + (0.09350)(V_{6} \text{ rating}) \\
+ (0.156)(V_{30} \text{ rating}) + (0.188)(V_{17} \text{ rating}) + \\
(0.06476)(V_{26} \text{ rating}) + (0.07145)(V_{31} \text{ rating}) + \\
(-0.124)(V_{16} \text{ rating}) \]

When the multiple regression formula was employed to generate a predictive index for each of the 60 randomly selected cases drawn from the total sample, the distribution represented in Table 10 was obtained. Table 10 includes the actual outcome of foster care placements (shown on the right) for the 60 youth based on the definitions used in the present study. Values of \( \hat{Y} \) and the corresponding pre-
dicted outcome based on the regression equation are shown on the left.

Placement outcome, the criterion variable, was defined as successful or failed for the purpose of this study. As noted in Appendix K, successful cases were coded with a "2" and failed cases with a "1." These same values were used in the regression equation to indicate the predicted outcome. Values from 1.0 to 2.0 were arbitrarily divided into three equal groups. Values of \( \hat{Y} \) that fall in the upper third of the range (1.67-2.0) predict a successful outcome for a particular youth. Values of \( \hat{Y} \) in the lower third of the range (1.0-1.33) predict that the youth is at high risk for placement failure. Scores in the midrange between 1.34-1.66 indicate that a definitive prediction cannot be made based on coding of the variables used in Equation 1.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predicted Outcome</th>
<th>Values of ( \hat{Y} )</th>
<th>Actual Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>1.67 - 2.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1.34 - 1.66</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>1.0 - 1.33</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the basis of the distribution observed in Table 10, it may be seen that a prediction of success or failure could be made for 42 of
the 60 cases that was accurate in 88% of the cases (37/42) when compared to the actual outcome of the case. A definitive prediction could not be made for those cases achieving scores in the midrange between 1.34-1.66. This degree of predictive accuracy is clearly superior to that achievable by merely relying on the base rate of placement success (50.2%) in the present study.

Treatment Group Home Sample

Five of the 30 pre-placement variables assessed were found to be significantly related to outcome of treatment group home placements. These variables are presented in Table 11.

Variables 5, 23, and 28 have been described before. As was seen in Table 9, the child's cooperation with the treatment plans prior to his or her being recommended for TGH placement (Variable #23) accounts for the largest share of variance in the eventual outcome of care. Variable #24, related to the child's degree of aggressive behavior, was significantly related to outcome in both the foster family and group home samples when the analysis was done with pre-treatment variables only, though the correlations were in different directions. Forty-six percent of the youth in the foster family setting received a rating of "very aggressive" (n = 61). Thirty-five (57%) of these more aggressive youth experienced placement breakdowns; significantly more than their less aggressive peers in foster family homes (R = .202, p<.05).
Table 11

Multiple Regression Analysis Excluding Post-placement Variables: Treatment Group Home (TGH) Sample^a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Parent/Family Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. b Parent's ability to establish reasonable rules</td>
<td>.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delinquent Youth Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Greater cooperation with prior treatment planning</td>
<td>.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. The relative absence of aggressive behavior</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Positive relationship with peers</td>
<td>.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Alcohol abuse</td>
<td>.27*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a n = 101. b Variable numbers refer to order of numbering in original list (see chapter 1).

* p<.05. ** p<.01.

In the TGH sample, though, 52% of the youth given the rating "very" aggressive" successfully completed their placement while only 44% of those rated as "somewhat aggressive" did likewise. It is also interesting to note that the most aggressive youth comprised the largest portion of the TGH sample (44%). It would appear that both of the foster care programs at the court studied receive large numbers of referrals on youth who have been involved in very aggressive behavior and that the TGH program is better able to work successfully with these youth based on the data from the present study. The
foster family analysis is not shown because Equation 1, based on the total sample, and Equation 4, based on the sample of non-white youth, proved more accurate in predicting foster home outcomes for youth included in this study.

The final variable from Table 11 related to the child indicates that youth who display no problems related to alcohol abuse (Variable #30) are more likely to remain in TGH placements successfully. The weighted regression equation generated from the analysis of the TGH sample is shown below:

\[
\hat{Y} = 0.163 + (0.205)(V23 \text{ rating}) + (0.124)(V5 \text{ rating}) + (0.203)(V30 \text{ rating}) + (0.278)(V28 \text{ rating}) + (-0.111)(V24 \text{ rating})
\]

When Equation 2 was used to predict outcome of care for each of 31 randomly drawn cases from the TGH sample, the distribution represented in Table 12 was obtained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predicted Outcome</th>
<th>Values of $\hat{Y}$</th>
<th>Actual Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>1.67 - 2.0</td>
<td>Failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1.34 - 1.66</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>1.0 - 1.33</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The distribution observed in Table 12 illustrates that a prediction could be made on 23 of the 31 cases (excluding the eight cases achieving midrange scores) that was accurate in 91% of the cases (21/23). This equation proved most accurate for white boys placed in a treatment group home setting.

**Girls**

Correlations noted in Tables 4, 6, 9 and 13 indicated that both white and minority girls were more likely to be involved in a placement breakdown than boys. This was especially true for foster family placements. The data from Table 3 reveal that only 12 of the girls who were placed in treatment group homes during the target years were found eligible for inclusion in the present study. There is only one treatment group home for girls which has been in operation for four years limiting the pool of subjects initially available. As mentioned in chapter 3, girls who had been in a previous out-of-home placement as a delinquent ward of the court were not included in the present study. The sample of girls in TGH placements is too small to base any conclusions on, but data from the total group of 37 girls yielded significant findings.

Six of the 30 pre-treatment variables assessed were found to be significantly associated with outcome of foster placements for girls. These variables, their correlation coefficients, and the respective levels of significance are presented in Table 13.

For girls, as well as boys, a higher degree of cooperation with previous treatment planning (Variable #23) is clearly suggestive of
Table 13

Multiple Regression Analysis Excluding Post-placement Variables: Girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Parent/Family Variables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Quality of parent-child relationship</td>
<td>-.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Parent's ability to enforce consequences</td>
<td>.52**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Parent's desire to have child at home with them</td>
<td>.56*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent Youth Variables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Child's race</td>
<td>-.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Cooperation with parents</td>
<td>-.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Greater cooperation with prior treatment planning</td>
<td>.70*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^n = 37.  Variable numbers refer to order of numbering in original list (see chapter 1).

*p < .05.  **p < .01.

Later success in foster placement outcome. This is not surprising in that past performance in any number of behavioral areas is strongly related to future performance. In contrast to the analyses on other sub-groupings of cases, which resulted in only one Parent/Family Variable shown as significantly related to outcome, three of the six variables in Table 13 are related the delinquent girl's parents and family. The parent's desire to have their daughter remain home with them (Variable #12) accounts for the second largest degree of variance in placement outcome. Those parents rated higher in their
desire to have their daughter remain home had girls who succeeded in
care significantly more often than those girls with parents who
refused or were ambivalent about having their daughters live with
them.

The negative correlation of Variable #4, quality of parent-child
relationships, suggests that girls involved in poor relationships
with their parents fared better in later foster placements than girls
with less conflictive relationships. The raw data is helpful to
explain this outcome. The distribution of actual outcomes for the
categories of this variable are presented in Table 14.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Rankings</th>
<th>Placement Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( n = 37. \)

Thirty-five of the 37 cases received a ranking on Variable #4
indicating a generally poor parent-child relationship. Due to the
small number of girls who succeeded in foster care, this item is
loaded at the "negative" end of the scale and generates a negative
correlation with successful outcome.

It may be that the parent's desire to have their child home and
their ability to enforce reasonable and consistent consequences for
rule infractions may offset the effect of the conflict between them
and their child to a degree and provide an experience which is facili-
titative of later success in foster care.

The generally conflictive relationships noted above may be re-
lated in part to the lack of cooperation by the girls with their
parents (Variable #21). Girls who were less cooperative appeared to
have a higher probability of success in later foster care, but the
loading on the negative end of this scale (12 "poor" and 24 "very
poor" ratings) appears responsible for the negative correlation rather
than a true comparison of girls who have demonstrated good cooper-
ation with their parents prior to foster placement. As was evident
in Table 3, 12 of the 13 minority girls in the present sample experi-
enced a placement breakdown accounting for the negative correlation
of race (Variable #16) with successful outcome.

Three of the six variables included in Table 13, Variables 6, 16,
and 23, also occur in Table 9, which was based on the analysis of
the total sample. Of the remaining three variables only the parent's
desire to have the child remain home (Variable #12) appears to have
face validity for discriminating accurately in the prediction of
foster care outcomes. The negative correlations of Variables 4 and
21 seem intuitively and theoretically not to make sense. The statisti-
cal weightings of the regression equation take these apparent
contradictions into account and yield accurate predictions as illus-
trated below. The regression equation based on the analysis of the
group of girls is listed below:

\[
\hat{Y} = 1.40 + (0.377)(V23 \text{ rating}) + (0.258)(V6 \text{ rating}) + \\
(0.216)(V21 \text{ rating}) + (0.209)(V12 \text{ rating}) + \\
(0.262)(V4 \text{ rating}) + (-0.399)(V16 \text{ rating})
\]  

(3)

When the regression formula was employed with each of the 37
girls in the total sample, the distribution represented in Table 15
was obtained.

Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predicted Outcome</th>
<th>Values of ( \hat{Y} )</th>
<th>Actual Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>1.67 - 2.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1.34 - 1.66</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>1.0 - 1.33</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When Equation 3 was used to predict outcome of a hypothetical
"best" case, that is one obtaining "very good" ratings on the vari-
ables in Table 13, the predicted outcome was "success" as expected.
Equation 3 was able to predict accurate outcomes in 89% of the 28
cases for which a definitive prediction could be made. Nine cases
received scores in the midrange indicating a prediction could not be
made. Equation 1 was also used to test the same cases and achieved an accuracy of 88% with 11 cases obtaining a score in the midrange. It appears that either equation can be useful with girls and achieve an accuracy of prediction greater than relying on the base rate of 73% failed outcomes for girls in foster care.

Minority Youth

As can be recalled from Tables 4 and 9, the child's race was listed as significantly related to outcome of foster care when data from all children in the sample were included in the analysis. The relatively small number of minority youth who were included in the TGH sample and the fact that minority boys were equally as likely to successfully complete foster family placements as to fail likely contributed to this variable not showing up as significant in either of these samples.

The data for the total sample clearly point to race as a significant factor with minority children at higher risk for placement breakdown. Because of this, a stepwise regression analysis was run on the data from just the minority children (n = 72) to determine if a set of predictor variables would emerge that could be used to predict outcome of care more accurately and perhaps suggest a more efficient allocation of resources to help maintain minority youth in community placements when at all possible.

Seven variables were found to be significantly associated with outcome for minority children. These variables are presented in Table 16.
Table 16

Multiple Regression Analysis Excluding Post-placement
Variables: Non-white Youth\(^{a}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problems Leading to Placement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. (^{b}) Index of past criminal record</td>
<td>-.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Parent/Family Variables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Parents' desire to have child remain home with them</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent Youth Variables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Child's sex</td>
<td>.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Better school behavior record</td>
<td>.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Greater cooperation with prior treatment planning</td>
<td>.31**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Stronger desire to remain home with parents</td>
<td>.43*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Ability to recognize and accept responsibility for own behavior</td>
<td>.41**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\)\(n = 72. \(^{b}\)Variable numbers refer to order of numbering in original list (see chapter 1).

*\(p < .05. **p < .01.\)

As is evident from the data in the table, minority boys (Variable #17) are more likely to remain in foster care successfully than are girls. Non-white children who have had fewer behavioral problems in school during the nine months prior to foster placement (Variable #18), who have demonstrated better cooperation with previous treatment planning (Variable #23), who have a strong desire to remain home with their parents (Variable #26), and who are able to
recognize and accept responsibility for their behavior (Variable #31) are more likely to succeed in foster placements. The negative correlation of Variable #12 with outcome suggests that youth whose parents show less desire to have their children remain home with them tend to have a greater likelihood of remaining in their initially assigned foster placement through completion of the treatment plan.

The negative correlation on Variable 3, concerning the youth's involvement in past status and criminal offenses, was expected and provides support for the hypothesis that youth with less extensive records of past criminal involvement will be more likely to complete foster placements successfully. This item's correlation with the variable regarding race of the child indicates that the minority children included in this study who were involved in placement breakdowns tended to have more extensive histories of delinquent behavior and/or police and court contacts.

In light of the finding that a minority youth's record of past delinquent behavior had predictive significance for outcome of placement, an additional analysis of the data was completed to determine if minority youth were more likely than white boys and girls to enter foster care placements with more extensive delinquent records. A two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was employed using ratings on Variable #3, index of past criminal behavior, as the dependent variable. Variable #16, race of the child, and Variable #17, child's sex, were used as the breakdown (classification) variables.

The mean score for boys on the index of past criminal behavior was 2.74, and the mean score for girls was 1.97. The two-way ANOVA
indicated a significant difference with boys more likely than girls to enter foster care with more extensive involvement in past delinquent behavior, $F(1, 229) = 10.38, p < .001$. Regarding race, the mean score for white youth was 2.13, and the mean score for minority youth was 2.59, $F(1, 229) = 3.70, p < .05$, indicating that minority boys and girls are more likely than white youth to enter foster placements with greater past involvement in delinquent behavior. There was no interaction effect between sex and race on ratings of past delinquent behavior.

The weighted regression formula generated from the analysis of the minority sample is shown below:

$$
\hat{Y} = .148 + (.198)(V31 \text{ rating}) + (.129)(V23 \text{ rating}) + (.153)(V26 \text{ rating}) + (.108)(V18 \text{ rating}) + (-.109) (V3 \text{ rating}) + (.319)(V17 \text{ rating}) + (-.07294)(V12 \text{ rating})
$$

When this multiple regression formula was employed to generate a predictive index for each of the 34 randomly selected cases of minority youth form the total sample, the distribution represented in Table 17 was obtained.

On the basis of the distribution observed in Table 17, it can be seen that a prediction could be made for 28 of the 34 cases that was accurate in 93% of the cases (26/28). The base rate of placement success for minority children was 37.5% in the present sample. Equation 4 achieves a degree of predictive accuracy clearly superior to reliance on the base rate alone in identifying those minority chil-
dren at greatest risk of placement breakdown.

Table 17

Distribution of Actual Outcome as a Function of Predictive Index: Equation 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predicted Outcome</th>
<th>Values of $\hat{Y}$</th>
<th>Actual Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>1.67 - 2.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1.34 - 1.66</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>1.0 - 1.33</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Foster Care Rating Scales

A set of rating scales has been developed using the results of the multiple regression analyses on the samples described above. Four versions of the scale are each titled Predictive Index For Foster Care Placements and labeled Scale 1 through Scale 4. These scales are included in Appendix M with a coding booklet and directions for their use.

Scale 1 is based on the results of the analysis of the total sample and is suggested for use with white boys being considered for foster family placements and girls being considered for either foster family or TGH placement.

Scale 2 is based on the results of the analysis of the TGH sample. It is suggested for use with white boys being considered for placement in a treatment group home.
Scale 3 was developed from the results of the analysis of the 37 girls in the resent sample. It is suggested for use with girls being considered for either foster or group home placement. Scale 1 may also be used with girls if desired and Scale 4 may be used with minority girls.

Scale 4 is suggested for use with non-white youth being considered for either foster or group home placement. It is based on the results of the regression analysis of the minority children included in the present study. Caution is advised when using this scale with minority children other than Blacks because of the small number of youth from other minority groups involved in the study.

A coding booklet titled *Questionnaire For Predicting Appropriate Foster Placement-Revised* includes all of the variables found to be significantly related to outcome of the various groups mentioned above. Each rating scale contains only the variables pertinent to the particular group upon which it was based and only those variables need be coded for entry into the regression equation for prediction of placement outcome.

The weighted regression equations for use with the above scales are labeled with corresponding numbers, e.g., Equation 1. These equations were listed above. In order to make their use as easy as possible and to insure accuracy of calculation, computer programs were written in Basic programming language for use on the computer of the court studied. A program was developed for each equation. A sample program and directions for entering data are included in Appendix N.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was designed to investigate variables related to the outcome of foster care for delinquent youth who were placed by a juvenile court in either a foster family home or a more specialized treatment group home. Both of these foster care options use private homes in the community owned by the foster or group home parents. The regular foster family homes generally take one youth in placement while the treatment group homes have 2–6 youth in placement at any given time. It was believed that the results of this investigation would contribute to the identification of reliable and objective factors that could be assessed routinely to determine those children who are most likely at risk for placement failure and to identify factors which might potentiate placement success.

A conceptual framework for the study was described in chapter 2 which emphasized that the juvenile court as well as the phenomenon of juvenile delinquency can be viewed from a number of perspectives. The court is an institution which can be examined in terms of variables such as characteristic patterns of case processing. Sarri (1981) found, for example, that girls typically have a higher probability than boys of being placed by juvenile courts in an institution regardless of the offense for which they were adjudicated.

The influence of various groups on the court's decisions regarding case dispositions is another aspect important to the under-
standing of the juvenile justice system. A central focus of community influence in recent years, which has drawn the attention of the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges (1984), involves issues of "treatment" versus punishment for juvenile offenders. This external pressure can influence decisions regarding which youth are considered for community foster placements. Additional perspectives from which the court can be studied include organizational and structural variables such as the interaction of court staff with foster parents and the influence that availability of placement resources for youth has on placement recommendations. This study focused on the outcomes of the court's decisions to place delinquent youth in foster care, either regular foster family homes or more specialized treatment group homes.

A number of theoretical propositions regarding the cause of juvenile delinquency were reviewed in chapter 2. Various theorists have emphasized genetic factors, incompetent and inadequate child rearing by parents, economic pressure on families such as poverty, poor housing, etc., psychological problems of the child, or the failure of schools to properly educate and socialize youth as reasons for delinquency. The various definitions and theories of juvenile delinquency were reviewed to illustrate the multi-determined nature of this problem--at once both psychological and social.

A major premise of this investigator was that decisions regarding placement recommendations and the outcomes of foster care placements are affected by the reciprocal interaction of factors such as those noted above. Pre-treatment, i.e., pre-placement, characteris-
tics of the delinquent youth and his or her family and post-placement variables, i.e., components of treatment, related to the actions of the probation officer, treatment group home (TGH) caseworker and foster parents interact in complex ways to influence the outcome of care for delinquent youth. To understand this process, a theoretical framework should be able to account for the interaction of these various elements within the treatment system.

A comprehensive assessment and treatment model for foster care of delinquent youth should facilitate the identification of variables unique to the individual which appear significantly related to desired treatment outcomes. At another level, when individuals interact over a period of time, whether in a natural family, foster family or professional relationship, their relationship may be characterized in terms of its own constancy, pattern and regularity which, in turn, help shape individual growth and psychological development. In this sense the organism and environment can be seen as a unified field, two interacting aspects of a whole. A theoretical framework must be able to delimit the way each member of the court-foster family-client family treatment system is connected to and interacts with the other parts to carry out the goals of the treatment plan. This focus demands a historical, psychological and social perspective.

Object-relations theorists assert that personality development occurs in the context of interaction between the organism and environment rather than through the internal process of maturation alone. A number of authors (Erikson, 1980; Guntrip, 1961; Kegan, 1982; Millon, 1981) point to the co-evolutionary development between
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children and their families. This co-evolutionary activity forms the "context" in which personality development takes place. The interaction of pre- and post-placement variables in the treatment of delinquents, as it relates to fostering the psychological growth and behavioral change of these youth, can be viewed as a particular instance of this principal.

The constructive-developmental theory of Kegan (1982) was introduced in chapter 2. It was suggested as an appropriate model for use in understanding the development of a young person and for illuminating the manner in which the court becomes involved in this process. Kegan suggested that the person always develops in a "culture" or "environment" that is psychosocial, that is, one's self develops in relation to the manner in which significant others do or do not tend to promote such growth through functions such as psychological holding, contradicting and staying in place. The young person who is adequately held in a psychological sense experiences unconditionality of his or her acceptance by others.

From such an ongoing basis, the youth may then be encouraged and invited, through a contradiction process, to gradually change his or her view of self, other and world and the associated behaviors to move toward a more mature view of self, other and world. Finally, as the youth adopts new ways of thinking, feeling and action—which reflect a new constitution of self, and a "(re)construction" (Kegan, 1982) of other and the world—the culture "stays in place" showing acceptance of the changes. The developmental process moves from total dependence through differentiation to autonomy, a process
replicated at different ages and with different issues throughout life.

Various "environments" (Kegan, 1982), including the family, school, peers, and for some children the juvenile court, become the context within which ego or self development of the child takes place. For growth to occur, these environments must be able to provide psychological support and appropriate contradiction to the child. The family, at its best, does this naturally through its ability to "reproduce itself" (Kegan, 1982) at the next level of its own evolution in order to provide appropriate "holding" for a child who now understands the world and self in new ways.

The juvenile court and its foster families face, perhaps, a more difficult task. The delinquent foster child has often been unable to navigate the transitions of normal development successfully. Like the therapist in the initial stages of forming a therapeutic relationship, the foster family must respond to this "client" in ways which at first do not differ too drastically from that to which he or she has been accustomed. If the therapist demands too much too soon, or is too responsive, caring, intimate or confrontative before the client is ready, that client is not likely to remain in therapy. If, on the other hand, the therapist duplicates the client's problematic "holding environment," no change is possible. Like therapists, the foster parents must achieve a similar balance, providing enough of what is "known" and familiar to a child so that he or she will remain in placement long enough to gain benefit, while not replicating pathogenic environments and while also contradicting "old," perhaps
self-defeating, understandings and patterns of behavior in ways that promote and support further healthy self development.

A theoretical assumption implicit in the discussion thus far is that a youth's self, or ego, determines his/her actions. A major goal of the court system is the provision of social services to rehabilitate the delinquent child. A primary measure of successful rehabilitation traditionally employed by the courts is change in the youth's overt behavior, i.e., his or her actions, and avoidance of recidivism, or repeat offenses. The court system is concerned with the youth's actions being appropriate and legal. The theoretical premise upon which foster care and family treatment is based is that if the delinquent youth has an improved psychological holding environment, then a new constitution of self, other and world has a greater chance of developing and his or her actions will be more appropriate. The question of which variables may be most important to consider in this process has immediate relevance in the ongoing dialogue between the court, its foster parents and the clients they serve.

Cognizant of the psychological, social and legal variables which restrain and shape not only the decisions of the juvenile court, but also the behavior and responses of youth and their families who become the subjects of those decisions, this investigator examined factors related to: (a) the nature of the delinquent's offense(s), Variables #1-3, (b) characteristics of the delinquent child's natural parents and family, Variables #4-14, (c) characteristics of the delinquent youth, Variables #15-31, (d) characteristics of the foster
parents and treatment program, Variables #32-36, and (e) characteristics of the probation officer, Variables #38-41. As noted in chapter 3, Variable #33 was dropped from the study. Forty variables related to these five categories were examined.

The major research question of this study was to determine which variables are significantly associated with outcome of foster care placements for juvenile delinquents. The second research question was concerned with determining whether there were different variables related to the outcome of foster family placements as compared to treatment group home (TGH) placement outcomes. Stepwise multiple regression analysis was employed with the total data set and the foster family and TGH samples separately to identify variables most strongly associated with placement outcomes.

An additional goal of the study was to develop mathematical equations based on the regression analysis which would incorporate the variables identified as significantly related to placement outcome. The regression equation yields a predicted outcome of foster care and may be used by the probation officer as one tool in the evaluation process to determine appropriate placements for delinquent youth.

As noted in chapter 3, in order to generate predictive equations which would have clinical utility for the probation officer, the post-placement treatment program variables (Variables #32-36), Variable #14, related to parent/child visiting during the first two months following placement, and the variables related to the probation officer's activities and energy expended on the case (Variables
#38-41) were discarded. It is important for the probation officer to know how these variables are related to foster care outcome, but placement recommendations cannot be based on this information. For that purpose, the probation officer must base clinical decisions on the assessment of the youth and family. Stepwise multiple regression analysis was employed with the remaining pre-treatment variables (Variables #1-13, #15-31) to develop regression equations for the prediction of successful foster care.

Discussion of variables found to be significantly associated with the outcome of foster care placements will be presented next. This will be followed by discussion of the regression equations developed for the prediction of successful foster care. Recommendations for further research will conclude this chapter.

Findings Related to Outcome of Foster Care

Previous estimates of failure in foster care placements suggested that approximately 25% of the children placed will fail due to behavioral problems (Martin & Beazley, 1976). Stone and Stone (1983), however, found "nearly one-half of all children placed in care had to be removed from the assigned home" (p. 15) in their sample of younger children who had been placed in foster care because of being neglected or abused by their parents. Results of the present study are consistent with those of Stone and Stone; 49.8% of the children were withdrawn from their foster family or treatment group home placement prior to the completion of the court treatment plan. In a study of three group homes for juvenile offenders, Simone
(1985) found that 31% of the youth failed to complete the rehabilitation plan successfully. The magnitude of the problem of foster home breakdown appears similar for both the younger neglected or abused child and the older delinquent teen.

It has been noted previously that often the child subjected to abuse and neglect in early formative years is likely to engage in delinquent behavior upon reaching adolescence. In the present sample, court records indicated that 66 of the 233 children (28%) had experienced abuse or neglect as youngsters serious enough to warrant Protective Services intervention. When examined in relation to the other variables included in this study, this factor (Variable #9) was not found to have significant predictive power regarding outcome of later delinquency foster placements for these youth.

The magnitude of placement breakdowns evident in the present sample reaffirms the need for probation officers to proceed with utmost caution in placing children. Forty-two percent of the youth included in this study experienced subsequent court-ordered placement in facilities ranging from another foster home through institutional placements. If only the children classified as having failed foster care are considered, 72% of these youth were subsequently placed by the court. Simone (1985) reported similar findings. Between 72-86% of the delinquent youth in Simone's study who failed to complete a court-ordered placement in one of the three open group homes were subsequently re-placed by the court. Clearly the act of separating the child from his or her parents could be only the first in a series of painful separations the child might face.
Characteristics of the Treatment Program

When all variables were considered, the results suggest that Variable #36, the daily attention to and management of behavioral problems that arise while youth are in placement, may be the single most critical variable in determining the outcome of foster placement. This variable was concerned with the degree to which actions were taken by the foster or group home parents, the probation officer and/or group home caseworker to handle problems on a timely basis rather than permitting time intervals of days or weeks to lapse before intervening. This variable was among those identified by probation officers in the survey completed for the study as relevant to placement recommendations. It reflects the court's emphasis in developing a "treatment team" approach in which the probation officers are encouraged to work closely with foster and group home parents and group home caseworkers to develop treatment plans which specify desired behavioral changes for youth in care and ways to monitor progress.

In light of the magnitude of the relationship between the effective management of day-to-day problems and the outcome of placement, an additional review of the data was completed to discover possible relationships between the post-placement action of the foster parents, probation officer and case worker and other predictor variables. Among the 39 predictor variables surveyed, six were found to be significantly correlated with ratings on managing daily problems.

The two most significant relationships ($p < 0.001$) occurred between
Variable #36 and Variables #39 (related to the contacts, rapport building and energy expended by the probation officer and caseworker with the foster parents) and #32 (the rapport of the foster parents with the court). These variables were correlated in a positive direction indicating that the cases which were rated higher on the management of day-to-day problems in foster placement tended also to be cases in which the probation officer or caseworker expended more energy with the foster parents and that the placements occurred with foster parents who enjoyed higher levels of rapport with court staff in general.

Other variables related to the management of day-to-day problems included the child's race (Variable #16), the degree of impulsiveness of the child (Variable #25), the history of problems among the members of the child's family (Variable #13), and the number of offenses leading to placement request (Variable #2). It appears that greater efforts to deal with placement problems in a timely manner occurred with non-white youth and with those rated as more impulsive, although it must be noted that these variables accounted for only eight percent and two percent respectively of the variance noted in Variable #36. There was also a tendency for foster parents and court staff to make more frequent and more effective efforts to handle the daily problems of youth who had experienced less chronic histories of family conflict and who were referred for placement on the basis of fewer criminal or status offenses.

As was seen in Table 4 (page 103), Variable #32 was negatively correlated with placement outcome ($R = -.16$) suggesting that a
greater degree of rapport was associated with placement failure. This correlation is difficult to explain logically since an examination of the raw data revealed that the foster parents who were rated as having the highest level of rapport with court staff had greater numbers of children successfully complete foster placements in their homes. Of the 85 children placed with foster parents who received the highest rating on Variable #32, 55% successfully completed their initial placements. In contrast, 47% of the children placed with foster parents rated as having "good" rapport and 46% of the children placed with those rated as having "poor" rapport with probation officers succeeded in completing their placements according to the treatment plan. This suggests that the highest ratings of rapport between the foster parents and court staff are associated with successful placement outcomes.

The finding of significant correlations between Variable #36, the effective management of daily problems during foster placements, and three of the variables referred to above, namely: (1) the energy expended by POs with foster parents (Variable #39), (2) the rapport of the foster parents with the POs (Variable #32), and (3) the impulsiveness of the child (Variable #25), suggests a further interpretation regarding the finding of a negative correlation between ratings of foster parent rapport and outcome of placement. As noted above, it appears that POs expended greater efforts to help foster parents deal with placement problems involving youth rated as more impulsive. It was seen in Table 4 (p. 103) that youth rated as highly impulsive were also more likely to fail in foster placements.
The associations of Variable #25, greater degree of impulsiveness, and Variable #32, higher level of rapport between foster parents and POs, with higher ratings on the effective management of daily problems (Variable #36) suggests that the more impulsive youth were frequently placed with foster parents having higher levels of rapport and better ratings of effectiveness in handling problems, i.e., the "good" homes. The higher failure rate of the more impulsive youth, even when placed in "good" homes, may help explain the negative correlation of foster parent rapport with outcome of placement.

These findings suggest the possible operation of an uncontrolled variable. It may be that the level of rapport between foster parents and probation officers interacts with the type of problems presented by the youth to influence outcome. It appears that there may be a critical level of rapport and cooperative effort between foster parents and POs which varies according to the type of child in placement. Highly impulsive or more aggressive youth may require a higher level of rapport between the PO and foster parent to support greater cooperation in dealing with these youth who are at higher risk for placement failure. More passive or withdrawn youth may not require the same levels of cooperative intervention by foster parents and court staff which also suggest that lower levels of rapport may not be as detrimental.

The present data suggest that when probation officers expend high levels of energy to establish rapport with foster parents and support the efforts of the foster parents to manage the day-to-day issues that arise during foster placements, the probability of suc-
cessful outcomes can be increased. It would appear that efforts to establish rapport with foster parents and involve them in the training and other activities of the court are successful in building a foundation for cooperative treatment efforts. The court studied has developed a number of activities to involve its foster parents and cooperates with area agencies in providing training seminars and classes open to all foster parents.

In summary, placement outcomes appear most strongly related to the efforts and ability of court staff and foster parents to handle the day-to-day problems of youth in foster care in a timely and effective manner. Not surprisingly, this tends to happen more often in cases where the probation officer or caseworker invests more energy to support the foster parents. The basis for this appears to be, at least in part, higher levels of rapport between the foster parents and court personnel. The data also suggest that more impulsive youth not only demand more time through their tendency to act out, but also receive more attention directed at dealing with their problems even though they were more likely to fail placements. Non-white youth, those from families with less chronic problems, and those with fewer offenses may also have received greater efforts by court staff and foster parents to manage problems resulting from their behavior, though the actual variance accounted for by these variables is quite small.

Further research appears warranted to determine whether court staff spend less time and energy working with youth who have had extensive histories of family conflict and are involved in higher
numbers of offenses within a relatively short time. It also appears that foster parents who had not achieved high levels of rapport with the court actually received less support and assistance from the probation officers which, in turn, correlated with less effective management of daily problems and higher numbers of placement failures.

Characteristics of the Probation Officer

The degree of contact, active rapport building and energy expended by the probation officer (PO), as discussed above, is a critical variable related to the outcome of foster placements. When data from all children were included in the analysis, the PO's efforts with the child's natural parent emerged as significant. When the sample was divided for analysis of the TGH placements separate from the foster home cases and the analysis of the total sample, the PO's involvement with the TGH home parents was identified as one of only four variables significantly associated with outcome of placement. A review of the raw data revealed that among TGH placements, successful outcomes outnumbered failures at only the highest level of staff involvement. It may be that the treatment group homes receive more difficult cases, as the program is designed to do and, therefore, only the highest levels of professional involvement and energy to support the TGH parents are consistently effective in contributing to successful outcomes for these youth.

The TGH program is designed as an alternative to institutional care and, as such, should receive more difficult cases. The data
suggest that both regular foster care and the specialized group homes receive an approximately equal percentage of referrals on youth rated most aggressive. The TGH program clearly appears more successful in dealing with these youth. It is suggested that this may be due, in part, to the combined efforts of experienced TGH foster parents and high levels of probation officer and caseworker involvement.

Characteristics of the Delinquent Youth

When all the variables were included in separate analyses of the foster home and TGH samples, only one variable related to the child, the youth's relationship with peers (Variable #28), emerged as significantly associated with outcome in TGH placements. In contrast, four different variables were found to be related to outcome of placements in foster family homes. Boys (Variable #17), youth who were more cooperative with treatment plans prior to placement (Variable #23) and youth who were less aggressive (Variable #24) and less impulsive (Variable #25) tended to do better in foster family homes. These results are not surprising because families typically experience more difficulty with aggressive or impulsively acting-out children. There is no "change of shift" after eight hours to relieve the foster parent who can easily become frustrated and worn out dealing with these types of children who often present more frequent problems. Unless the foster parents receive above-average support and involvement from professional staff to help them deal with these difficult youth, or are exceptional foster parents, more aggressive and impulsive youth are at greater risk for placement failure in
foster family homes.

The data from the analysis of the foster family and TGH samples provide an answer for the second research question regarding whether there would be a different set of variables related to successful foster family placement outcomes as compared to TGH outcomes. The differences in the two programs were discussed in chapter 1 and need not be reviewed here. Further interpretation of these findings will be presented below in the discussion of pre-treatment variables used to develop regression equations for the prediction of successful foster care.

The Prediction of Successful Foster Care

The data from the present sample suggest that when all variables are considered, those related to foster parent and court staff activities after the youth is in placement are most critical in determining outcome of placement. The court administration and probation officers can use this information to help allocate time and resources where they appear most needed following placements. For example, if youth rated as more aggressive or impulsive must be placed in a regular foster family home, the results of this study suggest that they may be at increased risk for placement failure. High levels of probation officer involvement with and support for the foster parents to assist in dealing with daily problems that arise with these youth may help maintain a particular child in placement despite his or her tendency toward aggressiveness or impulsiveness. All members of the treatment team, including the PO, foster parents and the natural
parents, should be aware of the increased risk for placement failure and the need for close supervision. This information is of less immediate value to the probation officer during the initial assessment phase, though, when clinical decisions must be made and recommendations presented to the judge regarding appropriate placement for youth who must be removed from their parents' homes.

In addition to delineating those factors which are associated with the outcomes of placements, it was hoped that the results of the present study would have predictive value. In order to generate predictive equations which would have clinical utility for the probation officer, stepwise multiple regression analysis on the pre-placement variables was completed. Use of the regression formulas identified in chapter 4 would appear to provide a probation officer with a significant capacity to predict the probability of a placement's success. Further interpretation of the variables included in the regression equations will be discussed under the following categories of variables: (a) problems leading to placement, and (b) characteristics of the delinquent youth and family.

**Problems Leading to Placement**

Among the variables related to past and current offenses, the index of past criminal behavior (Variable #3) was the only factor found to have predictive value regarding outcome of placement and only in the case of non-white youth. Minority youth who had a more extensive history of criminal and status offense behavior tended to fail in their initial court-ordered foster placements significantly
more often than youth with less previous police and court contact.

In light of the finding that a minority youth's record of past delinquent behavior had predictive significance for outcome of placement, an additional analysis of the data was completed to determine if minority youth were more likely than white boys and girls to enter foster placements with more extensive criminal records. If this were the case, it would suggest at least partial explanation for the significant correlation of Variable #3 with outcome of care for minority youth. As reported in chapter 4, a two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was employed using ratings on Variable #3, index of past criminal behavior, as the dependent variable. Variable #26, race of the child, and Variable #27, child's sex, were used as the breakdown variables. Results of the analysis revealed that in the present sample, boys were more likely than girls to have a more extensive past criminal record upon entering foster care placements ($p < 0.01$). This was true for white and non-white boys. A second finding indicated that non-white girls and boys were more likely than white youth to enter foster care with greater past involvement in criminal and status offense behavior ($p < 0.05$).

This finding in the present research is particularly interesting in light of data summarized by Baird, Storrs and Connelly (1984), Lewis (1982) and Smith, Black and Weit (1980) which indicate that prior criminal behavior is related to dispositional alternatives used by the court and that it is one of the variables which "seem universally predictive of continued criminal involvement for youth" (Baird et al., 1984, p. 14-15). In effect, the present research indicated
that if a non-white youth commits further offenses while in placement, as predicted by his or her past record, the foster placement is likely to be disrupted. In the present sample minority youth were more likely to enter foster placements with more extensive criminal records. It may be that they also were more likely to continue that criminal behavior, as the findings of Baird and his colleagues (1984) would predict, resulting in disruption of placement. Another explanation may be that white and non-white youth recidivate in equal proportion, but that non-white youth are more likely to be removed from placement for similar offenses than are their white peers. The findings of the present study cannot address this question which remains relevant for further research.

In spite of the fact that non-white youth were more likely than their white peers to have had greater involvement in past criminal behavior, it does not appear that this prevented them from being placed in community-based foster care. The association of more extensive past criminal records among minority youth, which tend to predict continued involvement in crime and a greater likelihood of additional referrals to the court, provides at least partial explanation for the high incidence of placement failure among minority youth.

Characteristics of the Delinquent Youth and Family

Cooperation with prior treatment plan

In each of the subsamples analyzed using only the pre-placement
variables, Variable #23, the child's cooperation with previous treatment planning, was found to be predictive of later success in foster placement. This variable accounted for the greatest portion of variance in outcome of foster care placements for girls (R = .70) when compared to all other pre-placement variables. Variable #23 was also among the variables significantly related to outcome for boys (R = .31) and again accounted for the greatest portion of variance in outcome. When the present sample was divided by the child's race for analysis, Variable #23 was found to be the factor most strongly related to outcome for white youth (R = .35). For non-white youth, their cooperation with prior treatment planning was significantly associated with outcome (R = .31), but did not correlate as strongly with outcome as the youth's desire to remain home with parents, Variable #26 (R = .43), or the child's ability to recognize and accept responsibility for his or her own behavior, Variable #31 (R = .41). Variable #23 was identified by probation officers as important to consider when making placement recommendations which is indicative of their recognition that past performance in many behavioral areas is strongly related to future performance.

Child's race and sex

The race (Variable #16) and sex (Variable #17) of the child were found to have predictive value for outcome of both foster family and TGH placements. As noted above, girls and non-whites were more likely to experience failure in their initial foster care placements. Non-white girls may be particularly at risk, though the small number
of these girls in the sample suggests caution in any conclusions.

As evident in Table 3 (p. 101), it is clear that the treatment programs of the court which was studied failed to meet the needs of and achieve treatment goals for a majority of the girls and non-white youth in the present sample. It would be erroneous to conclude simply that these programs are ineffective. The concept of interaction has been emphasized throughout this study. Hoffman (1981) noted that the study of interaction, of necessity, includes at least two pieces of information, "a statement about the individual entities and a statement about that larger entity which is brought into being by the fact of interaction" (p. 55). In this sense, it was suggested that the characteristics which youth bring to any treatment program interact with components of the treatment to influence outcome. In discussing the correlation of Variables #16 and #17, the child's race and sex respectively, with placement outcome, it is helpful to examine other factors which were found to be significantly related to outcome for girls and non-white youth and consider how they might interact with the efforts of court staff and foster parents to carry out the treatment plan.

Factors related to outcome for girls. Results from the analysis of data concerning the girls in the present sample revealed that four of the six variables related to foster placement outcome involve the interaction of the girls with their parents: (1) Variable #4, the quality of the parent-child relationship ($R = -.53$), (2) Variable #6, the parents' ability to enforce reasonable consequences for rule violations by their daughter ($R = .52$), (3) Variable #12, the par-
ents' desire to have their daughter home \( R = .56 \), and (4) Variable #21, cooperation of the girl with her parents \( R = -.34 \). As reviewed in chapter 2, Datesman and Scarpitti (1975) hypothesized that the larger proportion of broken homes among female delinquents reported in most previous studies appears to represent the greater involvement of girls in status offenses; running away, school truancy, ungovernability and sexual misbehavior. It was suggested that these behaviors may be a reaction of the girls to a conflictive and/or confused family situation, that is, to an inadequate psychological holding environment.

It appears that the majority of girls placed in foster care during the years covered in the present research experienced a conflictive and perhaps confusing home situation and that this experience is significantly related to their prognosis for successfully completing foster care placements. As indicated in chapter 4 (pp. 123-124), 35 of the 37 cases received low rankings on Variable #4 indicating a generally poor parent-child relationship. Thirty-six of the 37 cases received "poor" (12 cases) or "very poor" (24 cases) ratings on Variable #21, the child's cooperation with parents. It was suggested in chapter 4 that this loading of cases at the negative end of the scale and the small number of girls who succeeded in foster care appeared responsible for the negative correlations of these variables with placement outcome rather than a true comparison with girls who had positive relationships with their parents and demonstrated good cooperation with them prior to placement in foster care.

Gilligan's thesis (1982a, 1982b) regarding women's greater ten-
dency to view the world as comprised of relationships and to mediate conflict through those relationships is particularly relevant to the interpretation of these findings. For the girl in the present sample whose most important relationships, those with family members, were broken or severely conflicted, her tendency to understand and organize her world in terms of relationships appears to put her at significantly increased risk for placements failure in spite of the fact that placement may offer better, less conflicted relationships.

The child's early experience in a conflicted holding environment may have interfered with rather than promoted the healthy growth and development of her self, or ego. An adequate environment, summed up by Winnicott in the phrase "good-enough mothering" (Davis & Wallbridge, 1981) and extended by Kegan (1982) to include a sequence of "cultures of embeddedness", is essential for the realization of what Winnicott believed to be the intrinsic "momentum for growth towards emotional as well as physical maturity, and towards a positive contribution to society" (cited in Davis & Wallbridge, 1981, p. 176).

Rather than being encouraged and invited through the "contradiction" process described by Kegan (1982) to change her view of self, other and world to move toward more mature views, the girl who experienced severe and/or chronic conflict within her family may have been led, by necessity, to develop a defensive structure around a construction of self that is characteristic of an earlier age and developmental era. For example, if she retains the outlook on self, other and her world characteristic of Kegan's Imperial Age, with its egocentric focus on self and satisfying "my" needs and interests,
when she is a teenager and people expect her to coordinate meeting her needs with others meeting their needs, she is likely to experience much difficulty in her relationships. If she then comes into contact with foster care programs, she may be a very frustrating and difficult client to work with because of her inability to take the feelings and needs of others, including the foster parents, into account.

Factors related to outcome for minority youth. The analysis of data from the sample of non-white youth revealed that both Variable #12, the parents' desire to have their children home \( (R = -0.25) \), and Variable #26, the child's desire to remain home \( (R = 0.43) \), were related to outcome. Youth who exhibited stronger desire to live with their parents tended to remain in their assigned foster care placement through completion of the court treatment plan, perhaps to ensure their return home following the minimum required time in placement. On the other hand, the negative correlation of Variable #12 with outcome suggests that youth whose parents did not want them home appeared to do better in foster care placements. It may be that children whose parents expressed a clear desire to have their children removed from their care decided that since their parents were refusing to have them, they had nowhere else to go. In addition, if the parents' refusal to have their children remain home, as evident in the ratings on Variable #12, is due to significant levels of conflict between the children and their parents, then the discussion related to family conflict interfering with psychological development noted above may be relevant for minority youth also. The observed
difference in outcome for children whose parents refused to have them remain home may also be due, in large part, to a positive experience for these children in living with caring and capable foster parents.

Returning to the discussion of the effectiveness of the foster care programs and the need to consider the interaction of characteristics of the children with components of treatment, the findings regarding severe and/or chronic family conflict in the experience of girls and minority youth suggest additional interpretations regarding the treatment programs of the court. Girls and non-whites may find, to a greater degree, that the court and its treatment programs differ so drastically from their prior experience of various holding environments, e.g., family, neighborhood and school, that even though the court programs may be caring and positive, more girls and minority youth "run" from this new experience. In effect, court programs may be too dissonant with the youth's past experience to be well tolerated and used. Like the new therapy client who, when confronted with an experience too different from what is known and tolerable, cannot remain in treatment, girls and non-white youth psychologically may be unable to remain in their assigned placements and so literally "fail" those placements. The foster care programs, on the other hand, appear to work well for white boys who comprise the majority of referrals to these programs. It may be that boys, because of the past experiences, find the court sufficiently similar to their previous holding environment so that they remain in care long enough to benefit from treatment.

Another variable which emerged as significant for non-white
Youth, but not for whites, was Variable #18, the child's behavior record at school. Minority youth who had less conflict within the school and less disciplinary action taken against them in the nine months prior to placement were more likely to successfully complete their foster care placement. Neither this variable nor the others related to school truancy (Variable #20) and academic achievement (Variable #19) showed up as significant in the analysis of data from the white boys or the girls. One has to wonder whether these youth may have been "written off" by the school due to their history of poor school performance: 51% were one or more years behind appropriate grade level. If they then entered a court system that invested a significant amount of energy and caring into their well being, perhaps they responded in positive ways.

Further research is needed to confirm the hypothesis suggested by the present data that for white children who become wards of the court, their experience in school is, in fact, divorced from the outcome of foster placement. Gold and Mann (1984) presented a convincing argument that school failure is related to the likelihood of a child engaging in delinquent behavior. The present data suggest that once the child is involved with a court system that provides an experience of caring and structure, the effects of a poor school experience may be overcome and the likelihood of further delinquency reduced.

**Child's relationship with peers**

As noted in chapter 1, the TGH program relies heavily on peer
group experiences, interventions and activities as part of its treatment planning. It is not surprising to find Variable #28, the child's relationship with his or her peers, significantly related to outcome of TGH placements but not those of regular foster family care. In foster family placements, it appears more important that the youths be able to take responsibility for their own behavior, Variable #31 (R = .14). There is typically less structure and external control in foster family homes, so the less impulsive, more self-directed child is likely to do better.

Alcohol abuse

Alcohol abuse, Variable #30, was significantly related to foster family and TGH outcomes. Youth who demonstrate greater disruption of daily functioning due to alcohol abuse are at increased risk for failure. Of particular concern for the court which was studied is the fact that nearly 43% of the files reviewed contained no data regarding alcohol and drug abuse by the child. This finding suggests the possibility that the observed correlation between alcohol abuse and placement failure may not hold if the other cases were coded. In the 133 cases that could be coded, the relationship was significant and underlines the importance of assessing the alcohol use and/or abuse by the child.

Further Limitations of Research

Several limitations to this study were cited in chapter 1. Results of the present research and the development of predictive
scales suggest several others. Workers should be cautioned against applying the findings of this research to other populations of delinquent youth without consideration of other factors or with expectations of obtaining an identical rate of predictive accuracy. First, the prediction of outcome of foster placements for delinquent youth by statistical means is a relatively new effort. The procedure and the present formulas need cross-validation with an independent sample. One possibility for such cross validation includes using a random sample of youth from the same court who were removed from an initial foster or TGH placement in 1985 and 1986 to test the validity of the four scales of the Predictive Index for Foster Placement. Another possibility would be to have an independent rater complete the scales on youth currently in their first foster family or group home placement for the purpose of predicting outcome and then compare the actual outcomes with such predictions when the children are removed from placement.

Attempts to use the formulas developed during this study for populations dissimilar to the one studied will undoubtedly lead to shrinkage in the rate of predictive accuracy. It is possible that a caseload of youth from courts serving primarily a rural population or from a larger metropolitan area would require an assessment of a different combination of factors to aid in prediction. As studies of this nature are repeated with various delinquent populations, the validity and reliability of predictions should increase.

In the present population, 50.2% of the youth were maintained in their initial placement. In another population where the base rate
of success is different, the rate of accurate prediction using the present formulas would also be expected to change. In populations where the base rate approaches 80-85% success, these formulas would be of little value. In a population where 85% of the children typically complete foster placements successfully, the present formulas could not improve the probability of predicting successful outcome over that which could be achieved through reliance on the base rate of placement outcome alone.

Recommendations For Further Research

Future research involving a larger sample of girls may provide clarification and confirmation for trends noted in the present sample. It appears that family relationships are particularly important for girls. Use of a self-report scale designed to assess perception of family interaction, attitudes and feelings about one's family, or other measures of family functioning, in addition to ratings such as those employed in the present study, may provide further insight into the effects of a conflicted family system on girls who become delinquent wards of the court. Correlating these findings with outcome of care may help increase the probability of accurate predictions and the identification of girls at higher risk for placement failure and recidivism.

Further research is suggested to clarify the effects of varying levels of court staff involvement with foster parents, natural parents and youth both prior to and after placement has been initiated. It appears that not all youth need the same level of supervision. It
has been suggested that a critical level of cooperation and rapport between the probation officers, caseworkers and foster parents necessary for achieving successful foster placements may vary according to the type of child and the presenting problems. It may be possible for probation officers to allocate more time and energy with youth identified as likely to fail and with the foster parents caring for these high risk youth by reducing time spent with youth not requiring such close supervision. Future research designed to explore the interaction of various levels of PO/caseworker energy and foster parent rapport with different types of children as this affects case outcome will be helpful in developing a more empirical basis for the allocation of limited treatment resources.

The importance of the foster parents has been mentioned several times. A closer examination of characteristics of the foster parents such as length of time as foster parents and ratings of ability such as those provided by the Potential For Foster Parenthood Scale may identify further variables which contribute to successful outcomes for youth placed in foster care.

The findings of the present research suggest that community-based programs such as foster family and treatment group homes can work if clients are evaluated and placement decisions made on the basis of a number of factors in addition to the traditional reliance of juvenile courts on the severity or number of offenses. When services were provided to match the needs of the youth identified in the assessment process, even youth rated as very aggressive succeeded in an open group home setting. It is hoped that the results of the
present research have helped to specify the "conditions under which [rehabilitation] might have a chance to work" (Sahwver and Sanders, 1977, p.434) for youth who become delinquent wards of the juvenile court.

Within the scope of the limitations noted above, the judicious use of the Predictive Index scales, in conjunction with an application of the various regression equations observed to be effective in the prediction of placement outcomes and good clinical judgement, should together prove beneficial to the probation officer in making appropriate placement recommendations.
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Letter to Probation Staff
To: Probation Staff

From: Philip P. Versluis

Re: Research Project

Date: November 19, 1984

As I mentioned at the last staff meeting, John Weiks has the Court's support to conduct an intensive study of factors associated with success or failure of court wards placed in foster homes, treatment group homes and the camp program. In addition to reviewing the literature and looking at other studies to determine the most important factors to evaluate, Mr. Weiks would also like your input. It is felt your assistance will greatly improve the study and provide for more meaningful findings for the court's use. John will be tabulating results for use in the research on court placements and the In-Service Training Committee hopes to incorporate the responses in a training session on court placements. It would be appreciated if you would spend an hour or so responding to the attached material and return it to John Weiks by Tuesday, noon, November 27, 1984.
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Case Evaluation Form
Case Evaluation Form

Case NO.____________________

HYPOTHETICAL CASE EVALUATION

Please review the included case description for the purpose of answering the questions below. This case is similar to cases actually seen at court in that it contains information drawn from the social files of youth who were court wards during the period from 1980-83. Names and dates have been changed to protect confidentiality. Your replies will be anonymous since the only identifier we ask is that you put the case number (1, 2, or 3) corresponding to the one you review at the top of this form. Assume that the youth described has a hearing scheduled with the judge on the charge(s) indicated and make your recommendations with that in mind. Please do not recommend "adjourned disposition". Attach extra paper if necessary. Thanks much for your assistance.

1. Do you think this child should be removed from his/her parent's home? Yes____ No___

2. Please list the factors considered in making your decision.

3. In what program would you recommend this child be placed? ______________________

4. Please list the factors considered in making your recommendation.
Appendix C

Hypothetical Case Report: Case 1
CASE OF: Matthew I. S. Delinquent
BIRTH: 10-27-69
ADDRESS: 808 Diamond, N. E.
DATE OF REPORT: 9-21-84

I. REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COURT

A. Petitioner's Version: Four petitions were accepted from the Grand Rapids Police Department on 8-18-84: Count I: A petition was accepted from Officer A, GRPD, stating that on 7-16-84 at 413 Houseman, NE, Grand Rapids Matthew did break and enter the residence at 413 Houseman. Count II: A petition was accepted from Officer A, GRPD, stating that on 6-14-84 at 800 Diamond, NE, Grand Rapids Matthew did break and enter the residence at 800 Diamond, NE. Count III: A petition was accepted from Officer B, GRPD, stating that on 7-14-84 at 421 Houseman, NE, Grand Rapids Matthew did break and enter the residence at 421 Houseman, NE. Count IV: A petition was accepted from Officer B, GRPD, stating that on 7-13-84 at 503 Houseman, NE, Grand Rapids Matthew did break and enter the residence at 503 Houseman, NE.

B. Child's Version: Matthew is denying Counts I and III, and is admitting Counts II and IV.

(Intake Probation Officer listed the following reasons for accepting petition:
1. Matt denies 2 counts and admits 2;
2. Seriousness of incidents;
3. Has been on probation before - 1 year ago, probation in parents' home;
4. Many problems at home; curfew, stealing, lying;
5. Suspended from school for stealing.)

C. Present Whereabouts of Child: Matt was brought to detention at 1:30 PM on 7-16-84 by GRPD on a charge of "attempted B&E of 413 Houseman". He was released to his mother at 5:00 PM on the same day. After a Preliminary Inquiry was done on 8-18-84, a Denial Hearing was scheduled for 9-21-84. At the present time a plea agreement has been reached with the Assistant Prosecuting Attorney, in that if Matt admits to Counts II and IV, Counts I and III will be dismissed.

D. Victim and Restitution: Concerning Count I, there is no restitution to be made. Concerning Count II, approximately $250 worth of damage was done. Concerning Counts III and IV, approximately $300 worth of damage was done.
II. PREVIOUS COURT AND POLICE HISTORY

A. Court:

8-7-83 - GRPD, referral to the Juvenile Court for R&C stolen property valued at under $100.
10-2-83 - MTWC, and placed in the home of his parents. Further, that he complete 8 hours of work in the Court work program, and that a Review Hearing be held on 12-4-83.
12-4-83 - Discharged from Court Wardship with a discharge code of B-2.

B. Police:

2-7-81 - GRPD, ran away from home.
7-11-81 - GRPD, picked up for possession of marijuana. He was lectured, warned, and released.
8-7-83 - GRPD, referred to Juvenile Court for R&C stolen property valued under $100.

III. CHILD'S PERSONAL HISTORY

A. Personality: Matt is a 15 year old, white male. He is 5'10" tall and weighs approximately 150 pounds. At the time of Matt's first contact with the court, he was described as a quiet, shy, and introverted young man who had a ready smile when discussing topics he liked. When confronted about problems he was experiencing in school or at home, though, he became quite tearful. Last year Matt readily admitted that he was a follower and that this caused him problems in the past because he let other children lead him into a series of minor infractions at school. Matt presents himself now as an individual who is emotional, self-centered, and unmotivated. When confronted with his wrong doings, he continues to resort to tears and often tries to rationalize why he did what he did.

In contrast to his former characteristics of following others into trouble, he now appears to be acting on his own. He did these current B&E's without anyone's help. When seen in 1983, he indicated that he felt there was a lot of pressure put on him by his parents to excel even though he had a difficult time even maintaining average grades and behavior. He now does his best to ignore his parents' efforts to get him to improve his behavior or his school work.

Matt's parents stated initially that they had very little confidence in him and that he often lied and stole things from home.
His father says that his is quite strict with Matt, but that "it is for his own good". When the family was seen in September, 1983, the parents explained that Matt had been grounded almost all of the summer due to his inappropriate behaviors at home. The situation has deteriorated during the past year to the point now where the other family members have "given up" on Matt, and he, in turn, sees no need for trying to rectify the problems.

B. School: Matt has never been motivated to attend school on a regular basis. School personnel believe that he has the potential and the intelligence to do well, but is unmotivated to push himself or even try. He does just enough to get by. During the 1983-84 school year he was at Catholic Central High School. His grades were below average with a cumulative GPA of 1.59. While he was on probation from 9/83 through 12-4-83, he attended school regularly and maintained a "C" average.

Following his discharge from probation, Matt returned to a pattern of minor misbehaviors according to the assistant principal. He was caught stealing pizza from the lunch room and was suspended from Catholic Central for the last few weeks of the 1983-84 school year.

Matt is currently enrolled at Central High School, but appears to be continuing his misbehavior. School records indicate that he has been skipping a number of classes, usually either the first or the last class of the day.

IV. FAMILY ASSESSMENT

A. Structure: Matt presently lives in the home of his parents. His parents were married shortly after they graduated from high school in 1963. Neither of his parents attended college. Matt's father is 41 years old and his mother is 39. They have two other sons besides Matt; Larry, age 19, who works at a gas station and lives alone, and Tim, age 18, who just graduated from high school and is now employed as a cook at an area restaurant. Tim lives at home with his parents. Matt's father commutes to Greenville for his job, while his mother is employed at a local Meijer Thrifty Acres.

B. Relationships: When seen in 1983, Matt described his relationship with his parents as "very strained". He had been caught stealing from other family members, lying to his parents on several occasions, and breaking his grounding which had been imposed because of misbehavior. He stated at that time he could
talk easier with his mother than his father. He described his father as extremely strict and believed his father went overboard on discipline. Matt's disagreement over discipline usually took the form of a tearful protest in frustration from feeling "imprisoned" or, as noted above, staying away from home beyond his curfew. His father was, and is, openly critical of Matt's crying, seeing this as a sign of weakness in a young man, and he belittles him for it on a regular basis.

Matt's father wanted him locked up for a period of time and "forced to straighten out" when first seen by the Court in 1983. He made it quite evident that it should be Matt who was punished and not his parents. He refused to participate in counseling at that time indicating that it was Matt who was "screwed up" and not he. Matt's mother appeared to be more reasonable in that she believed Matt could be worked with successfully in the parents' home. She did not have the power to convince her husband of her views, though, once he decided something. There were clear indications that the mother attempts to compensate for her husband's severe approach to disciplining Matt and his strained relationship with his son. It appeared that this caused tension between the parents, but father rigidly refused to acknowledge any kind of problem other than Matt's behavior.

At this point, things are not going well for Matt and his family. He continues to lie and steal and refuses to help out with chores around the home. His father is extremely upset with Matt and fears he "may become physical with Matt if he doesn't straighten up". The parents indicate that everything at home is always locked up and that they constantly watch Matt in fear of him stealing and then selling their possessions. Although it was not mentioned as a major problem, his parents suspect that Matt is using marijuana on a fairly regular basis. Matt denies this and claims to not understand why no one trusts him or believes in him.

V. EVALUATION

This is Matt's second time before the Juvenile Court for a law violation. He was referred approximately one year ago for stealing 184 returnable (empty) beer cans. Presently he is being referred for four B&E's. He shows no remorse for his actions, but states that this was the only way he could "earn" some money.

Matt was cooperative when on probation last year. He attended all meetings with his probation officer and completed 8 hours in
the Court Work Program with minimal problems. The parents, especially father, were uncooperative in that they refused to participate in counseling or to meet with the probation officer on a regular basis. At this point, they maintain their focus on Matt as the source of all problems in the home. Matt displays little remorse or desire to change his behavior.
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Hypothetical Case Report: Case 2
HYPOTHETICAL CASE REPORT: Case 2

SUPPLEMENTAL HEARING REPORT

CASE OF: Leroy R.
BIRTH: 8-10-67
ADDRESS: 821 Alexander, S.E.
DATE OF REPORT: 9-13-83

I. REFERRAL HISTORY

7-1-82 - KCSD, referral to the Juvenile Court alleging that Leroy had in his possession a stolen bicycle valued at over $100 on 6-24-82.

9-16-82 - EGRPD, referral to the Juvenile Court alleging that on 9-14-82, in the 700 block of Cardinal, S.E., Leroy was involved in a theft of a bicycle valued at over $100.

1-14-83 - WPD, referral to the Juvenile Court alleging that on 1-11-83, at the K-Mart store located at 155 28th St., S.W., Leroy was involved in larceny in a building.

2-11-83 - MTWC, placed on probation in mother's home. Further, that he successfully complete the Kentfields Program, that he make restitution in the amount of $192.64 to the victims and/or their respective insurance companies, and that he spend 60 days in the detention facility of this court, with 58 of those days to be suspended after Leroy successfully complete the Kentfields Program and all the probation expectations of him, and a review hearing be scheduled for 6-10-83 at 10 a.m.

3-21-83 - Transferred to Kentfields probation officer and first day in the Program.

4-22-83 - Kentwood P.D., referral to the Juvenile Court for shoplifting at D&W Grocery Store, located at 5270 Eastern, S.E.

5-18-83 - Preliminary Inquiry: Child pled guilty to larceny in a building (same petition as 4-22-83)

6-4-83 - KCSD, referral to the Juvenile Court alleging that on 6-4-83, at Montgomery Wards (North Kent Mall), Leroy was involved in larceny in a building.

6-7-83 - Preliminary inquiry: Child pled guilty to larceny in a building (same petition as 6-4-83).

6-10-83 - CTWC, remain in the home of his mother pending completion of the Kentfields Program. Further, that disposition be adjourned and a review hearing be held on 9-13-83, and if a new law violation came to the Court, Leroy was to be placed in detention at that time.
II. CURRENT REFERRAL

No new referral. At the review hearing held on 6-10-83, it was ordered that a review hearing be held on 9-13-83.

III. CHILD'S PERSONAL HISTORY

A. Personality: Leroy is a 16 year old, black male. He presents himself as a rather mild-mannered and pleasant individual. He seems to take pride in his personal appearance and appears neat and clean. He expresses himself only upon being asked specific questions and does not elaborate on general questions asked of him. He does not appear to possess the characteristic of being assertive or aggressive in his verbal or nonverbal behaviors. It is unknown whether Leroy makes or maintains friends easily, but it appears from the law violations that he associates with peers who get involved in delinquent activities and possibly have a detrimental influence upon him. In some ways, it seems that Leroy has not taken his court involvement seriously. Initially, the Intake worker attempted to hold the matter at the Intake level with restitution to be made to the victims. Several appointments had to be scheduled before Leroy and his mother actually came for the initial Intake appointment. Leroy was unable to make any restitution as time progressed, and as noted above, new law violations continued to occur.

B. School: When he first became involved with the Court, Leroy was attending Ottawa Hills High School in the ninth grade. He was evaluated by his school counselor as a passive individual with little motivation within the school setting. His work habits were considered poor and his social habits average. In the first quarter, Leroy failed three subjects and received D's in the others. Also, he failed all of his exams following the first quarter. By the beginning of the second semester, he began skipping classes on a more regular basis. On a more positive note, Leroy has never had any form of behavioral problems within the school setting. His counselor at school believed, however, that he was not receiving maximum benefits from OHHS and possibly should be involved in some other form of educational program.

IV. FAMILY ASSESSMENT

A. Structure: Leroy lives in the home of his mother. His father is currently living in Toledo, Ohio. His parents were never married. At the present time, Leroy is the only child that is residing in the mother's home. There are several other
older siblings living within the Grand Rapids area. One of the older boys, who was involved with this court and the Kentfields Program several years ago, is currently in the Kent County Jail. Leroy's mother is 42 years of age and appears to be in reasonably good health at the present time. Her source of income is ADC payments. It should also be noted that there are various other relatives residing in the home including one of the mother's sisters and her children. It appears that people seem to settle in with the family for a period of time and then move on. This type of living arrangement seems to be unsettling to Leroy.

B. Relationships: Leroy's mother reported that she has a positive relationship with her son. She indicates that he does well within the home and claims she has control over him when he is present with her. Leroy has no contact with his natural father and, in fact, there appears to be no adult male giving him any form of positive direction. Mother has been uncooperative at times, missing scheduled appointments without notice and seeming to minimize problems with Leroy. She reportedly has not fully cooperated with DSS officials either regarding her participation in the WIN Program. The home situation does not appear to provide a great deal of structure and supervision. While it is true that mother is in the home on a regular basis, her supervisory skills are questionable.

V. EVALUATION

This case was transferred to the Kentfields Program on 3-21-83. Leroy's probation officer offered the following reasons for the recommendation of the Kentfields placement.

Leroy seems to do well within the home of his mother, although her parenting skills appear to be rather weak. He is failing miserably in his current school setting, and the opportunity to start an alternative education program will be most beneficial to Leroy. Also, the ability to earn money will help him pay back the victims and/or their insurance companies the money they are due, and hopefully instill in him the belief that he is to be held accountable for his law breaking behaviors. Leroy is not seen as an aggressive or violent individual, but rather compliant when structure is given to him. There is no known drug or alcohol usage by Leroy. His older brother, Philip, is currently in the Kent County Jail and notorious in the neighborhood for larcenies. Leroy seems to be somewhat caught up in this same kind of pattern and this should be monitored closely.
A. **Present Situation:** On 3-21-83, Leroy started attending the Kentfields Program from the home of his mother. During his stay in the first six weeks of the program, he did an excellent job. He managed to graduate from the first phase of the program in the allotted amount of time and on 4-29-83 he began the after-care phase.

Two new referrals were received by the court alleging that Leroy was involved in larceny in a building to which he pled guilty. On 6-10-83 Leroy was ordered by the Judge to remain in the home of his mother pending completion of the Kentfields Program. Further, that disposition be adjourned and a review hearing be held on 9-13-83, and if a new law violation came to the Court, that Leroy was to be placed in detention at that time.

B. **Other Salient Factors:** As mentioned above, Leroy did very well in the first phase of the Kentfields Program. He missed only two days out of the total program and was able to graduate in the allotted time. He began the Kentfields extension program on 5-2-83, and during the first week he missed two days which were unexcused. He responded well when confronted about his skipping and, for a time, his attendance improved. Academically, he has made significant progress while at the Harrison Park School. He usually behaves himself well and does not get into the horseplay that the other kids get involved in. Of concern, though, is the fact that he does not seem to relate very well with the other students. He mostly stays to himself and minds his own business.

During the last three weeks of the school year, Leroy began skipping much more frequently. He made frequent promises to improve his attendance, but his resolve did not last as it had during the first phase of the program. Since his involvement began with the court and through July of this year, Leroy did not show any problem maintaining his curfew according to his mother. As noted above, he was usually compliant with rules that were clearly defined. Beginning in July, his behavior started to change. He began to stay out past his curfew, and though there have been no new law violations referred to the court, there is concern that he is associating primarily with the same friends who were involved with him in previous thefts.

Leroy indicates that there have been several conflicts between his mother and her sister, who lives with their family, in recent months. While he denies that this upsets him, he gives many nonverbal indications in his interactions with his mother that he is becoming increasingly dissatisfied with their current
living arrangement. His mother states that Leroy is becoming harder to control, though she continues her pattern to minimize the problems. She still has difficulty providing adequate supervision or consistent limits on Leroy's behavior.
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HYPOTHETICAL CASE REPORT: Case 3

CASE OF: Mary R.A. Way
BIRTH: 7-17-69
ADDRESS: 3113 Jeanlawn, S.E.
DATE OF REPORT: 11-19-84

I. REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COURT

A. Petitioner's Version: A petition was accepted on 9-26-84 from Sgt. K, KCSD, stating that on 9-19-84 Mary did desert her home without just cause.

B. Child's Version: Mary admits to the above allegation.

C. Present Whereabouts of Child: Mary was placed at the time of her Preliminary Hearing in the girl's Shelter Home.

D. Victim and Restitution: Restitution does not apply.

II. PREVIOUS COURT AND POLICE HISTORY:

A. Court:
   4-12-84 - GRPD, referral to the Juvenile Court for larceny in a building (diverted to ACT - ABC Program).
   6-6-84 - KCSD, referral to the Juvenile Court for run away (diverted to the Crisis Intervention Program).

B. Police:
   3-21-84 - KCSD, ran away from home.
   4-12-84 - GRPD, referred to Juvenile Court for larceny in a building.
   5-18-84 - KCSD, family fight.
   6-6-84 - KCSD, referred to Juvenile Court for run away.
   7-31-84 - KCSD, ran away from home, taken to The Bridge.

III. CHILD'S PERSONAL HISTORY

A. Personality: Mary is an attractive, white female of 15 years. During this worker's first contact, Mary was very friendly and very talkative. She seemed to bubble over with information. It seems as though she had been holding things in for so long that she could not wait to get it out. Hardly any prompting was made for Mary to talk about her feelings regarding her home situation. She was very cooperative with this worker and the shelter home parents. Subsequent contacts with Mary have been different. Sometimes she was open and friendly, but at other times, quiet and withdrawn and very hesitant to talk. She has not let this worker become too close to her. She seems
to be somewhat moody and when she gets this way, it is hard to get her to communicate at all except with the answer of yes or no. She will not offer any information and will not initiate conversations when she is in these kinds of moods.

The most prominent features of Mary's personality are her apparent loneliness, depression, and confusion regarding events of her past, specifically her mother's "walking out on the family" and her father's abuse of his former and his present wife. Mary's mood changes are fairly frequent and seem to reflect the inner turmoil she is experiencing. Of particular concern is her level of depression which she attempts to cover with either a superficial outgoing friendliness or a rather sullen withdrawal and refusal to talk. She has never attempted suicide, but admits she has thought about it during the past summer. The acting out and fighting which occurred in her father's home diminished markedly following her placement in shelter care.

B. School: Mary attended Forest Hills Central High School last year and at the beginning of this year until she ran away from home on 9-19-84. The assistant principal reported to this worker that Mary was in and out of counseling with him last year. Her school attendance was fairly good, though there were periods of time last Spring when she skipped several days. These corresponded to the period in March, 1984 prior to and during the time when she ran away from home, and four days in May, 1984 following a family fight for which the Kent County Sheriff Department was called to respond. Mary indicated that her father became more violent than usual during that fight and it bothered her for several days.

In spite of the conflict and confusion in her home, Mary's behavior at school has always been very good. The assistant principal stated he also thought her home was not a healthy environment for Mary, but he believed that she occasionally used her past as an excuse for avoiding some responsibilities. Mary is of average intelligence and has maintained average grades throughout her school years. In a more stable environment and with less conflict on her mind, she has the potential to achieve higher grades on a more consistent basis. She has adjusted to the change of schools since her move to shelter care and is doing well.

IV. FAMILY ASSESSMENT

A. Structure: Mary was living with her father and her stepmother prior to placement in shelter care. Her father works at
a local dye cast factory and her stepmother will be working in a
doctor's office in Grand Rapids until February when she is
supposed to have an operation. She has an older brother, Pat,
who is 17, lives at home, and attends Forest Hills Central High
School. Siblings living out of the home include Violet, 21,
marr:ried, and David, 19, working as a printer and living outside
of Grand Rapids. Mary's mother is presently unemployed and
living in Cutlerville.

B. Relationships: Mary has a very conflictual relationship
with her father and stepmother. She describes her stepmother as
being jealous of Mary and Violet's relationship with their
father. None of the children in the family have a good rela-
tionship with their stepmother, but they all seem to have at
least some positive feelings toward their father. Mary gets
along well with her brothers and sister. It appears that all of
the older children, with the exception of Pat, left home to live
elsewhere because of the conflict in the home. Most of this
difficulty, according to the children, stems from their step-
mother's treatment of them and her attempts to keep the girls
from their father. It seems that many of the things done by the
stepmother were kept from the father as the kids were growing
up.

Martha W., Mary's mother, left the family when Mary was five
years old due to repeated physical and emotional abuse by her
husband. She was married to Mr. Way for thirteen years. She
has not remarried. Mr. Way remarried approximately eight years
ago to his current wife. Mary and her siblings seem to have a
fair relationship with their mother, but it appears that they
hold a lot of grudges against her for leaving the family. They
do not keep in very close contact with her nor have any of the
children lived with their mother since the divorce. She lives
in a very small apartment and indicated she could not possibly
take Mary at this time. Mary made it very clear that she will
not live with her mother under any circumstances.

V. EVALUATION

It is obvious to this worker that Mary's past has been very
difficult. Her mother left the family when Mary was very young.
Her mother describes her relationship with Mary's father as bad.
During an interview with this worker, it was noted that she
became very nervous when talking of the past. In describing her
relationship with her ex-husband, she would clench her fists
while she talked. She described several incidents of being hit
and being subjected to verbal abuse in front of the children.
She said she was emotionally exhausted from the relationship so she left. After their divorce, she underwent therapy at Pine Rest. The children were put in a foster home at this time until after their father married his present wife.

Since Mr. Way's remarriage, the children's relationship with their father has been very bad. In 1981, David, the oldest son, was taken from the home by Protective Services because his stepmother had been having sexual relations with him for the past five years. Since David later refused to testify, the petition was changed to neglect and David was placed in a foster home until he was able to live on his own. The family was ordered into counseling, but were uncooperative and attended very few sessions.

In this worker's meeting with Violet, the oldest daughter, she described her childhood as bad also. She remembers her father hitting both her mother and her stepmother frequently, but says that he never beat any of the children when they were young. She indicated that at times she is afraid of her father but does not know why, perhaps the incidents of abuse that she witnessed.

The stepmother did not allow the girls in the family to be around their father in their robe or nightgown, even when young. It appears that she was very jealous of Mr. Way's relationship with his daughters and felt very threatened by them. They were not allowed to sit by him on the couch or walk alone with him outside in the yard because their stepmother would punish or argue with them if they did. It is not certain if Mr. Way was aware of this, but if he was, he seemed to try not to believe that this was happening. Their stepmother made life so unbearable for the girls that eventually Violet moved out and stayed with her previous foster parents until she found an apartment. Violet said the girls in the family were not allowed in the basement where her father and stepmother's bedroom was, but she does remember on one occasion going down there and finding David lying on the bed with their stepmother.

As noted above, Mary and her family were referred by the Intake Department to the Crisis Intervention Program (CIP) of this Court on 6-6-84 following receipt of a referral from KCSD alleging that Mary ran away from home. CIP records show that the family failed to show for the first two scheduled appointments. The father called after the scheduled dates claiming business responsibilities had prevented their keeping the appointments. When the family finally came in on 6-21-84, it was clear that the parents were present only to declare what a problem Mary
The parents were very uncooperative with the counselor's attempts to set goals for family counseling claiming that all they expected from their children, including Mary, was to follow their simple rules.

When questioned about his use of physical punishment, Mr. Way became extremely defensive and angry claiming that all counselors ever wanted to do was blame parents for the problems. He calmed down enough to schedule a second appointment, but the family failed to show. When contacted by phone, the stepmother explained that her husband was sick and they would call back to reschedule, but they never did.

During this worker's first contact with Mr. Way, he was very uncooperative. He refused to have Mary come home again and refused to come in and discuss her future. He explained that he does not want to have anything more to do with her. He says that it is all Mary's fault and no one understands this. He admits he is a strict disciplinarian, but he refuses to change. He claims he is done meeting with "social workers" and has refused to schedule further appointments with this worker. He seems to be trying to make Mary feel guilty by saying that he is going to lose the house because she ran away and he will have to pay money for her if she is placed outside of his home. Yet, as noted above, he says he will not have her home. At this point, Mary states she does not ever want to live at home again because her stepmother has made life unbearable for her and also she is afraid she might get beat.
Appendix F

Summary of P.O. Responses: Case 1
Summary of P.O. Responses - Case 1

1. Do you think this child should be removed from his/her parent's home?  
   Yes 6  No 11

2. Factors listed by P.O.s in making decision (number before response indicates frequency of listing by P.O.s)

   YES

   I. Police/Court History

   3 number of current law violations
   2 number of previous police contacts
   1 number of previous referrals to court
   1 past criminal record of youth
   3 number of previous appearances before judge

   II. Characteristics of Natural Parents and Family

   1 parents' lack of parenting skills
   4 parents' refusal to work on problems
   1 serious communication problems between parents and child
   1 inability of parents and child to demonstrate cooperation
   1 parents' lack of motivation to change

   III. Characteristics of Youth

   3 misbehavior at school, home and community
   1 lack of remorse about law violations
   1 thinks B&Es only way to make money
   1 new school may provide fresh start

   NO

   I. Police/Court History

   9 successful on probation before
   1 first felony referral to court
   1 number of previous police contacts
   1 relatively short history of law violations
   1 property felonies, not violent crimes against person

   II. Characteristics of Natural Parents and Family

   3 removal would reinforce idea that Matt is the problem
   2 child's behavior appears to be reinforced by parental pattern of focus only on negatives
Summary - Case 1

1 parents involved, even if doing more harm than good
1 relationship between Matt & parents strained, but not broken
1 family problems dealt with best if child in the home
1 parents must accept responsibility for their part in problem
2 father must be pressured to cooperate
1 older sibs "OK" so parents did "something right"

III. Characteristics of Youth

2 Matt's "attitude" problem seems of relatively recent origin
2 Matt not totally out of control
2 school behavior not that bad, IEPC vs. court placement
1 cooperative in the past
1 good candidate for community-based program
1 age
1 change by Matt may stimulate parents' cooperation
1 need for restitution
1 job may keep him from stealing

3. Placement Recommendations and Reasons

Probation in Parents' home (3)

there is some stability in the home
parents appear to care, but inappropriate ways of showing
Matt not "in the streets" or constantly running away
Matt attending school on partial to regular basis
mother seems to be cooperative
Matt maintaining "C" average in school
parents can be ordered to attend parenting classes/counseling
no obvious signs of neglect/abuse

Kentfields (8)

court can justify discharge based on points earned, rather than rely
on reports by parents
Matt needs structure, control, & consistent feedback
Matt's age allows time to try in home option
emphasize this is last option before placement
can make restitution with money earned in Kentfields
parents can be ordered to attend parenting classes/counseling
positive atmosphere of Kentfields will bolster self image
Kentfields school program will help Matt catch up
behavioral treatment orientation
both parents work
Summary - Case 1

Foster Care (1 - FC; 2 - FC/TGH)

number and type of offenses
Matt projecting blame on others
qualified by availability, locale, and strengths/weaknesses of particular foster home vs. treatment group home
qualified by resources in area of particular foster home that is available

Treatment Group Home (2 - TGH; 2 - FC/TGH)

more contact with caseworker
Matt's need for structure and a lot of attention
peer group could provide support
level system may foster responsibility
will be held accountable for his behavior
program works with family who need to be involved
court "policy" of increasing restrictiveness of placement

Youth Camp (1)

punishment for law violations
Matt must take responsibility for his actions/pay consequences
family counseling can be initiated
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Appendix G

Summary of P.O. Responses: Case 2
Summary of P.O. Responses - Case 2

1. Do you think this child should be
removed from his/her parent's home? Yes 10 NO 7

2. Factors listed by P.O.s in making decision (number before response indicates frequency of listing by P.O.s)

YES

I. Police/Court History

4 additional law violation during court involvement
1 past criminal record of youth
1 prior police contacts

II. Characteristics of Natural Parents and Family

5 confusion in the home
2 mother's inability to control child and set limits
4 mother uncooperative with the court
1 lack of adult male relationships

III. Characteristics of Youth

1 not taking court involvement seriously
3 very poor school attendance and grades
1 failure to respond to treatment plan while in Kentfields

NO

I. Police/Court History

1 even though many problems, allowed to stay home on 6/10/83
4 no law violations since 6/10/83
1 several law violations, but relatively minor
1 reports come from mother who may be exaggerating frequency and/or
   magnitude due to her poor parenting skills
2 did well in Kentfields for most of the program
1 child not asking for removal
2 mother appears willing to continue to work on problems
1 drastic change in Leroy's behavior may be result of situation
   that can be dealt with while he is at home
2 some progress made in school
1 addition of counseling may help deal with home problems

3. Placement Recommendations and Reasons

Probation in Parent's home (7)
no new law violations since last hearing
mother minimizes problems, wait until she admits problems or new law
  violations before placement out of home
mother willing to work on problems
additional support can be provided for mother
offenses not violent
child responded to external structure before
problems are "home-oriented", keep home with counseling
significant school progress in Kentfields

Foster Care (3 - FC; 2 - FC/Camp)

need more structure than family providing
need for punishment ("taken out of circulation")
Leroy complies and obeys when structure provided
older siblings have a pattern of criminality
behavior increasingly getting worse
age
problems in home and school
court policy to remove if new law violations in Kentfields
need for stable environment
need for positive role models
needs privacy of his own room
no substance abuse
child is mild-mannered, pleasant, neat and clean

Treatment Group Home (2 - TGH; 1 - TGH/FC)

age
need to work with child and parent
child responds well to external structure
no significant behavior problems (lack of aggressive behavior)
need for structured environment
need for positive role model
need for environment in which he can mature/become responsible

Youth Camp (2 - Camp; 2 - FC/Camp)

long history of law violations and school problems
youth responds well to structure
need for immediate reinforcers
need for progressive response by court in regard to probation viola-
tion
camp school program is effective
positive male role models at camp
age
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Appendix H

Summary of P.O. Responses: Case 3
Summary of P.O. Responses - Case 3

1. Do you think this child should be removed from his/her parent's home? Yes 15  NO 2

2. Factors listed by P.O.s in making decision (number before response indicates frequency of listing by P.O.s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Police/Court History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 long history of physical and sexual abuse in family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 continued runaways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 previous police contacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| II. Characteristics of Natural Parents and Family |
| 6 father doesn't want her there |
| 3 many home problems, unstable family situation |
| 1 parents unable to deal with problems in family |
| 6 uncooperative parents |
| 5 personal problems of parents (father's violence and abuse, mother "walked out", stepmother neglectful/abusive) |
| 1 poor relationship between father and stepmother |
| 4 parents uncooperative with past counseling |
| 3 unsupportive, emotionally abusive home |
| 3 family relationships unworkable |
| 1 no consistent rules or expectations for child |
| 2 older children removed by court or left on their own |

| III. Characteristics of Youth |
| 1 child voices fear of father |
| 1 stable school attendance, good grades |
| 2 Mary needs break from stressful environment |
| 3 child doesn't want to be there |
| 2 Mary needs benefit of loving parents |
| 1 manic-depressive affect of child |
| 1 Mary's need to deal with her own confusion about her past before returning home |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 new case with the court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 parents could be workable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 no previous out-of-home placements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 incorrigible petition - no law violations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Placement Recommendations and Reasons

Probation in Parents' home (1 - own home; 1 - own/relative)

this is the type of case that could go delinquent, mental health, or neglect
no law violations
if situation continues as is, order foster care "for Mary's sake"

Foster Care (11 - FC; 3 - relative's home/FC)

child's good adjustment in Shelter Care
need for stable environment (safe, predictable, nurturing)
"easy to place" - attractive, good potential in school
for child's safety
Mary's need for positive role models
only order foster care if acceptable relative's home can't be found
problems appear to be with parents, not child
foster care is "least restrictive"
child needs setting in which she can express feelings, learn good communication skills
good school behavior
type of offense (status)
child's behavior fairly good outside of home

Treatment Group Home (1)

program provides much needed nurturing and clear expectations
Appendix I

Placement Questionnaire
PLACEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Listed below are a number of factors identified by probation officers as important to consider when making out-of-home placements. We would like to ask your assistance one more time to help narrow the list to those agreed upon by a majority of staff. Please rate each of these statements in terms of whether you agree or disagree that it is important to you when considering a recommendation to the three Court programs listed on the attached sheet. Write in the number from the following scale that most closely corresponds to your opinion of the item's importance for each program. Please use the attached answer sheet for your responses. Thanks again for your time and help.

Strongly Not Strongly
Agree Agree Not Applicable Disagree Strongly
5 4 3 2 1

I. Nature of Problem(s) Leading to Placement Request

1. Seriousness of current offense(s)
2. Number of current offense(s)
3. Past criminal record of youth
4. Number of previous contacts with police
5. Number of previous referrals to court
6. Number of previous appearances before judge

II. Characteristics of the Natural Parents and Family

7. Quality of the marital relationship
8. Quality of parent(s)' relationship with child
9. Parent(s)' ability to express affection toward child
10. Parent(s)' ability to set reasonable limits on child's behavior (establish reasonable rules)
11. Parent(s)' ability to enforce reasonable and consistent consequences for child's behavior
12. Parent(s)' ability to provide adequate supervision
13. Parent(s)' ability to recognize and to accept appropriate responsibility for problems with their child
14. Mental health of the parent(s)
15. Intelligence of the parent(s)
16. Past physical, sexual, emotional abuse of child by parents
17. Current physical or emotional abuse of child by parent
18. Cooperation of parent(s) with treatment plan
19. Parent(s)' motivation to change
20. Parent(s)' desire to have child home
21. History of problems in family
III. Characteristics of the Delinquent Youth

22. Age at time of placement
23. Race
24. Sex
25. School behavior - appropriate behavior and response to teacher's discipline, independent of achievement
26. School achievement
27. School truancy
28. Cooperation of child with parent(s)
29. Compliance of child with rules in the home
30. Cooperation of child with treatment plan
31. Degree of aggressive behavior by child
32. Child's need for "structure" - evident through inability to control his/her own impulsive/criminal behavior
33. Child's attitude about remaining in parent(s)' home
34. Child's "personality"
35. Child's degree of emotional attachment to parents
36. Child's ability to form relationship with adult in position of authority
37. Child's ability to recognize and accept appropriate responsibility for his/her behavior

IV. Characteristics of the Treatment Program

38. The program is flexible enough to work with "difficult or "unusual" cases
39. There is a clear understanding of the role relationship between PO and care providers
40. PO has substantial input on treatment plan
41. There is a well defined, consistent treatment program
42. Family issues are dealt with effectively
43. Daily behavioral issues are dealt with effectively
44. Placement provides a "family" atmosphere
45. Placement primarily provides effective growth
46. Placement primarily provides effective punishment
# Placement Questionnaire

**Answer Sheet**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Foster Care</th>
<th>Group Home</th>
<th>Youth Camp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J

Results of P.O. Ratings
Results of P.O. Ratings

Listed below are the factors rated by probation officers as most important to consider when making recommendations for out-of-home placements of delinquent youth. Factors were included in this list (judged most important) through the following arbitrary method. If at least two-thirds of the probation officers responding to the survey (9 out of 14) gave the item a "5", indicating that they "strongly agree" it is important to consider, that factor was included. If 90% of the respondents, 13 out of 14, rated an item "4" or "5", indicating that they "agree" or "strongly agree" it is important, that factor is included also. The items are listed under the same headings as on the survey questionnaire, though the numbering has been changed. Following the list of items, the identified factors are shown marked with an "X" on the "PLACEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE Answer Sheet". This is a rough indication for which placement (foster care, treatment group home, or youth camp) or combination of placements it was rated as most important for inclusion in the assessment and recommendation process.

I. Nature of Problem(s) Leading to Placement Request
   1. Seriousness of current offense(s)
   2. Number of current offenses
   3. Past criminal record of youth

II. Characteristics of the Natural Parents and Family
   4. Quality of parent(s)' relationship with child
   5. Parent(s)' ability to set reasonable limits on child's behavior (establish reasonable rules)
   6. Parent(s)' ability to enforce reasonable and consistent consequences for child's behavior
   7. Parent(s)' ability to provide adequate supervision
   8. Parent(s)' ability to recognize and to accept appropriate responsibility for problems with their child
   9. Past physical, sexual, emotional abuse of child by parent
  10. Current physical or emotional abuse of child by parent
  11. Cooperation of parent(s) with treatment plan
  12. Parent(s)' desire to have child home
  13. History of problems in family

III. Characteristics of the Delinquent Youth
  14. School truancy
  15. Cooperation of child with parent(s)
  16. Compliance of child with rules in the home
17. Cooperation of child with treatment plan
18. Degree of aggressive behavior by child
19. Child's need for "structure"
20. Child's attitude about remaining in parent(s)' home
21. Child's "personality"
22. Child's ability to form relationship with adult in position of authority
23. Child's ability to recognize and accept appropriate responsibility for his/her behavior

IV. Characteristics of the Treatment Program

24. The program is flexible enough to work with "difficult or "unusual" cases
25. PO has substantial input on treatment plan
26. There is a well defined, consistent treatment program
27. Daily behavioral issues are dealt with effectively
28. Placement provides a "family" atmosphere
29. Placement primarily provides effective growth
PLACEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Factors identified as most important in placement recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foster Care</td>
<td>Group Home</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Camp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix K

Questionnaire for Predicting Appropriate Foster Placement
Questionnaire for Predicting Appropriate Foster Placement

DIRECTIONS

The following directions clarify the procedures used by the researcher to complete the Placement Evaluation face sheet and to code the items from the Questionnaire for Predicting Appropriate Foster Placement on the Answer Sheet. All coding was done by the researcher alone. All items from the Placement Evaluation face sheet and the Questionnaire assume a suffix of "as indicated by the child's court record/file". All items were coded by putting the scale number corresponding to the answer which was closest to being the correct response on the blank after the item number on the Answer Sheet.

Placement Evaluation face sheet

This face sheet was adapted from a form used by the court under study to evaluate all out-of-home placements of delinquent youth ordered by the court. Most information on the face sheet was simply transferred from the form which was filled out by the supervising probation officer when the youngster was removed from placement. The current format of the face sheet was chosen, in part, to facilitate its use in the court's computerized data base system.

1. PLACEMENT OUTCOME (Research definition)
   Check appropriate item based on following definitions

   1 - Failure: Removal of the child from the foster or group home within one and one-half years of placement due to (1) disruptive behavior by the child or (2) noncompliance by the natural parents.

   2 - Success: Continued maintenance of the child in the initially selected foster placement for a period of no less than sixty days. Child removed from foster care according to the independent planning of the court and probation officer.

Code appropriate number under PLACEMENT OUTCOME (item #1) on Answer Sheet
2. RECOMMENDED PLACEMENT
Write in appropriate answer from following list

1 - Own Home
2 - Own Home with Kentfields Program
3 - Foster Home
4 - Treatment Group Home
5 - Youth Camp
6 - Private Institution
7 - Commitment to State Department of Social Services (SDSS)
8 - Combination Order

Code appropriate number under PLACEMENT DEMOGRAPHICS (item #2) on Answer Sheet

3. ACTUAL PLACEMENT
Write in type of first out-of-home placement for the child

1 - Foster Home
2 - Treatment Group Home

Code appropriate number under PLACEMENT DEMOGRAPHICS (item #3) on Answer Sheet

4. PREVIOUS PLACEMENT

For the children included in this study their previous placement must have been in their parents' home or the home of their legal guardian. Write in the appropriate answer.

5. REASON FOR REMOVAL FROM PARENTS' HOME
Write in appropriate answer from following list

1 - Run Away
2 - Incorrigible Home Behavior
3 - Family Problems
4 - Law Violations
5 - School Problems
6 - Neighborhood/Peer Group Problems
7 - Other (specify)

Code appropriate number under PLACEMENT DEMOGRAPHICS (item #5) on Answer Sheet

6. PLACEMENT DATE

Record date child entered foster or treatment group home

7. REMOVAL DATE

Record date child actually left the foster or group home whether
planned or unplanned (e.g. run away)

8. TOTAL DAYS IN PLACEMENT

Record actual number of days child remained in initial foster or group home placement. For coding on Answer Sheet use following categories.

1 - Under One Month (under 30 days)
2 - One to Three Months (31-90 days)
3 - Three to Six Months (91-181 days)
4 - Six to Twelve Months (182-365 days)
5 - Twelve to Eighteen Months (366-547 days)
6 - Over Eighteen Months (548 or more days)

Code appropriate number under PLACEMENT DEMOGRAPHICS (item #8) on Answer Sheet

9. PRIMARY REASON FOR REMOVAL FROM PLACEMENT

Write in appropriate answer from following list

1 - Treatment Objectives Met
2 - Improper Behavior in Placement
3 - Runaway From Placement
4 - Youngster Refuses to Return to Placement
5 - New Law Violation
6 - Other (specify)

Code appropriate number under PLACEMENT DEMOGRAPHICS (item #9) on Answer Sheet

10. WHERE CHILD PLACED FOLLOWING REMOVAL

Write in appropriate answer from following list

1 - Own Home
2 - Relative's Home
3 - Foster Home
4 - Treatment Group Home
5 - Youth Camp
6 - Private Institution
7 - Commitment to State Department of Social Services (SDSS)

11. GENERAL QUALITY OF PLACEMENT

Write in appropriate answer using definitions from following list

High Improvement: All or most goals of placement met. No law violation while in care. Placement reports satisfactory adjustment. Maintained satisfactory school or work record, i.e., good attendance, good or improved grades.
Fair Improvement: Goals of placement partially met. Adjustment was marginal to satisfactory, i.e., placement had some continuing problems with the child but were manageable. May have had police contact. For Treatment Group Home placements - the child may have been removed prior to completing treatment plan, but was placed in foster care (less structured placement).

Placement Failure: Child could not adjust to placement. No improvement in behavior while in placement. Child appears to have regressed. Possibly new law violations. For Treatment Group Home placements - the child leaves program and goes to a more structured placement.

Questionnaire for Predicting Appropriate Foster Placement

Most items in the Questionnaire are self-explanatory and were coded by simply putting the scale number corresponding to the answer which was closest to the correct response on the blank after the item number on the Answer Sheet. Additional procedures used by the researcher on a few of the items are explained below.

1. Seriousness of the current offense(s) (SerOff)

If there were were multiple offenses, only the most serious of the offenses that resulted in the court hearing at which the child was ordered into a foster or group home placement was coded.

2. Number of current offenses (NumOff)

The total number of offenses for which the child was charged in the court hearing at which he or she was ordered into foster or group home placement was coded.

3. Index of past criminal record of youth (Index)

A. Previous police contacts were defined as any status offense or criminal behavior that led to the child having contact with the police, but for which the police did not send a referral to the juvenile court. Severity of the crime was based on the rank order used in item one (e.g., status offenses were equal to 1, sex offenses equaled 4, and so on). Previous police contacts are listed on the referrals sent to the court by police and/or recorded in the probation officer's Field Investigation Report to the judge. The number of prior police contacts for each category of offense was multiplied times the severity of the crime. The resulting figures were then added and the total recorded.

B. Previous petitions filed were defined as referrals (complaints, reports) filed with the Intake Department of the juvenile
court by police, parents or other authorities regarding status offense or criminal behavior of a child. The severity of the crimes for each referral was based on the rank order used in item one. The placement value referred to whether the child remained in his/her parents' home on formal or informal probation (1), or whether the Home Detention (2) or Kentfields (3) programs was ordered in addition to probation at home. Previous petitions filed included those on which informal action was taken by the court as well as those scheduled to be heard in front of a judge. The number of previous petitions for each category of offense was multiplied times the severity of the crime. This figure was then multiplied times the number associated with the placement resulting from action taken by the court on that referral. The resulting figures were then added and the total recorded.

C. The Index Value was found by adding the totals of the previous two items. The grand total was then coded according to the scale included in the Questionnaire.

9. Past physical, sexual abuse or neglect of child (PstAbus)

The Child Protection Law (1975) of the State of Michigan was used as a basis for definitions of abuse and neglect in the coding of this item and item 10. As defined in Section 2 of this act, "child abuse" means "harm of threatened harm to a child's health or welfare which occurs through non-accidental physical or mental injury; sexual abuse; sexual exploitation; or mistreatment". "Child neglect" means "harm to a child's health or welfare which occurs through negligent treatment, including the failure to provide adequate food, clothing, shelter, or medical care". "Sexual abuse" is defined as "engaging in sexual contact or sexual penetration as defined in section 520a of the Michigan penal code, Act No. 328 of the Public Acts of 1931, being section 750.520a of the Michigan Compiled Laws, with a child by a person responsible for the child's health or welfare". The act further defines "sexual exploitation" as "allowing, permitting, or encouraging a child to engage in prostitution by a person responsible for the child's welfare; or allowing, permitting, encouraging, or engaging in the photographing, filming, or depicting of a child engaged in a listed sexual act as defined in section 145c of Act No. 328 of the Public Acts of 1931, being section 750.145c of the Michigan Compiled Laws, by a person responsible for the child's health or welfare".

A clear example of child abuse would be a parent who beats a 10 year old child with his or her fists to the point where the child is bruised. On the other hand, when a case record documents that a 15 year old boy provoked his father or mother into hitting him by initiating an attack against the parent, and shows that the parent was acting in self-defense, this will not be considered child abuse unless the parents exceeds the point of self-defense and continues beating the child after the child had stopped fighting. Child
neglect is defined for the purpose of this study to include a parent repeatedly failing (for a period of five or more days or continuing after action by appropriate authorities requesting the child's attendance) to send a child to school when the child was healthy and there was no verifiable reason for the child to miss school.

Past abuse is defined as that which occurred two or more months prior to court action which resulted in the placement of the child in foster care or the Treatment Group Home Program as a delinquent ward of the court.

10. Current physical, sexual abuse or neglect of child (CurAbus)

Child abuse and neglect are defined as above in item 9. Current abuse or neglect is defined as that which occurred within two months immediately preceding the court action that resulted in the placement of the child in foster care or the Treatment Group Home Program as a delinquent ward of the court. A Protective Service referral is warranted, according to Section 3 (1) of the Child Protection Law (1975), when any "duly regulated child care provider ... has reasonable cause to suspect child abuse or neglect". Occasionally a probation officer may suspect that there is abuse or neglect, but be unable to obtain enough information to support "reasonable cause", and, therefore, does not make a report to Protective Services. In these instances, it is appropriate to code item 10 as a "2".

13. History of interpersonal problems between family members; marital, parent-child, &/or sibling conflict (HxProb)

This item refers to interpersonal problems of a serious nature such as marital problems leading to divorce, conflict between family members necessitating the intervention of external authorities or helping agents (spouse abuse, child abuse, etc.), or problems resulting in serious emotional disturbance of a family member or members (e.g. alcoholism, drug abuse, etc.).
## Placement Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case #</th>
<th>DOB</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. **Placement Outcome** (Research definition)
   - [ ] Success
   - [ ] Failure

2. **Recommended Placement**

3. **Actual Placement**

4. **Previous Placement**

5. **Reason for Removal from Home**

6. **Placement Date**

7. **Removal Date**

8. **Total Days in Placement**

9. **Primary Reason for Removal from Placement**

10. **Where Child Placed Following Removal**

11. **General Quality of Placement**
PREDICTING APPROPRIATE FOSTER PLACEMENTS

Answer Sheet

Case Number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACEMENT OUTCOME</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ____</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACEMENT DEMOGRAPHICS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. ____  3. ____  5. ____  8. ____  9. ____</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROBLEM VARIABLES</th>
<th>CHILD VARIABLES</th>
<th>TREATMENT PROGRAM VARIABLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ____</td>
<td>15. ____</td>
<td>32. ____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ____</td>
<td>16. ____</td>
<td>33. ____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ____</td>
<td>17. ____</td>
<td>34. ____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATURAL PARENT VARIABLES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. ____</td>
<td>19. ____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ____</td>
<td>20. ____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ____</td>
<td>21. ____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ____</td>
<td>22. ____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ____</td>
<td>23. ____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. ____</td>
<td>24. ____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. ____</td>
<td>25. ____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. ____</td>
<td>26. ____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. ____</td>
<td>27. ____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PO VARIABLES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35. ____</td>
<td>36. ____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. ____</td>
<td>38. ____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. ____</td>
<td>39. ____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. ____</td>
<td>40. ____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. ____</td>
<td>41. ____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questionnaire for Predicting Appropriate Foster Placement

I. NATURE OF PROBLEM(S) LEADING TO PLACEMENT

1. Seriousness of current offenses (code most serious) \( \text{(SerOff)} \)
   1 - status offense
   2 - probation violation/minor misdemeanors
   3 - narcotics and drug offenses
   4 - sex offenses
   5 - property crime (larceny, burglary, auto theft)
   6 - violent personal crime (homicide, rape, assault)

2. Number of current offenses \( \text{(NumOff)} \)
   1 - one offense
   2 - two offenses
   3 - three or more offenses

3. Index of past criminal record of youth \( \text{(Index)} \)
   A. previous police contacts recorded in file (no petition filed) times severity of crime (see #1)
      Police Contacts Severity of Crime
      _____ X _____ = _____
      _____ X _____ = _____
      Total _____  _____
   B. previous petitions times severity of crime (see #1)
      times placement value \( \text{(1 - parents' home; 2 - Home Detention; 3 - Kentfields)} \)
      Previous PetitionsFiled Severity of Crime Placem't Value
      _____ X _____ X _____ = _____
      _____ X _____ X _____ = _____
      Total _____  _____
      Total _____  _____
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C. Index Value

1 - Index Value = 0-10
2 - Index Value = 11-15
3 - Index Value = 16-20
4 - Index Value = 21+
9 - Unidentifiable from record

II. CHARACTERISTICS OF NATURAL PARENTS AND FAMILY

4. Quality of parent-child relationship (PCRelat)
   1 - very poor (e.g. frequent physical fighting)
   2 - poor (e.g. frequent arguments, no physical fights)
   3 - good (e.g. infrequent arguments, usually able to solve
        problems, affection displayed)
   4 - very good (e.g. frequent expressions of affection and
        encouragement, able to solve most daily problems)
   9 - unidentifiable from record

5. Parents' ability to set limits (LimtSet)
   1 - very poor (e.g. parents do not set appropriate limits with
       respect to all of the following areas of the child's behav-
       ior: peers, school work, household responsibilities, per-
       sonal habits, social behavior.) (rule establishment)
   2 - poor (e.g. parents overly lenient in 4 of these areas)
   3 - average (e.g. parents overly lenient in 3 of these areas)
   4 - good (e.g. parents overly lenient in 2 of these areas)
   5 - very good (e.g. parents overly lenient in 1 of these areas)
   6 - excellent (e.g. parents are not overly lenient in any area -
        limitations are considered appropriate for the child's age)
   9 - unidentifiable from record

6. Parents' ability to enforce consequences (EnfCon)
   1 - very poor (e.g. parents are overly punitive and over-
       controlling or excessively lenient with respect to all of
       the following areas of the child's behavior: peers, school
       work, household responsibilities, personal habits, social
       behavior
   2 - poor (e.g. parents overly punitive etc. in 4 of these areas)
   3 - average (e.g. parents overly punitive etc. in 3 of these
       areas)
   4 - good (e.g. parents overly punitive etc. in 2 of these areas)
   5 - very good (e.g. parents overly punitive etc. in 1 of these
       areas)
   6 - excellent (e.g. parents are not overly punitive or exces-
       sively lenient in any areas (use appropriate consequences
       for enforcing limits)
   9 - unidentifiable from record
7. Parents' ability to provide adequate supervision (Superv)
   1 - very poor (e.g. parents frequently leave kids unattended, overly lenient)
   2 - poor (e.g. parents occasionally leave kids unattended, overly lenient or excessively punitive)
   3 - good (e.g. parents or adequate substitute usually enforce reasonable rules)
   4 - very good (e.g. appropriate limits and consequences consistently enforced)
   9 - unidentifiable from record

8. Parents recognize and accept responsibility for problems (NPResp)
   Consider the following: agreement between the parents that a problem exists and the degree of acceptance for responsibility to handle problems.
   1 - very poor (e.g. denial of problems by parent(s), it's not my child's fault)
   2 - poor (e.g. parents admit problems, but blame child &/or others)
   3 - good (e.g. admit problems, accept minimal responsibility)
   4 - very good (e.g. admit problems, accept appropriate resp.)
   9 - unidentifiable from record

9. Past physical, sexual abuse or neglect of child (PstAbus)
   1 - Protective Service involvement, child removed
   2 - Protective Service involvement, family referred for treatment, child remained home
   3 - no Protective Service involvement, but past abuse/neglect reported by parents or child
   4 - no past physical or sexual abuse
   9 - unidentifiable from record

10. Current physical, sexual abuse or neglect of child (CurAbus)
    1 - Protective Service referral warranted
    2 - evidence of some abuse/neglect, but referral unnecessary
    3 - no evidence of current abuse/neglect
    9 - unidentifiable from record

11. Cooperation of parents with treatment plan (NPCoop)
    1 - very poor (e.g. several skipped appointments, failure to follow suggestions)
    2 - poor (e.g. occasional skipped appointments, problems with follow through)
    3 - good (e.g. appointments kept, occasional disagreements with plan)
    4 - very good (e.g. appointments kept, positive contributions by parents)
    9 - unidentifiable from record
12. Parents' desire to have child home (NPDesire)
   1 - refusal to have child at home maintained by parent(s)
   2 - parents change their minds or disagree with each other
   3 - parents willing to have child if no other options
   4 - parents want child home
   9 - unidentifiable from record

13. History of interpersonal problems between family members; marital, parent-child, &/or sibling conflict (HxProb)
   1 - problems manifested in family for more than 75% of time since this child born
   2 - problems manifested in family from 50-75% of time since this child born
   3 - problems manifested in family from 25-50% of time since this child born
   4 - problems manifested less than 25% of time since child born
   9 - unidentifiable from record

14. Number of parental visits with child during first 2 months of placement (NPVisits)
   0 - no visits
   1 - 1-5 visits (including family meetings with PO)
   2 - 5-10 visits " " " " " "
   3 - 10 or more visits " " " " " "
   9 - unidentifiable from record

III. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE DELINQUENT YOUTH

15. Age at time of placement (ChAge)
   1 - 12 years old or younger
   2 - 13 through 14 years old
   3 - 15 years or older

16. Race (ChRace)
   1 - white
   2 - non-white (Black, Native American, Spanish American, other)

17. Sex of child (ChSex)
   1 - female
   2 - male

18. School behavior record (SchBeh)
   Evaluate the child's marks in "conduct areas", classroom behavior and responsiveness to teacher's discipline within most recent 9 months of school
   1 - very poor (e.g. 2 or more suspensions from school, 3 or more times sent into school's discipline system)
   2 - poor (e.g. 1 suspension, 1-2 times sent into school's discipline system)
3 - good (e.g. no suspensions, occasional problems, responds well to teacher's disciplinary actions)
4 - very good (e.g. no suspensions, no disciplinary action needed)
9 - unidentifiable from record

19. School achievement according to school reports (SchAch)
1 - 2 or more years behind grade level
2 - 1 year behind grade level
3 - at grade level
4 - working academically above grade level
9 - unidentifiable from record

20. School truancy within most recent 9 months of school (SchTru)
1 - excessive truancy (e.g. resulting in referral to attendance officer, suspension from school, school transfer)
2 - frequent truancy (11-20% of total school days)
3 - occasional truancy (less than 10% of total days)
4 - no truancy reported
9 - unidentifiable from record

21. Cooperation of child with parents while at home (ChCoopP)
1 - very poor (e.g. usually refuses to help in any way)
2 - poor (e.g. frequent complaints about helping, must be asked repeatedly by parents to help)
3 - good (e.g. few complaints, usually helpful)
4 - very good (e.g. no complaints, helpful majority of time)
9 - unidentifiable from record

22. Compliance of child with rules of parents (ChComRu)
1 - very poor (e.g. refuses to obey most rules)
2 - poor (e.g. frequent defiance of most rules)
3 - good (e.g. usually follows rules, occasional defiance)
4 - very good (e.g. no problems reported, cooperative)
9 - unidentifiable from record

23. Cooperation of child with treatment plan (ChCoopTP)
1 - very poor (e.g. repeated &/or major violations of court order)
2 - poor (e.g. frequent minor violations of probation)
3 - good (usually participates in meetings, follows suggestions)
4 - very good (e.g. actively contributes in meetings, complies with probation)
9 - unidentifiable from record

24. Degree of aggressive behavior (ChAggres)
1 - very aggressive (e.g. frequent fights, hostile attitude, referred to court for violent crimes)
2 - aggressive (e.g. mild tendencies toward violence noted in record, malicious destruction of property)
3 - no problems (appropriately assertive)
4 - passive in relation to others' aggressiveness (e.g. allows others to take advantage)
9 - unidentifiable from record

25. Degree of impulsiveness (ChImpul)
1 - very impulsive (e.g. usually unable to control own behavior)
2 - somewhat impulsive (e.g. occasionally "acts without thinking")
3 - no problems
9 - unidentifiable from record

26. Child's desire to remain in parents' home (ChDesire)
1 - refusal to remain with parents
2 - initial refusal, then agreement; ambivalent
3 - willing to stay with parents if no other options
4 - wants to stay with parents
9 - unidentifiable from record

27. Child's relationships with adult authorities (ChRelAu)
Judge the degree of the child's reticence/openness in talking with the probation officer, school authorities, cooperation in answering questions and discussing problems, degree of spontaneity in behavior and amount of trust.
1 - very poor (e.g. usually refuses to talk with school authorities, PO, police except minimal replies to direct questions, no spontaneous discussion of issues, expresses distrust of authorities)
2 - poor (e.g. displays hesitancy in all of the above, but will talk when encouraged, occasionally shows trust through agreement with authorities to "handle arrangements" affecting child)
3 - good (e.g. usually talks about issues/problems with PO, reports of good relationships with teachers, etc.)
4 - very good (e.g. will seek out advice etc. from teachers, PO, etc. on problems, open in discussions)
9 - unidentifiable from record

28. Child's relationships with peers (ChRelPrs)
1 - delinquent gang member
2 - negative influence, companions involved in delinquent behavior; frequent fights; few friends
3 - good support and influence
9 - unidentifiable from record
29. Drug/chemical abuse by child (DrugAbus)
   1 - chronic abuse, serious disruption of functioning
   2 - occasional abuse, some disruption of functioning
   3 - no known use or no interference with functioning
   9 - unidentifiable from record

30. Alcohol abuse by child (AlcAbus)
   1 - chronic abuse, serious disruption of functioning
   2 - occasional abuse, some disruption of functioning
   3 - no known use or no interference with functioning
   9 - unidentifiable from record

31. Child's ability to recognize and accept responsibility for
   his/her behavior (ChResp)
   1 - very poor (e.g. denies most problems or responsibility)
   2 - poor (e.g. admits problems, denies responsibility)
   3 - good (e.g. admits problems, accepts limited responsibility)
   4 - very good (e.g. admits problems and accepts appropriate responsibility)
   9 - unidentifiable from record

IV. CHARACTERISTICS OF TREATMENT PROGRAM

32. Overall level of rapport between foster parents and court
   Assess level of rapport between foster parents and agency as a whole (not with a specific caseworker). (FPRap)
   1 - very poor (e.g. chronic complaints/problems)
   2 - poor (e.g. occasional problems, minimal participation)
   3 - good (e.g. few problems, frequent participation in court training/activities, good relationships with POs)
   4 - very good (e.g. leaders in foster parent activities)

33. Competency of foster parents (total score of PFPS) (PFPS)
   1 - poor: 161 or less
   2 - fair: 162-188
   3 - good: 189-215
   4 - excellent: 216
   9 - unidentifiable from record

34. Ability and motivation of foster mother (PFPS subscale score)
   (FPAbil)
   1 - poor: 55 or less
   2 - fair: 56-65
   3 - good: 66-75
   4 - excellent: 76
   9 - unidentifiable from record
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35. **Degree of PO input/involvement in treatment plan (POInpt)**
   Consider degree to which PO participates in treatment planning, intervention, and problem solving with youth, foster parents, and natural parents.
   1 - none (e.g., PO had no or very little input in development or implementation)
   2 - minimal (e.g., PO helped develop plan, others implement)
   3 - frequent involvement (e.g., developed plan and active involvement in implementation)
   9 - unidentifiable from record

36. **Effectiveness of management of daily behavioral problems (BehIsu)**
   Consider degree to which actions are taken to handle daily problems vs letting build into crisis.
   1 - very poor (e.g., problems mentioned but responses inadequate or ineffective to resolve problems)
   2 - poor (e.g., problems mentioned, action taken occasionally adequate and appropriate but problems continue)
   3 - good (e.g., problem solving attempts usually adequate, appropriate, and successful)
   4 - very good (e.g., problem solving attempts most often adequate, effective, and successful)
   9 - unidentifiable from record

37. **Was placement in program recommended by PO? (RecPlmt)**
   1 - yes
   2 - no
   3 - PO did not make specific recommendation
   9 - unidentifiable from record

V. **CHARACTERISTICS OF PROBATION OFFICER**

38. **Degree of contact, active rapport building and energy expended by PO with natural family (PONF)**
   1 - none
   2 - very little (e.g., 1 visit per month or 1-2 phone calls)
   3 - occasional (e.g., 2-3 visits per month and 1-2 phone calls)
   4 - frequent (e.g., 4-5 visits per month and 3-4 phone calls)
   5 - a great deal (more than 5 visits per month and 5+ calls)
   9 - unidentifiable from record

39. **Same as #38 but with foster parents (POFP)**
   1 - none
   2 - very little
   3 - occasional
   4 - frequent
   5 - a great deal
   9 - unidentifiable from record
40. Same as #38 but with treatment group home parents (POGHP)
   1 - none
   2 - very little
   3 - occasional
   4 - frequent
   5 - a great deal
   9 - unidentifiable from record

41. Same as #38 but with delinquent youth (POCH)
   1 - none
   2 - very little
   3 - occasional
   4 - frequent
   5 - a great deal
   9 - unidentifiable from record
Appendix L

Sample Ratings of Verbatim Statements
Sample Ratings of Verbatim Statements

Appendix L contains statements quoted verbatim from 12 files included in the treatment group home and the foster care samples. The statements from each file that pertain to a given variable are listed under that variable according to the ranking that was given by the researcher. The statements are provided as an example of the type of material used to justify a given ranking on the variables used in this study. Six files were chosen from the foster care sample and six files from the group home sample for inclusion in this appendix. The six files were chosen from each group to represent a stratified sample based on a ranking by the researcher which classified the files as "excellent", "average", or "poor" in terms of the thoroughness of the reports, case notes and other documentation. The intent is to provide a representative group of files which will give an indication of the kinds of information from which the variables were coded for this study.

Cases were coded during the period from April through September, 1985. Files were chosen for this appendix from each month to present a sample of variable codings from the initial cases completed through the final cases completed for this study. The largest group of cases was coded during June and July which accounts for the fact that four of the files chosen for inclusion in the appendix were coded during June. The foster care sample was coded first followed by cases from the treatment group home sample. This order was chosen simply because the records of foster care placements were available first. Of the 12 files chosen for this appendix, seven represent youth who successfully completed out-of-home care as defined in this study, and five represent youth who failed, or were removed from placement due to (1) disruptive behavior by the child or (2) noncompliance by the natural parents.

Listed below is a summary of information on the 12 cases which can be used to identify the date the case was coded, whether the youth was male or female, the year the child was removed from foster or group home placement, and the outcome of placement. The foster care cases are presented in Table L-1, followed by the treatment group home cases in Table L-2. Within each sample, the cases are grouped as "excellent", "average", or "poor". This information should be helpful when reading the verbatim statements which follow. The statements from each of the twelve files which pertain to a particular variable are grouped together under that variable to provide a sample of how the researcher coded the statements.
### Table L-1
Foster Home Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Sex of Child</th>
<th>Year Removed</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excellent Documentation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/24/85</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/19/85</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Documentation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/2/85</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/15/85</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poor Documentation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/8/85</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/4/85</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>success</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table L-2
Treatment Group Home Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Sex of Child</th>
<th>Year Removed</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excellent Documentation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/24/85</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/30/85</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Documentation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/16/85</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/3/85</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poor Documentation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13/85</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14/85</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>success</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A number of abbreviations were used in the presentation of the material from the files to protect confidentiality and facilitate the typing of the statements. These are listed below with an explanation of their meaning and how they were used.

MO - mother of the child in placement. This abbreviation was substituted whenever the mother was mentioned by name in quoted material.

FA - father of the child in placement. Used as above.

SMO - Stepmother of the child in placement. Used as above.

SFA - Stepfather of the child in placement. Used as above.

PO - probation officer

Intake - Intake Department report. This is usually a short report summarizing the information gathered at the meeting between the Intake Probation Officer, the child named in the referral, and the parents.

FIR - Field Investigation Report. This is the initial report prepared by the probation officer to present to the judge prior to the adjudication/disposition hearing - the hearing at which a decision is made as to whether the child will be made a ward of the court and what court order(s) will be entered regarding the terms of probation, including out-of-home placement.

Chrono. - Chronological Recording. A summary of the actual court hearing prepared by the probation officer after each hearing.

Crt. Rep. - Supplemental Hearing Report. This is a report prepared by the probation officer for the judge for each court hearing subsequent to the initial adjudication/disposition hearing. It contains a summary of case activity since the last scheduled hearing and recommendations with rationale for continued treatment/probation. Review hearings are held by the court under study at three or six month intervals and may also be convened if a new referral is received charging the youth with a new law violation.

CIP Rep. - Crisis Intervention Program Termination Summary. A report from the intensive family counseling program of the court under study which works with youth and family members while youth reside in their parents' home.

TGH Rep. - Treatment Group Home Report. A report prepared by the caseworker of the treatment group home where the youth is
living. A report is submitted to the judge prior to each hearing while the child is in the group home.

Psych. Rep. - Psychological/psychiatric evaluation. This type of evaluation is not requested for each case. Often an evaluation of this type will have been done on a youth prior to court involvement and a copy will be requested if necessary.

School Rep. - a report from various school personnel obtained by the probation officer as part of the assessment and treatment planning process.


M.D. Rep. - report from medical personnel. This could be a report of a drug screen, a physical exam, of other relevant information obtained by the probation officer in the process of working with a particular child.

An example of the format used to present the quoted material is provided below with an explanation of each section.

4. Quality of parent-child relationship (PCRelat)

1 - very poor (e.g. frequent physical fighting)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/24/85</td>
<td>1/11/82 Crt. Rep. &quot;It was indicated [MO] and K ...&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 - poor (e.g. frequent arguments, no physical fights)

The independent variables used in the study are shown in boldface type. The rankings for each variable are indented for easier identification and the statements from the files which received that ranking are found immediately below it. The date at the far left column indicates the date that the case containing the quoted material was coded by the researcher. Each case was coded in a single sitting on the given date. The next two items, a date and a type of report or case note, which are both underlined, indicate the kind of material or report which was quoted and the specific date of that entry in the case file. Following these items is the material quoted from the file on which the coding for a given variable was based.
The same twelve cases are shown for each variable, of course, though the order, as shown by the "Date Coded", will vary according to the ranking given for that variable. It will be noted that a single letter is used to indicate the child in placement. This was done to protect confidentiality and to facilitate identification of the statements across the variables included in this appendix. It can also be seen that not all variables included in the study are found in this appendix. The reason for this is that a number of variables required simply the counting of certain events (variables 2, 3, 14, 35, 38, 39, 40, 41), a self-evident ranking (variables 1, 15, 16, 17, 37) or a ranking given by the foster home licensing coordinator responsible for the recruiting and ongoing training of the court foster parents (32, 34). As noted above, variable 33 was dropped from the study.
II. CHARACTERISTICS OF NATURAL PARENTS AND FAMILY

4. Quality of parent-child relationship (PCRelat)

1 - very poor (e.g. frequent physical fighting)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/24/85</td>
<td>1/11/82 Crt. Rep. &quot;It was indicated that since the time of the last hearing, the situation had deteriorated and that K and her mother had begun to engage in physical conflict to the point that K was put out of her home.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/2/85</td>
<td>5/11/79 FIR &quot;SPECIFIC PROBLEM BEHAVIORS: Being abusive towards his mother.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 - poor (e.g. frequent arguments, no physical fights)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/4/85</td>
<td>10/13/78 FIR &quot;Up to approximately five months ago mother and daughter had a good relationship with [MO] able to meet all of C's needs.... The areas of conflict that have developed are C's wish to date boys which her mother will not allow since she is only 13 and a competitive relationship with her brother.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/19/85</td>
<td>10/21/81 FIR &quot;In the opinion of this worker, D and his mother do not have a proper relationship with each other. MO is not able to communicate with D other than shouting at him and he reciprocates by shouting at her.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13/85</td>
<td>9/25/80 FIR &quot;At this point relationships in this family are very strained.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/24/85</td>
<td>4/6/81 FIR &quot;It appears that J is alienated from his entire family. There seems to be a lot of friction between J and his father. J has a poor but somewhat better relationship with his mother.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/30/85</td>
<td>10/23/81 FIR &quot;In the opinion of this worker, D and his mother have an improper relationship with each other. [MO] claims that she is inept in dealing with this child and they do not communicate well.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 - good (e.g. infrequent arguments, usually able to solve problems, affection displayed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/8/85</td>
<td>11/16/82 FIR &quot;F gets along well with his mother and siblings. He is the youngest child and appears to be his mother's favorite. (1/11/83 Crt. Rep) F voiced much concern for his mother, alleging that she drinks heavily [and] that his mother did not give him adequate supervision.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/15/85</td>
<td>5/6/81 Crt. Rep. &quot;T seems to get along well with all family members including mother.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/16/85</td>
<td>6/27/79 FIR &quot;S seems to be quite close to his mother.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/3/85</td>
<td>1/7/82 FIR &quot;It appears that Mc is the only sibling in his family that has ever had any problems with breaking the law, however, family members are not degrading him for his past behaviors, but are very concerned and supportive of Mc gaining insight into his behaviors and getting control of these behaviors.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14/85</td>
<td>7/2/82 FIR &quot;Fk has a good relationship with his mother, although she appears to be very overprotective of him.... He and his mother seem to be very close since he is the youngest and the baby of the family.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Parents' ability to set limits (LimSet)

1 - very poor (e.g. parents do not set appropriate limits with respect to all of the following areas of the child's behavior: peers, school work, household responsibilities, personal habits, social behavior. (rule establishment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/24/85</td>
<td>3/9/82 Crt. Rep. &quot;The incorrigible problem is not really severe but mother wants absolute control and nothing less. MO indicated a severe curfew problem and school truancy. But ... her school truancy amounted to skipping one day this year and skipping one or two classes and being late one and one half hour for her curfew a couple of times.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/8/85</td>
<td>1/11/83 Crt. Rep. &quot;F's MO drinks on a daily basis and is often heavily under the influence of alcohol. ... she seems to recognize that F was very much out of her control.... F's numerous law violations are felt to be the result of a lack of supervision in the home.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6/2/85  3/28/79  Intake "Mt has problems getting to school."
5/11/79  FIR "[MO] has been very erratic in her treatment
of Mt. For example, she has severely scolded him for being
'high' and has also driven Mt and his friends to purchase
marijuana. And, while she will yell at Mt for two weeks
afterwards, she almost never punishes his misbehavior imme-
diately. [MO] has allowed Mt to live on his own, or at
friends' houses for the last couple of years. Also, he has
been bounced between his mother and father."

6/15/85  5/6/81  Crt. Rep. "This child has never known his father
and in the opinion of this worker, his mother fails to
provide him with consistent rewards and punishments for is
behavior. T needs some well-defined expectations from his
mother, with some consistent rewards and punishments for
his behavior."

6/19/85  10/21/81  FIR "This child has never had a father and his
mother has never had a sense of how to raise children. She
seems to have no game plan in raising her family. She
don't tell D what to do, but assumes that he should know
what to do. This child has no set curfew hour to adhere
to, nor any specific chores given to him in the home. What
he does seems to be totally left up to trial and error.

8/30/85  10/23/81  FIR "[MO] has attempted to provide her children
with a proper home but now again finds herself heavily
involved in drugs and is no longer able to properly provide
for her children. [MO] claims that she is inept in dealing
with this child."

2 - poor (e.g. parents overly lenient in 4 of these areas)

Date Coded   Statements From Files

9/14/85  2/28/83  Crt. Rep. "It was learned that [MO] had minimal
expectations of Fk and that her rules regarding curfew were
lax."

3 - good (e.g. parents overly lenient in 3 of these areas)

Date Coded   Statements From Files

7/16/85  2/20/79  CIP Rep. "However, as time went on it became more
apparent that S was having difficulty following his
mother's rules, mother was having difficulty determining
what the rules should be.... [MO] seems willing to follow
through on the suggestions made by both CIP and the school
to her. [MO] seemed to have the situation under pretty
good control at the time this [CIP] case was closed."
8/24/85  4/6/81  FIR  "For the past three years [the parents] have basically viewed J as being a maladjusted individual who is not in control of himself.... They felt they had to come down on him and discipline him for his own good.... J's father is a very stern man and at times acts like a drill sergeant. Although [FA] understands J's needs, he nevertheless cannot change his ways of dealing with him. As long as father comes off negative to J, it's my belief that J will continue to respond negatively to him."

5 - very good (e.g. parents overly lenient in 1 of these areas)

Date Coded               Statements From Files

9/3/85                1/7/82  FIR  "Mother seems to have very good control and influence over her boys, set definite expectations and appears to have the ability to communicate with her children.... [MO] requires each of her sons to be responsible for themselves in the home including doing their laundry, and helping out with keeping the house clean."

9 - unidentifiable from record

Date Coded
6/4/85
8/13/85

6. Parents' ability to enforce consequences (EnfCon)

1 - very poor (e.g. parents are overly punitive and over-controlling or excessively lenient with respect to all of the following areas of the child's behavior: peers, school, work, household responsibilities, personal habits, social behavior)

Date Coded               Statements From Files


5/8/85                1/11/83  Crt. Rep.  "F's mother drinks on a daily basis and is often heavily under the influence of alcohol.... she seems to recognize that F was very much out of her control."
P's numerous law violations are felt to be the result of a lack of supervision in the home."

6/2/85  5/11/79  FIR  "[Mother] has been very erratic in her treatment of Mt. For example, she has severely scolded him for being 'high' and has also driven Mt and his friends to purchase marijuana. And, while she will yell at Mt for two weeks afterwards, she almost never punishes his misbehavior immediately."

6/15/85  5/6/81  Crt. Rep.  "T needs some well-defined expectations from his mother, with some consistent rewards and punishments for his behavior. Those expectations should center around getting T to attend school on a regular basis, completing chores around his home, and adhering to a decent curfew. T has an inordinate amount of free time on his hands and he can come and go as he pleases."

6/19/85  10/21/81  FIR  "[MO] appeared to be a totally ineffective mother. She seemed to have no other form of discipline other than shouting at her kids."

8/30/85  10/23/81  FIR  "[MO] claims that she is inept in dealing with this child and they do not communicate well.... [MO] again finds herself heavily involved in drugs and no longer able to properly provide for her children."

2 - poor (e.g. parents overly punitive etc. in 4 of these areas)

Date Coded  Statements From Files

7/16/85  6/27/79  FIR  "However, it is quite obvious to someone fairly close to S to see that [MO] can be easily manipulated by S. [MO] has had her ups and downs with S and has tried to gain control over his behavior at home. When [MO] is not working things seem to work out quite well. However, when she started to work problems occurred."

8/13/85  9/25/80  FIR  "C appears to be a young man from a middle class family.... On the other hand, C is the youngest of the family who has apparently been spoiled for most of his growing up years. He has apparently also experienced the inconsistency of an alcoholic father."

8/24/85  4/6/81  FIR  "J's father is a very stern man and at times acts like a drill sergeant. Although father understands J's needs, he nevertheless cannot change his ways of dealing with him. As long as father comes off negative to J, it's my belief that J will continue to respond negatively to him."
9/14/85 2/28/83 Crt. Rep. "It seems that she [MO] would allow him to go wherever he pleased as long as he was back by 10 p.m. She did little to monitor his whereabouts or activities and seemed to trust that he would stay out of trouble." 12/9/83 Crt. Rep. "The area of supervision has improved; however, it is this worker's belief that due to [MO's] work schedule, Fk continues to have too much unsupervised free time."

4 - good (e.g. parents overly punitive etc. in 2 of these areas)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/3/85</td>
<td>1/7/82 FIR &quot;This worker is very pleased with mother's rules and expectations and is convinced that mother is concerned and does have influence and control over her children... however, his [child's] main problem comes into play when he is on the streets with friends.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/4/85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 - unidentifiable from record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/4/85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Parent's ability to provide adequate supervision (Superv)

1 - very poor (e.g. parents frequently leave kids unattended, overly lenient)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5/8/85     | 1/11/83 FIR "F's mother drinks on a daily basis and is often heavily under the influence of alcohol... F's numerous law violations are felt to be the result of a lack of supervision in the home."
| 6/2/85     | 5/11/79 FIR "[MO] has allowed Mt to live on his own, or at friends' houses for the last couple of years. Also, he has been bounced between his mother and father." |
| 6/4/85     | 10/9/78 Psych. Rep. "[MO] works all day in a factory job and goes to work very early in the morning. Her mother calls C [to wake her up] before she goes to work. C says she gets up and then goes to sleep again on the couch. Often at night [her mother] goes out to a bar." |
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6/15/85  11/28/79  FIR  "[The school principal] states that T has an
inordinate amount of freedom with minimum structure and
supervision. He states that [MO] refuses to come to the
school [for conferences]."

6/19/85  10/21/81  FIR  "It appears that [MO] has totally given up
on D and no longer involves herself in his welfare."

8/30/85  10/23/81  FIR  "[MO] has attempted to provide her children
with a proper home but now again finds herself heavily
involved in drugs and no longer able to properly provide
for her children."

2 - poor (e.g. parents occasionally leave kids unattended,
overly lenient or excessively punitive)

Date Coded  Statements From Files

severe but mother wants absolute control and nothing less.
[MO] indicated a severe curfew problem and school truancy.
But...her school truancy amounted to skipping one day
this year and skipping one or two classes and being late
one and a half hours for her curfew a couple of times."

12/30/82  Psych. Rep.  "Her mother seems to require too
much of a level of perfection before reinforcing her good
behavior."

7/16/85  6/27/79  FIR  "[MO] has had her ups and downs with S and
has tried to gain control over his behavior at home. When
[MO] is not working, things seem to work out quite well.
However, when she started to work problems occurred."

4/2/80  Crt. Rep.  "If anything, the main problem at home
seemed to be the lack of supervision in regards to curfew
and knowing where S was going and when he would be back."

8/13/85  9/25/80  FIR  "C states that usually he runs away when his
father is getting on his case. Additionally, [MO], as well
as C, report that C has been spoiled. According to [MO],
in C's earlier years he got just about anything he wanted."

9/14/85  12/9/83  Crt. Rep.  "The area of supervision has improved;
however, it is this worker's belief that due to [MO's] work
schedule, Fk continues to have too much unsupervised free
time."
3 - good (e.g. parents or adequate substitute usually enforce reasonable rules)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/24/85</td>
<td>4/6/80 FIR &quot;For the past three years his parents have basically viewed J as being a maladjusted individual who is not in control of himself.... They felt they had to come down on him and discipline him for his own good.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/3/85</td>
<td>1/7/82 FIR &quot;This worker is very pleased with mother's rules and expectations and is convinced that mother is concrete and does have influence and control over her children.... As I previously said, Mc can handle school and home O.K., however, his main problem comes into play when he is on the streets with friends.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Parents recognize and accept responsibility for problems (NPResp)
Consider the following: agreement between the parents that a problem exists and the degree of acceptance for responsibility to handle problems.

1 - very poor (e.g. denial of problems by parent(s), it's not my child's fault)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/15/85</td>
<td>11/28/79 FIR &quot;The weakness in this case as this worker views it, is getting [MO] to provide T with the necessary structure that he needs. [MO] views authorities as being out to get her kids. Therefore, her behavior is to protect her children at all times.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 - poor (e.g. parents admit problems, but blame child and/or others)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/2/85</td>
<td>5/11/79 FIR &quot;SPECIFIC PROBLEM BEHAVIORS: [MO] saying things which indicate that Mt is uncontrollable and/or that she is afraid of him.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/19/85</td>
<td>10/21/81 FIR &quot;[MO] fully admits that her form of discipline is not working, but never seems to change her tactics. Her attitude toward D is that he cannot get any better and that the court should place him immediately.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8/13/85 9/25/80 FIR "[FA] and C's brothers do not want him home. In fact, [FA] is quite disgusted with C.... C uses this 'FA's alcoholism] as an excuse for his stealing and running away, however, the rest of the family do not feel this is the real reason for his running away."

8/24/85 5/29/81 Crt. Rep. "[FA] feels that the problem all resides with J.... At this time J is viewed by his parents as being antiauthoritarian, highly manipulative and maladjusted."

3 - good (e.g. admit problems, accept minimal responsibility)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;[MO] notes their relationship is deteriorating and has some insight into the negative nature of the relationship and negative impact this has on K.... [but] states that the situation had deteriorated to the point that she just doesn't care at times.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/4/85</td>
<td>10/13/78 FIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;[MO] is willing to look at her own behavior and make changes if necessary.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/16/85</td>
<td>2/20/79 CIP Rep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;[MO] had decided to quit her evening job after talking with her older son. He told her that, as old as he was, it had bothered him when she worked evenings. [MO] also realized her only interactions with S over the last few months had been negative.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/30/85</td>
<td>10/23/81 FIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;[MO] claims that she is inept in dealing with this child.&quot; 10/23/81 Chrono. &quot;[MO] stated [to the judge] that she is not able to provide a positive home for D at this time and requested that the court place him in foster care.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;It should be noted that since the last court hearing, [MO] has made great gains regarding her ability to supervise her children.... Also, she has been actively involved in the family therapy provided by the program. [MO] is now less defensive of FK and more willing to try to develop appropriate consequences for his inappropriate behaviors.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 - very good (e.g. admit problems, accept appropriate responsibility)

Date Coded Statements From Files

9/3/85 1/7/82 FIR "[MO] has stated to this worker that she is willing to get involved with whatever the court would recommend at this time that would help her children."

9. Past physical, sexual abuse or neglect of child (PstAbus)

1 - Protective Services involvement, child removed from home

Date Coded Statements From Files

8/30/85 10/23/81 FIR "[MO] used drugs to excess and was very dependent on them. These drugs have been taken since 1968 and they include Speed, Cocaine, TCP, Heroin, Downers, Uppers, and Alcohol.... In 1977 she voluntarily made her kids neglect wards and had then removed from her care while she sought help for her problems. Her children were returned to her care ... [in] 1980."

2 - Protective Services involvement, family referred for treatment, child remained home

Date Coded Statements From Files

6/15/85 10/22/79 Intake Rep. "T was recently [7/7/79] a victim of sexual assault [by a non-family member] and Protective Services is also investigating a beating T supposedly received from mother's boyfriend."

3 - no Protective Services involvement, but past abuse/neglect reported by parents or child

Date Coded Statements From Files

4/24/85 5/26/81 Psych. Rep. "I feel the major problem we are faced with here is a very early developmental scar."
11/9/82 Crt. Rep. "[MO] states that prior to K's adoption [at age three] both K and her natural sister ... had been moved from one relative's home to another."

5/8/85 1/11/83 Crt. Rep. "F voiced much concern for his mother, alleging that she drinks heavily [and] that his mother did not give him adequate supervision."
6/2/85 4/20/77 Psych. Rep. "[FA] is a heavy drinker, has a bad temper, is immature and destructive.... According to the mother, the patient [the delinquent child] has shown a fear of people and school since the first grade. This really became apparent by the time he reached second grade. During this time and prior to it, the patient was punished quite a bit by his father for very minor things or for no apparent reason at all."

6/19/85 10/21/81 FIR "This child has never had a father and his mother has never had a sense of how to raise children. On asking this child why he shouts at his mother, he claims because he has always been allowed to do so. She don't tell D what to do, but assumes he should know what to do."

8/14/85 2/28/83 Crt. Rep. "Fk's mother ... did very little to supervise her children and allowed them to come and go as they pleased. She seemed to lack parenting skills and failed to establish controls for her children. Also, numerous police contacts were taken very lightly."

4 - no past physical or sexual abuse or neglect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6/4/85     | 10/13/78 FIR "Up to approximately five months ago mother and daughter had a good relationship with mother able to meet all of C's needs."
| 8/24/85    | 4/6/81 FIR "one could easily see that this child has been brought up in a very negative environment. This was not deliberate on the part of the parents, but rather the result of the parents attempting to discipline J."
| 9/3/85     | 1/7/82 FIR "[MO and FA] divorced two years after their marriage when Mc was very young. During the past 12 years after their divorce, [FA] has failed to establish a relationship with the children. According to the mother, Mc has tried to make contact with his father and feels very neglected and hurt that his father does not spend time with him. Nevertheless, I see [MO] as being a very conscientious and concerned parent."

9 - unidentifiable from record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/16/85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13/85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 10. Current physical, sexual abuse or neglect of child (CurAbus)

### 1 - Protective Services referral warranted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/30/85</td>
<td>10/23/81 FIR &quot;Recently [MO] has increased her indulgence in drugs which resulted in her decreasing her responsible behavior. She has utilized her A.D.C. money to buy drugs and indulge in her whims, without providing her children with adequate food and a place to stay.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2 - evidence of some abuse/neglect, but referral unnecessary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/8/85</td>
<td>10/22/82 Case Notes &quot;The office interview was unproductive as the mother was extremely intoxicated.&quot; 1/11/83 Crt. Rep. &quot;F's mother drinks on a daily basis and is often heavily under the influence of alcohol.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/2/85</td>
<td>5/11/79 FIR &quot;[MO] has allowed M to live on his own or at a friend's house for the last couple of years.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/19/85</td>
<td>10/21/81 FIR &quot;[MO] is a very small and petite person, but is highly vocal and sometimes verbally abusive towards her children. D has lived under threats, scorn and put downs from his own mother.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3 - no evidence of current abuse/neglect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/24/85</td>
<td>11/9/82 Crt. Rep. &quot;Trust between [MO] and K has completely broken down. It appears that there have been serious communication problems between K and her mother for a long period of time.&quot; (The case record shows instances of situational flare ups and fights between mother and daughter, but no evidence of abuse)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/4/85</td>
<td>10/13/78 FIR &quot;In the counseling session with [MO], it was apparent that she is very concerned about her daughter. She [mother] has attempted to get help for C through the [run away shelter] and [counseling].&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/15/85</td>
<td>5/6/81 Crt. Rep. &quot;T is nevertheless very fortunate in that his family truly loves him.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
7/16/85  2/20/79 CIP Rep. "S is a very likable boy who cares a
great deal for his mother and vice versa."

8/13/85  9/25/80 FIR "C has said that he gets along with his
mother and brothers quite well, however, he and his dad do
not get along at all. He says that he and his dad hardly
speak to each other except when his father has been drink­
ing and then he will lecture C."

8/24/85  4/6/81 FIR "[MO] appears to be a very concerned mother
who has not given up on J.... The parents ... appear to be
economically stable. The home is very clean and well
furnished. The home, in the opinion of this worker, has a
very healthy atmosphere.... His parents are very negative
towards J yet they are very much committed to him."

9/3/85  1/7/82 FIR "I [probation officer] see [MO] as being a
very conscientious and concerned parent.... [MO] and her
children live in a very well-kept home where there is
definite structure, expectations, and over-all accountabi­
li ty for each family member."

9/14/85  12/9/83 Crt. Rep. "[The family therapist] has indicated
that he has seen growth and improvements in the relation­
ships between family members."

11. Cooperation of parents with treatment plan (NPCoop)

1 - very poor (e.g. several skipped appointments, failure to
follow suggestions)

Date Coded  Statements From Files
5/8/85  10/22/82 Case Notes "The office interview was
unproductive as the mother was extremely intoxicated."

1/11/83 Crt. Rep. "F's mother drinks on a daily basis and
is often heavily under the influence of alcohol."

a treatment plan, and that of her boyfriend to aid her in
that pursuit, need at least be called into question.... In
summation, [mother's boyfriend's] motivation to discipline
the children is low. The tenuous nature of his relation­
ship with [MO] forces her to conceal or ignore problems
with the children rather than burden him by asking his
help."
6/15/85  9/17/81  Crt. Rep.  "T and his mother consistently failed to keep appointments with this worker, whether it was in my office or in their home. On numerous occasions this worker has gone to the home for a scheduled visit only to find that neither T nor his mother was home."

6/19/85  10/21/81  FIR  "This far she has failed to consistently record D's curfew hour as prescribed by this worker."
1/6/82  Crt. Rep.  "Unfortunately, his mother put forth no significant effort [since the previous court hearing], although she might think so."

8/30/85  4/22/82  Crt. Rep.  "While at the [shelter home awaiting placement], D had some visits from his bio-father, but no visits from his mother.... There has been little to no involvement from [MO]."

2 - poor (e.g. occasional skipped appointments, problems with follow through)

Date Coded  Statements From Files

4/24/85  3/9/82  Crt. Rep.  "The incorrigible problem is not really that severe but mother wants absolute control and nothing less. [MO] indicated a severe curfew problem and school truancy. But ... her school truancy amounted to skipping one day this year and skipping one or two classes."
12/30/82  Psych. Rep.  "Her mother seems to require too much of a level of perfection before reinforcing her good behavior."

7/16/85  4/2/80  Crt. Rep.  "If anything, the main problem at home seemed to be lack of supervision in regards to curfew and knowing where S was going and when he would be back.... [MO] became very upset and stated she could no longer handle the problem and wanted S placed in some sort of a home."

3 - good (e.g. appointments kept, occasional disagreements with plan)

Date Coded  Statements From Files

6/4/85  10/13/78  FIR  "[MO] has attempted to get help for C through the [run away shelter] and [counseling]."

8/13/85  4/29/81  Chrono.  "He [Treatment Group Home coordinator] also mentioned the fact that there was good cooperation with C's parents."
2/28/83 Crt. Rep. "The [legal guardians] have been very cooperative with this worker and have worked very hard to supervise Fk within their home. [MO] has been attending parenting classes provided by the court."

4 - very good (e.g. appointments kept, positive contributions by parents)

Date Coded Statements From Files

8/24/85 11/25/81 TGH Rep. "[The parents] have been very actively involved in the treatment plan with J. They have attended all of our workshops in parenting and have made positive reports from what they have received from these workshops. They have also attempted to follow up on something they have learned in their relationship with J."

9/3/85 9/17/82 Crt. Rep. "[MO] agreed to meet with this worker along with Me on an every two week basis and help monitor Mc in both home and school [case notes document appointments kept].... Mother at this time is willing to get involved and agrees that something else should be tried now after eight months of court involvement."

12. Parent's desire to have child home (NPDesire)

1 - refusal to have child at home maintained by parent(s)

Date Coded Statements From Files

4/24/85 1/11/83 Crt. Rep. "On 12-20-82 K was kicked out of the home [by her mother]. On 12-22-82 a preliminary hearing was held. [MO] refused to get an appointment [for counseling] or to take K home."

6/2/85 6/21/79 Crt. Rep. "When [MO] was appraised that her son had been 'bailed out' of detention, she said, 'oh, then I don't have to come?' because she was afraid of being late to a party."

6/19/85 10/21/81 FIR "[MO's] attitude towards D is that he cannot get any better and that the court should place him immediately. 1/6/82 Chrono. "[MO] stated [to the judge] that D was an extreme burden on the entire family. She also recommended D be placed outside the home."

7/16/85 2/20/79 CIP Rep. "[MO] was requesting that S be placed our of the home." 3/18/80 Intake "Both S and his mother feel foster home placement is needed at this time."
8/13/85 9/25/80 FIR "[FA] and C's brothers do not want him home.... Consequently, the situation has deteriorated so badly that C and [FA] are barely speaking to each other and at this point [FA] does not wish C to be at home."

8/30/85 10/23/81 Chrono. "[MO] stated [to the judge] that she is not able to provide a positive home for D at this time and requested that the court place him in foster care. [FA] stated that D and his new wife do not get along. Therefore, he requested that D be taken out of his mother's home and placed in a suitable foster home."

4 - parents want child home

Date Coded Statements From Files
6/15/85 9/17/81 Crt. Rep. "[MO] stated that in general he is no problem while at home. She also stated that she would not like to see T involved in foster care because she believed that would only make him worse."

9/14/85 12/9/83 Chrono. "[MO] would like him to be home."

9 - unidentifiable from record

Date Coded
5/8/85
6/4/85
8/24/85
9/3/85

13. History of interpersonal problems between family members; marital, parent-child, and/or sibling conflict (HxProb)

1 - problems manifested in family for more than 75% of time since this child born

Date Coded Statements From Files
4/24/85 11/9/82 Crt. Rep. "[MO] stated that K has been a difficult child since she was adopted at age three, that she is headstrong and stubborn.... [MO's first husband] committed suicide in 1969 [when K was two years old].... In 1972,
[MO] married [her] second husband and was divorced in 1976.

6/2/85 8/3/68 School Social Work Rep.  "[regarding Mt's parents] This marriage began with problems. This was a forced marriage and [FA's] family was very upset about it. They did not approve of [MO] and felt that it was her fault that she was pregnant."

6/15/85 1/11/78 Psych. Rep.  "[The parents] were married 9-4-1950 and [have been] separated for about 15 years. The father is listed in the record as unknown [but] lives in St. Louis Missouri. [FA] has come to see them a few times."

7/16/85 6/27/79 FIR "[MO] has a 10th grade education and has been married twice prior to being married to S's father.... S states that he has seen [his father] once since he was eight years old and really does not care to see him. The mother is also quite adamant in stating that she would rather not have [FA] come to any of the court proceedings nor did [FA] want to come to any of them."

8/24/85 4/6/85 FIR "[The parents] report that J has always been considered by the family as 'a little unusual'. Supposedly, as a toddler J engaged in a lot of acting out and defiance.... As J grew up and entered the school system, his acting out behavior continued. The parents report the more they disciplined J the more he acted out."

8/30/85 10/23/81 FIR "[MO] used drugs to excess and was very dependent on them. These drugs have been taken since 1968 [the year that D was born] and they include Speed, Cocaine, TCP, Heroin, Downers, Uppers, and Alcohol.... In 1977 she voluntarily made her kids neglect wards and had them removed from her care while she sought help for her problems. Her children were returned to her care ... [in] 1980."

9/3/85 1/7/82 FIR "[MO and FA] divorced two years after their marriage when Mc was very young. During the past 12 years after their divorce, [FA] has failed to establish a relationship with the children. According to the mother, Mc has tried to make contact with his father and feels very neglected and hurt that his father does not spend time with him."
2 - problems manifested in family 50-75% of time since this child born

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/4/85</td>
<td>10/13/78  FIR &quot;C's parents were separated [approximately 10 years ago when C was three years old] but only divorced a few years ago when [FA] refused to pay child support. Then [FA] left the state. His address is listed as unknown.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 - problems manifested in family from 25-50% of time since this child born

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/19/85</td>
<td>10/21/81  FIR &quot;[MO] was born in Aberdeen, Mississippi 37 years ago. Her first child, D, was born out of wedlock while she resided in Mississippi. Immediately after his birth, mother relocated to Grand Rapids along with her oldest sister. She married ... in 1973 [when D was five years old] and divorced him in 1976. [MO] claims she has not seen her husband since their divorce and she reports that she received no support payments from him.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 - unidentifiable from record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/8/85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13/85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14/85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE DELINQUENT YOUTH

18. School behavior record (SchBeh)

Evaluate the child's marks in "conduct areas", classroom behavior and responsiveness to teacher's discipline within most recent 9 months of school.

1 - very poor (e.g. 2 or more suspensions from school, 3 or more times sent into school's discipline system)

Date Coded | Statements From Files
---|---
6/15/85 | 5/6/81 Crt. Rep. "[The assistant principal] further indicated that T tends to be a behavioral problem at school. He has had three in-house suspensions thus far this year, and on 2-16-81, was suspended for three days for fighting."
6/19/85 | 10/21/81 FIR "This child has been in special education since the sixth grade. Since that time he has been in seven different schools. While attending these schools, D was assigned to an E.I. classroom. His antisocialable [sic] behavior was the primary reason for him moving from one school to the next."
7/16/85 | 6/27/79 FIR "S has had an extensive history of problems throughout school starting back in the sixth grade.... More than anything, he is difficult to control in the classroom and get to the point of doing his work.... It seems that many of these behaviors are resulted [sic] in asking S to leave the class which appears to be what he wants."
8/13/85 | 9/25/80 FIR "However, C was suspended once from ... [Middle School] and later transferred to ... Middle School because of two incidents of stealing."
8/30/85 | 10/23/81 FIR "On 10-12-81 ..., Assistant Principal, stated that ... this child is very much a behavioral problem while in school. He tends to be argumentative toward teachers and his peers.... and some times engages in physical confrontations. D has been suspended for three days."
2 - poor (e.g. 1 suspension, 1-2 times sent into school's discipline system)

Date Coded | Statements From Files
---|---
8/24/85 | 4/6/81 FIR "School is one of the major problem areas for J.... [The assistant principal] stated J was not properly prepared to handle high school emotionally and socially."
He suggested J is a very immature individual for his age [15 years]. J voluntarily dropped out of high school prior to the end of the first semester."

9/14/85 7/2/82 FIR "According to his report card, it states that at times Fk refuses to do work in class.... Fk is in a regular classroom although they do have behavior problems with him at times."

3 - good (e.g. no suspensions, occasional problems, responds well to teacher's disciplinary actions)

Date Coded Statements From Files

5/8/85 11/16/82 FIR "He has a tendency to be the class clown and loves to make the other students laugh. The teacher would like to see him less chatty."

9/3/85 1/7/82 FIR "This worker met with [the school counselor] on 11-18-82 in regards to Mc's school involvement. [The school counselor] sees Mc as a fairly good student. In the past there has been no serious behavior problems."

4 - very good (e.g. no suspensions, no disciplinary action needed)

Date Coded Statements From Files

4/24/85 11/9/82 Crt. Rep. "in regards to school, this worker contacted ..., counselor at ... High School, who stated K has never presented any social or behavioral problems within the school."

6/2/85 5/11/79 FIR "Mt's attendance has been good since his referral [3/28/79] and he is cooperative and well liked by the school staff." 3/7/80 Crt. Rep. "He is never a disciplinary problem within the class."

9 - unidentifiable from record

Date Coded Statements From Files

6/4/85
19. School achievement according to school reports (SchAch)

1 - two or more years behind grade level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/2/85</td>
<td>5/11/79 FIR &quot;Mt is a ninth grader at KEC. His academic skills are several years behind.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/15/85</td>
<td>4/28/79 FIR &quot;T is two years behind academically. His main deficiencies are in reading and math.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/19/85</td>
<td>10/21/81 FIR &quot;D is far behind academically. It is reported that his reading and math scores are about third grade level.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 - one year behind grade level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/13/85</td>
<td>9/25/80 FIR &quot;Presently, C [age 15] is in the ninth grade at ... High School.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/30/85</td>
<td>10/23/81 FIR &quot;D is a seventh grader at ... Junior High School... This child is enrolled in a self-contained classroom setting where he receives extra help in reading and math. D is quite deficient academically and has been so for some years.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 - at grade level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/24/85</td>
<td>11/9/82 Crt. Rep. &quot;K is presently in the 10th grade at ... High School.... [The school counselor] feels that K has a high raw academic ability, but lacks motivation, as shown by her grades.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/8/85</td>
<td>11/16/82 FIR &quot;F [age 12] is a sixth grader at ... School. F has been coming to school regularly and making a good effort academically.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/4/85</td>
<td>10/13/78 FIR C [age 13] is an eighth grader at ... Middle School.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/16/85</td>
<td>6/27/79 FIR &quot;S [age 14] is presently in the ninth grade at ... High School.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8/24/85 4/6/81 FIR "This past school year J started school at ... High School as a ninth grader."

9/3/85 1/7/82 FIR "Mc [age 14] is a ninth grader at ... High School.... [The school counselor] sees Mc as a fairly good student. Mc's grades are average."

9/14/85 7/2/82 FIR "Fk [age 12] has been in the sixth grade at ... Elementary School.... There was a possibility that Fk might flunk although he was passed on to the seventh grade."

20. School truancy within most recent 9 months of school (SchTru)

1 - excessive truancy (e.g. resulting in referral to attendance officer, suspension from school, school transfer)

Date Coded Statements From Files

4/24/85 6/25/82 School Report Card "21 absences out of 90 days [23%]" [School report from first marking period of 10th grade showed] "7 absences out of the first 25 days of school [28%]."

6/15/85 5/6/81 Crt. Rep. "He has been absent over 30 days this school year and his cumulative grade point is about D plus."

6/19/85 10/21/81 FIR "[The] school counselor stated that last year D had a severe absenteeism problem. D missed 37 days of school last year." 11/30/81 Case Notes "school counselor states that D has been present 26 times and absent 25 times this year."


8/24/85 4/6/81 FIR "J [age 15] voluntarily dropped out of ... High School prior to the end of the first semester of the school year. J re-enrolled himself ... at the beginning of the second semester of this school ... [but] failed to attend ... on a regular basis. By the time J officially became involved with Juvenile Court, he had completely ceased to attend ... School [an alternative school]."

8/30/85 10/23/81 FIR "On 10-12-81 ..., Assistant Principal, stated that D has missed ten days of school thus far this school year."
3 - occasional truancy (less than 10% of total days)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/2/85</td>
<td>3/28/79 Intake &quot;He also has problems getting to school.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/11/79 FIR &quot;Mt's attendance has been good since his referral [3/28/79] and he is cooperative and well liked by school staff.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/3/85</td>
<td>1/7/82 FIR &quot;Mc's grades are average and his attendance is average.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 - no truancy reported

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/8/85</td>
<td>11/16/82 FIR &quot;F is a sixth grader at ... School. F has been coming to school regularly and making a good effort academically.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13/85</td>
<td>9/25/80 FIR &quot;C has not had any problems with school skipping.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14/85</td>
<td>8/27/82 Crt. Rep. &quot;Fk was also having some problems in school; not with attendance, so much as behavior and grades.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 - unidentifiable from record

21. Cooperation of child with parents while at home (ChCoopP)

1 - very poor (e.g. usually refuses to help in any way)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/2/85</td>
<td>3/7/80 Crt. Rep. &quot;Although the placement [with his father] was far more successful than his mother's home, there were still problems. Mt allowed several of his friends from G.R. to visit, when he had been explicitly told not to. He also began to leave home without authorization and remain at large for days at a time.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8/24/85  4/6/81  FIR "J began to respond to his parents by verbally abusing them and personally acting out against them. J began to steal from his parents, destroy their property, and openly defy them. Additionally, J began to runaway from home, failed to attend school, and indulge in marijuana and alcohol."

2 - poor (e.g. frequent complaints about helping, must be asked repeatedly by parents to help)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/24/85</td>
<td>11/9/82  Crt. Rep. &quot;in the past, K has failed to cooperate around the house. [MO] stated that K has been a difficult child since she was adopted at age three, that she is headstrong and stubborn.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/4/85</td>
<td>10/9/78  Psych. Rep. &quot;When it comes to getting things done, she often has to be asked a few times before she does it, especially at home. When her mother tells her to work, C gets 'mad'.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/15/85</td>
<td>9/17/85  Crt. Rep. &quot;In the opinion of this worker, T's home situation is not conducive to extracting good behavior from him. T receives little or no supervision or discipline from [MO] and comes and goes as he pleases.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/19/85</td>
<td>10/21/85 Chrono. &quot;[MO] stated [to the judge] that D refused to attend school, steals from the family, and remains out late at night.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/16/85</td>
<td>4/2/84  Crt. Rep. &quot;S also started to act out more in regards to his home behavior. Eventually, S refused to obey his curfew and at times left home ... without telling his mother where he was going.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13/85</td>
<td>9/25/80  FIR &quot;[FA] reports that he has attempted to employ his son at the body shop and give him an opportunity to earn extra money. however, this has not stopped C's stealing.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/30/85</td>
<td>10/23/81 FIR &quot;In light of the above-mentioned facts [history of neglect and abuse by parents], it is easy to understand why D is so frustrated, hostile, and noncompliant [with his mother].&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 - good (e.g. few complaints, usually helpful)

Date Coded: 5/8/85  
Statements From Files: 11/16/82 FIR "[According to MO] F is very helpful around the house."  1/11/83 Crt. Rep. [Probation officer questions accuracy of mother's reports indicating] "F's mother drinks on a daily basis and is often heavily under the influence of alcohol."

4 - very good (e.g. no complaints, helpful majority of time)

Date Coded: 9/3/85  
Statements From Files: 1/7/82 FIR "[MO] requires each of her sons to be responsible for themselves in the home including doing their laundry and helping out with keeping the house clean."  9/17/82 Crt. Rep. "At home and school, Mo does very well and once out in the community with his friends is where the trouble usually begins."

Date Coded: 9/14/85  
Statements From Files: 7/2/82 FIR "[MO] is very structured in regards to the chores that the kids have to do. Fk has been very good about doing his chores and helping around the house."

22. Compliance of child with rules of parents (ChComRu)

1 - very poor (e.g. refuses to obey most rules)

Date Coded: 4/24/85  

Date Coded: 7/16/85  
Statements From Files: 2/20/79 CIP Rep. "At home S was doing some very disturbing things. He was repeatedly remaining away until five or six in the morning, was drinking and smoking pot."  3/18/80 Intake "Further, from 3/10/80 - 3/17/80, S has repeatedly disobeied home rules."

Date Coded: 8/24/85  
Statements From Files: 4/6/81 Fir "J began to respond to his parents by verbally abusing them and personally acting out against them. J began to steal from his parents, destroy their property, and openly defy them. Additionally, J began to runaway from home, failed to attend school, and indulge in marijuana and alcohol."
2 - poor (e.g. frequent defiance of most rules)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/8/85</td>
<td>1/11/83 Crt. Rep. &quot;[MO] reports no problems of disobedience.... [yet] within 10 days of his court hearing, F was involved in unarmed robbery and breaking and entering, and felonious assault.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/2/85</td>
<td>3/7/80 Crt. Rep. &quot;Although the placement [with his father] was far more successful than his mother's home, there were still problems. Mt allowed several of his friends from G.R. to visit, when he had been explicitly told not to. He also began to leave home without authorization and remain at large for days at a time.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/4/85</td>
<td>10/9/81 Psych. Rep. &quot;C is not very obedient to her mother or others in authority. She is individualistic, undisciplined, and temperamental.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/15/85</td>
<td>9/17/81 Crt. Rep. &quot;In the opinion of this worker, T's home situation is not conducive to extracting good behavior from him. T receives little or no supervision or discipline from his mother and comes and goes as he pleases.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/19/85</td>
<td>10/21/81 Chrono. &quot;[MO] states that D no longer obeys her reasonable and lawful commands.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13/85</td>
<td>9/25/80 FIR &quot;C has spent approximately the last two years stealing from his family. According to the parents, C started out stealing little things.... This stealing has escalated into C taking things like the family stereo, jewelry, dad's power saw and other tools.... In addition to the stealing behavior, C has also run away from home approximately four or five times.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/30/85</td>
<td>10/23/81 FIR &quot;D fails to attend school on a regular basis... has an anti-authority problem and he fails to comply with the requests of his teachers and other authority figures.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 - good (e.g. usually follows rules, occasional defiance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/3/85</td>
<td>9/17/82 Crt. Rep. &quot;Even though Mc gets to school every day and maintains his curfew almost perfect, he still gets into trouble in the streets.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 - very good (e.g. no problems reported, cooperative)

Date Coded Statements From Files
9/14/85 8/27/82 Crt. Rep. "Fk has had no further law violations, and according to [MO], his behavior at home has been excellent. He follows his 9 p.m. curfew, and when he is away from home, she does know where he is at."

23. Cooperation of child with treatment plan (ChCoopTP)

1 - very poor (e.g. repeated and/or major violations of court order)

Date Coded Statements From Files
5/8/85 1/11/83 Crt. Rep. "Within 10 days of his court hearing, F was involved in an unarmed robbery, felonious assault and breaking and entering."

6/15/85 9/17/81 Crt. Rep. "This worker has had only three contacts with T since his being placed on probation 5/6/81. T and his mother consistently failed to keep appointments with this worker whether it was in my office or in the home. The GR Police Department has referred T to this court on four additional [law] violations [since last court hearing]."

6/19/85 1/6/82 Crt. Rep. "GR Police Department immediately referred D to this court for assault and battery. This worker immediately moved to bring D into secure detention, on the grounds that he was in violation of the conditions of placement [with his mother]. However, D became extremely elusive and avoided this worker for approximately two weeks. During that time he committed another law violation by stealing a bicycle ... valued at $600."

8/24/85 5/29/81 Crt. Rep. "Usually this worker attempted to reason with J and the conversation usually ended with J promising to do better the following day. However, J failed to live up to his promises and he attempted to avoid talking to the worker altogether.... He refused to adhere to his 9:00 PM curfew hour and failed consistently to do chores around the home."

9/3/85 9/17/82 Crt. Rep. "Mc was found guilty beyond a reasonable doubt on charges of armed robbery occurring on 3-20-82.... Also, on 9-17-82 a count two charge will be entered alleging that on 6-28-82 Mc attempted to break into a vehicle."
2 - poor (e.g. frequent minor violations of probation)

Date Coded | Statements From Files
--- | ---
4/24/85 | 12/22/82 Prelim. Rep. "K has been grounded since she was placed on probation mostly because she received school grades lower than a 'C'. Recently K and her mother have gotten into several physical fights. Family counseling is recommended by the probation officer, but has never been started since K was placed on probation. Several [counseling] appointments broken due to actions by both mother and K."

6/2/85 | 3/7/80 Crt. Rep. "Although the placement [with father] was far more successful than his mother's home, there were still problems. Mt allowed several of his friends from G.R. to visit when he had been explicitly told not to. He also began to leave home without authorization and remain at large for days at a time."

6/4/85 | 11/17/78 Crt. Rep. "C totally failed to cooperate with the treatment plan. C barely got started on the Home Detention Program, running away on 10-16-78, returning home the same day and running again on 10-18-78. She was admitted to detention on 10-25-78."

7/16/85 | 4/2/80 Crt. Rep. "S would do well in school and the next week do poorly. He especially got along well with his Special Education Teacher [sic].... Unfortunately, she took a leave of absence and a new teacher took her place. Quite soon after that S was suspended from school indefinitely.... S also started to act our more in regards to his home behavior."

8/13/85 | 10/30/80 Crt. Rep. "Not long after that [psychological testing] C was brought to detention because of his disobedience of the rules at [the shelter home where he was awaiting Treatment Group Home placement]."

9/14/85 | 5/25/84 Crt. Rep. "On 11-15-83, a preliminary inquiry was held regarding a new law violation of MDOP [malicious destruction of property]."

4 - very good (e.g. actively contributes in meetings, complies with probation)

Date Coded | Statements From Files
--- | ---
8/30/85 | 4/22/82 Crt. Rep. "Immediately after his last hearing, D could not get into the treatment group home until the end
of the first semester of the school year. Therefore, from late October, 1981 until February, 1982, D resided [in shelter care]. ... When D entered [shelter care], it was felt that he could not make it in such a program. D showed everyone that they were wrong by actually making it in the [shelter] home."

24. Degree of aggressive behavior (ChAggres)

1 - very aggressive (e.g. frequent fights, hostile attitude, referred to court for violent crimes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/8/85</td>
<td>11/16/82 FIR child referred to court on charge of &quot;unarmed robbery&quot;. 1/11/83 Crt. Rep. child referred to court on charge of &quot;felonious assault&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/2/85</td>
<td>4/20/77 Psych. Rep. &quot;DIAGNOSIS: Unsocialized Aggressive Reaction of Adolescence ... based on overt and covert hostile disobedience, quarrelsomeness, physical and verbal aggressiveness, destructiveness, temper tantrums, solitary stealing, lying and hostile teasing of other children.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/15/85</td>
<td>5/6/81 Crt. Rep. &quot;T's inappropriate behavior at school consists of: being physically aggressive with other students; verbally abusing students and teachers; harassing students on the bus; and spitting out the window.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/19/85</td>
<td>10/21/81 FIR &quot;He is full of hostility and rage.... PREVIOUS COURT AND POLICE HISTORY B: Police 5-7-76 and 5-10-76 - Malicious destruction of property.&quot; 12/3/81 Prelim Rep. &quot;Petition accepted on Assault and Battery.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/16/85</td>
<td>3/18/80 Intake &quot;On 3/14/80 S was suspended from school indefinitely for hitting a teacher with a bottle of perfume. Further, on 3/8/80, S and another juvenile were involved with an assault which the police may or may not refer to Juvenile Court.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/24/85</td>
<td>4/6/81 FIR &quot;J began to respond to his parents by verbally abusing them and personally acting out against them. J began to steal from his parents, destroy their property, and openly defy them. Additionally, J began to run away from home, failed to attend school, and indulge in marijuana and alcohol.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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8/30/85  10/23/81  FIR  "D is a very hostile and emotional child. He suppresses his hostile feelings while in the presence of his family but acts out those feelings at school and in his community.... D has been suspended [from school] for three days this year for fighting."

9/3/85  9/17/82  Crt. Rep. "Mc was found guilty beyond a reasonable doubt on charges of armed robbery.... Mc along with three other juveniles robbed [an adult male] possibly by hitting him up side the head with some numbchucks."

2 - aggressive (e.g. mild tendencies toward violence noted in record, malicious destruction of property)

Date Coded Statements From Files

4/24/85  12/22/82  Prelim Rep. "Recently K and her mother have gotten into several physical fights."

8/13/85  undated TGH Rep. "There have also been incidents [of C] fighting with another boy in the group home. Other than these few incidents, there seems to be good interaction going on at school with others."

9/14/85  5/25/84  Crt. Rep. "On 11-15-83, a preliminary inquiry was held regarding a new law violation of MDOP [malicious destruction of property]."

9 - unidentifiable from record

Date Coded Statements From Files

6/4/85

25. Degree of impulsiveness (ChImpul)

1 - very impulsive (e.g. usually unable to control own behavior)

Date Coded Statements From Files

6/4/85  10/13/78  FIR "She admits that she has run away several times in the last five months.... SPECIFIC DESIRED BEHAVIORS: 1) handling problems rather than running away."

6/15/85  9/17/81  Crt. Rep. "This child has been referred to this court for nine law violations in the past two and a half years."
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6/19/85  10/21/81  FIR  "This child appears to be extremely emotional and he tends to lose emotional control."

7/16/85  6/27/79  FIR  "Various problems S has in class are refusing to work, teasing and mouthing off to other students, excessive talking to the distraction of himself and others."
4/2/80  Crt. Rep.  "S must learn to work on his impulsive behavior and doing things without thinking."

8/24/85  4/6/81  FIR  "J began to steal from his parents, destroy their property, and openly defy them. Additionally, J began to run away from home, failed to attend school, and indulge in marijuana and alcohol."
5/29/81  Crt. Rep.  "As time went by it became more obvious that the parents were not in physical control of J. He, sensing this, began to take more liberties and simply refused to cooperate altogether."

8/30/85  11/23/81  FIR  "D seems to be extremely jealous of other students, he tends to act out in a manner that forces [the teacher] to pay attention to him."

9/14/85  12/9/83  Crt. Rep.  "It is this worker's belief that K is no longer responding to his mother's authority. Due to his impulsive behavior and lack of internalized controls, it is this worker's belief that it is necessary to seek another out of home placement."

2 - somewhat impulsive (e.g. occasionally "acts without thinking")

Date Coded     Statements From Files

4/24/85  Psych. Rep.  "Although she tends to respond emotionally and at times acts impulsively without taking consequences into account, she can learn to do so."

5/8/85  1/11/83  Crt. Rep.  "This is a hearing on a new petition. Within ten days of his court hearing, F was referred to this court by GR Police Department for MDOP [malicious destruction of property] under $100, unarmed robbery, larceny in a building, and breaking and entering."

6/2/85  5/11/79  FIR  "He is capable of outbursts of temper, but these have lessened significantly over the years in both frequency and intensity."
8/13/85  9/25/80  FIR  "C has spent approximately the last two years stealing from his family.... In addition to the stealing behavior, C has also run away from home four or five times."

9/3/85  1/7/82  Chrono.  "[MO] said to the court that she was very concerned about M because M in the past has been easily influenced by his peers and also at time did not think."

26.  Child's desire to remain in parents' home (ChDesire)

1 - refusal to remain with parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/24/85</td>
<td>1/11/83 Crt. Rep. &quot;K indicated also a need to be outside of her mother's home for a period of time.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/8/85</td>
<td>1/11/83 Crt. Rep. &quot;F requested the opportunity to be placed on foster care, as he felt that his mother did not give him adequate supervision.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/16/85</td>
<td>2/20/79 Intake &quot;Both S and his mother feel foster home placement is needed at this time.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13/85</td>
<td>9/3/80 Intake &quot;C says he doesn't want to stay at home because his father is an alcoholic.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/24/85</td>
<td>5/29/81 Crt. Rep. &quot;J requested that he not be allowed to go home on a home visit as a way of making sure that he and his father do not enter into any physical confrontations.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 - initial refusal, then agreement; ambivalent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/2/85</td>
<td>6/21/79 Crt. Rep. &quot;[following the court order placing him at his father's] Mt indicated to this probation officer that he felt really caught in the middle [about staying with his father or his mother].&quot; 8/24/79 Crt. Rep. &quot;Mt afterwards was not happy about the disposition [foster care].&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 - wants to stay with parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6/4/85     | 10/9/78 Psych. Rep. "Her three wishes were: to get out of detention, to go back home, and to get along better with her mother."
| 6/19/85    | 10/21/81 Chrono. "Judge ... asked him if he wanted to remain in the home of his mother. D said 'yes'."
| 8/30/85    | 10/23/81 Chrono. "D stated to the Court that he does not desire to be taken out his home and placed anywhere."
| 9/3/85     | 1/7/82 Chrono. "Mc committed himself verbally to obeying the reasonable commands of his mother and completing the orders and expectations of this court [to remain home]."

9 - unidentifiable from record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/15/85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14/85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. Child's relationships with adult authorities (ChRelAu)

1 - very poor (e.g. usually refuses to talk with school authorities, PO, police except minimal replies to direct question, no spontaneous discussion of issues, expresses distrust of authorities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6/4/85     | 10/13/78 FIR "C does not relate well to counselors or POS. For the most part she remained silent throughout her [counseling] sessions. C has been more verbal with this worker, but still is not sharing any reasons her her runaways."
| 6/15/85    | 5/6/81 Crt. Rep. "T's inappropriate behavior at school consists of: being physically aggressive with other students; verbally abusing students and teachers."
|            | 9/17/81 Crt. Rep. "T and his mother consistently failed to keep appointments with this worker whether it was in my office or in the home." |
In all the areas that he was involved in at home, relative, school, or wherever he was under adult authority figures in his life, he went through the pattern of rejecting those people whenever he did not agree with their particular situation. 11/25/81 Crt. Rep. "J showed complete oppositional behavior to his authority figures both in the home and at school.

D has difficulty interacting with others and he tends to not give eye contact when conversing. D has an anti-authority problem and seems to be in opposition with all adults.

On 12-5-83, it was learned that Fk had been placed on in-house detention for disruptive and disrespectful behavior in his reading class. While serving the detention, Fk stole some keys belonging to a teacher which resulted in school officials calling the police to take a formal report. [The] assistant principal ... indicated that Fk was very uncooperative and cocky when being questioned about the incident. Similar negative attitudes have been noticed by [his therapist] during therapy.

2 - poor (e.g. displays hesitancy in all of the above, but will talk when encouraged, occasionally shows trust through agreement with authorities to "handle arrangements" affecting child)

At first F denied being involved in the law violations, but after being confronted admitted his actions. 11/16/82 FIR "F is well behaved in class."

With mild probing, Mt spoke of the damaging effects of heavy drug usage. He claims he had been taking 'acid' several times a week.

"He seems to have a conscience and he shows proper respect to the powers of this court." 1/6/82 Chrono. "[The] school counselor at KEC school reported on D's behavior there. He basically stated that D had had some extremely difficult times getting along with staff and applying himself academically. He concluded his report by stating that D had done a very fantastic job in school for the past three weeks."

"In all interviews he is quite friendly and easy to talk to. [MO] claims that one of his problems is that he has a big mouth and sometimes by talking too much and teasing he gets into trouble. S also has a temper
which has gotten him into trouble before. S especially gets mad when he knows he is wrong and someone confronts him with that."

8/13/85  9/25/80  FIR  "C is a medium sized, Black teenager who was extremely quiet during all interviews."

3 - good (e.g. usually talks about issues/problems with PO, reports of good relationships with teachers, etc.)

Date Coded  Statements From Files

4/24/85  11/9/82  Crt. Rep. "K is able to answer most questions with little prompting and maintain good eye contact.... [The school counselor] advised this worker that there has never been a problem in regards to her social behavior."

9 - unidentifiable from record

Date Coded  Statements From Files

9/3/85

28. Child's relationships with peers (ChRelPrs)

2 - negative influence, companions involved in delinquent behavior; frequent fights; few friends

Date Coded  Statements From Files

5/8/85  11/16/82  FIR  "He is very street wise and tends to associate with many youngsters who are well known to this court."

6/2/85  6/21/79  Crt. Rep. "While he was in detention, this worker was able to visit Mt daily for seven working days, during which time he spoke freely of his drug usage and of his association with two friends whom he finally identified as his accomplices in the [B&E] offense currently charged."


6/15/85  5/6/81  Crt. Rep. "T's inappropriate behavior at school consists of: being physically aggressive with other students; verbally abusing students and teachers; harassing students on the bus."
6/19/85  10/21/81  FIR  "Since he first started school, he had a
difficult time accepting the teacher as the authority fig-
ure and getting along with his peers."

female and older boys in the neighborhood.... S readily
identified with them and the types of activities they were
involved in.... The Court has just received an assault
charge ... stating that S and another older adult were
involved in assaulting a neighborhood youth."

8/13/85  4/29/81  TGH Rep.  "He has experienced some problems with
others in the school situation with some fighting.... There
have also been incidents in fighting with another boy in
the group home."

8/24/85  3/6/81  Intake  "J appears very easily influenced by his
peers."  4/6/81  FIR  "[The assistant principal] stated J
was not properly prepared to handle high school emotionally
and socially."

8/30/85  10/23/81  FIR  "Additionally, D has difficulty relating to
his schoolmates. He is very argumentative and sometimes
engages in physical confrontations."

9/3/85  1/7/82  FIR  "SPECIFIC PROBLEM BEHAVIORS ... 2. Poor selec-
tion of friends."

9/14/85  8/8/84  TGH Rep.  "Fk's biggest difficulty over the past
several months ... has been his relationship with authority
figures and his relationship with peers."

3 - good support and influence

Date Coded  Statements From Files

worker that there has never been a problem in regard to her
social behavior."

29. Drug/chemical abuse by child (DrugAbus)

1 - chronic abuse, serious disruption of functioning

Date Coded  Statements From Files

damaging effects of heavy drug usage. He claims he had
been taking 'acid' several times a week"
### Date Coded Statements From Files

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/24/85</td>
<td>4/6/81 FIR &quot;J heavily engages in marijuana and alcohol.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14/85</td>
<td>12/9/83 Crt. Rep. &quot;Another concern is the fact that during his psychological evaluation, Fk admitted to smoking marijuana on an average of two times a week, which is a marked increase in this behavior.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 - occasional abuse, some disruption of functioning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/19/85</td>
<td>1/19/83 Crt. Rep. &quot;D had made some good progress in many areas but still experienced difficulties at home. Those difficulties consisted of him sneaking out of the home at night and indulging in the use of alcohol and marijuana.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/16/85</td>
<td>2/20/79 CIP Rep. &quot;Unfortunately, there seems to be far more to S's acting out than a lack of motivation to do well in school. An indication of this would be S's frequent use of alcohol and marijuana in the last few months.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13/85</td>
<td>undated TGH Rep. &quot;C has not been without problems in the [treatment group] home and is experiencing difficulty with others at times and it is believed that he has been involved in some pot smoking.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3/18/83    | 3/18/83 TGH Rep. "It began to get out of hand and combined with not going to school a couple of times and his getting high on weekends ..."

3 - no known use or no interference with functioning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/30/85</td>
<td>10/26/82 M.D. Rep. &quot;D's drug screen was negative except for ... caffeine present in the blood, but no other medications.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 - unidentified from record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/24/85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/8/85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 30. Alcohol abuse by child (AlcAbus)

1 - chronic abuse, serious disruption of functioning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/24/85</td>
<td>4/6/81 FIR &quot;J heavily engages in marijuana and alcohol.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 - occasional abuse, some disruption of functioning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/2/85</td>
<td>8/24/79 Crt. Rep. &quot;Further, although his substance abuse has dramatically diminished (there is currently no reason to believe that he is doing 'hard' drugs), he will drink when given the chance.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/19/85</td>
<td>1/19/83 Crt. Rep. &quot;D had made some good progress in many areas but still experienced difficulties at home. Those difficulties consisted of him ... sneaking out of the home at night, and indulging in the use of alcohol and marijuana.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/16/85</td>
<td>2/20/79 CIP Rep. &quot;Unfortunately, there seems to be far more to S's acting out than a lack of motivation to do well in school. An indication of this would be S's frequent use of alcohol and marijuana in the last few months.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 - no known use or no interference with functioning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/30/85</td>
<td>10/26/82 M.D. Rep. &quot;D's drug screen was negative except for ... caffeine present in the blood, but no other medications.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 - unidentifiable from record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/24/85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/8/85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
31. **Child’s ability to recognize and accept responsibility for his/her behavior (ChResp)**

1 - very poor (e.g. denies most problems or responsibility)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/3/85</td>
<td>1/7/82 FIR &quot;When talking to Mc it is very apparent that Mc has a good concept of what is right and wrong.&quot; 3/18/83 Crt. Rep. &quot;In the past in my opinion, Mc has failed to admit the fact he does have problems. Mc sees his placement at the [treatment group home] as the result of his probation officer recommending the placement.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14/85</td>
<td>12/9/83 Crt. Rep. &quot;Although Fk's behavior at home and at school has worsened, he has shown little interest in working toward improving his behavior and has shown no remorse for his misdeeds.&quot; 12/9/83 Chrono. &quot;Fk commented that he could do better. [He] blamed his negative behavior on peer pressure.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 - poor (e.g. admits problems, denies responsibility)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/24/85</td>
<td>11/9/82 Crt. Rep. &quot;After meeting with K on several occasions, it is this worker's opinion that K does exhibit low self-esteem and would rather consider herself the family scapegoat, than begin to take a look at her own behavior and attitudes.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/15/85</td>
<td>9/17/81 Crt. Rep. &quot;T stated that he understood the difference between right and wrong and that he agreed to follow the judge's orders to the letter.&quot; [within three days of placement in foster care T ran away blaming the foster parents for his problems;]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7/16/85  6/27/79 Chrono. "[S's counselor] stated that she was seeing S on a weekly basis and saw problems of S not being responsible, not being very concerned about himself, and being somewhat immature."

3 - good (e.g. admits problems, accepts limited responsibility)

Date Coded  Statements From Files

5/8/85     11/16/82 FIR "F is very willing to modify his behavior so that he may continue to reside in his home." 1/11/83 Crt. Rep. "F expressed the desire to straighten up his life."


8/24/85     4/6/81 FIR "J admits that his parents are correct in their assessment of him and he also admits his guilt for the way he treats them. J explains he wants to do right but it seems that everything he does turns out wrong."

8/30/85     4/22/82 TGH Rep. "After an initial period of adjustment wherein D quickly learned the rules and limits within the [treatment group] home, he has grown considerably to be responsible. This responsibility not only is seen in the group home, but also carries over in the school setting and the community."

9 - unidentifiable from record

Date Coded  Statements From Files

8/13/85
IV. CHARACTERISTICS OF TREATMENT PROGRAM

36. Effectiveness of management of daily behavioral problems (Behlsu)
   Consider degree to which actions are taken to handle daily problems vs letting build into crisis

2 - poor (e.g. problems mentioned, action taken occasionally adequate and appropriate but problems continue)

Date Coded Statements From Files

4/24/85 2/16/83 Case Notes "[Foster mother] states K and her younger daughter are having problems. [The foster mother's daughter] is in counseling." 3/1/83 Case Notes "K was caught stealing from lockers and problems between her and S [foster mother's daughter] have increased. [Foster mother] concerned that placement might not work. [Probation officer] Suggested K also have counseling with S's therapist." 4/8/83 Case Notes "Problems with K have continued and [foster mother] doesn't feel it will work to keep her."

5/8/85 1/5/83 through 1/24/83 Case Notes Several problems mentioned which continue until removal of child from foster home on 1/24/83.

6/15/85 11/22/81 Crt. Rep. "After the foster parents learned of T's suspension, they attempted to punish him by grounding him to the house. T became very resentful towards [the foster parents] and began to make small complaints to this worker. On 10-3-81, two days after being suspended from school and subsequently disciplined by the foster parents, T ran away from placement [and was removed from foster care placement by the court]."

3 - good (e.g. problem solving attempts usually adequate, appropriate, and successful)

Date Coded Statements From Files

6/2/85 3/7/80 Crt. Rep. "His relationship to the foster parents and other foster children has been very positive. He is able to relate on a high level with [the foster mother] in particular and when he does err, he is willing to accept the punishment, even when it is as severe as loosing a home visit."

7/16/85 5/2/80 Case Notes "This worker instituted a contract with S at [the foster] home and also set up a pattern of meeting with S once a week.... S does very well at [the foster]
home. This worker monitors the foster home situation very closely and this monitoring is reinforced by the weekly meetings.

4 - very good (e.g. problem solving attempts most often adequate, effective, and successful)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/4/85</td>
<td>6/8/79 Crt. Rep. &quot;C's leaving home without permission was responded to by the foster parents grounding her for one month's time. On the second occasion, she was again grounded and firmly cautioned that a 3rd runaway could result in removal from the foster home.&quot; 10/1/79 Crt. Rep. &quot;C has been very obedient in the foster home - discontinuing running away and attending school regularly.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/19/85</td>
<td>7/2/82 Crt. Rep. &quot;[The foster parents] reported that D is extremely obedient towards them, and that he relates on a positive level with all family members. Indeed, D seems to be extremely close to [the foster parents]. He respects them and seems to have no difficulty in accepting love or discipline from them.&quot; 7/20/83 Crt. Rep. &quot;The foster parents describe him as being obedient, pleasant, and sensitive.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/24/85</td>
<td>11/25/81 Crt. Rep. &quot;J's greatest success, in my opinion, has been his ability to relate on a positive level to the Treatment Group Home parents.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/30/85</td>
<td>4/22/82 Crt. Rep. &quot;K views himself as being a bad boy and he feels that [the Treatment Group Home father] knows how to deal with bad boys. Surprisingly, D and [the Treatment Group Home mother] are getting along extremely well. This is worth noting because D has had a long history of not relating very well to females.... [But] he accepts her authority and follows her directions without any problems.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 - unidentifiable from record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Coded</th>
<th>Statements From Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/13/85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/3/85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14/85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Questionnaire for Predicting Appropriate Foster Placement—Revised

DIRECTIONS

The following directions clarify the procedures used to code the items from the Questionnaire for Predicting Appropriate Foster Placement—Revised and to complete the Predictive Index For Foster Care Placements. All items are to be coded by putting the scale number corresponding to the answer which is closest to being the correct response on the blank after the item on the Index sheet.

Questionnaire for Predicting Appropriate Foster Placement—Revised

The Questionnaire is used as a coding booklet to help in the assessment of youth being considered for foster family or treatment group home placement. Most items in the Questionnaire are self-explanatory and can be coded by simply putting the scale number corresponding to the answer which is closest to the correct response on the blank after the item number on the Index sheet. Additional procedures for a few of the items are explained below.

1. Index of past criminal record of youth (Index)

   A. Previous police contacts are defined as any status offense or criminal behavior that led to the child having contact with the police, but for which the police did not send a referral to the juvenile court. Severity of the crime is based on the rank order listed in the coding booklet (e.g., status offenses are equal to 1, sex offenses equalled 4, and so on). The number of prior police contacts for each category of offense is multiplied times the severity of the crime. The resulting figures are then added and the total recorded.

   B. Previous petitions filed are defined as referrals (complaints, reports) filed with the Intake Department of the juvenile court by police, parents or other authorities regarding status offense or criminal behavior of a child. The severity of the crimes for each referral is based on the rank order listed in the coding booklet. The placement value refers to whether the child remained in his/her parents' home on formal or informal probation (1), or whether the Home Detention (2) or Kentfields (3) programs was ordered in addition to probation at home. Previous petitions filed include those on which informal action was taken by the court as well as those scheduled to be heard in front of a judge. The number of previous petitions for each category of offense is multiplied times the severity of the crime. This figure is then multiplied times the number associated with the placement resulting from action taken by
the court on that referral. The resulting figures are then added and
the total recorded.

C. The Index Value is found by adding the totals of the pre-
vious two items. The grand total is then coded according to the
scale included in the Questionnaire.

5. Parents' desire to have child remain at home with them (NPDesire)

This item attempts to assess the parents' stated or implied
feelings about keeping their son or daughter at home. Parents fre-
quently demand the removal of their child immediately following a
crisis or the report of particular crimes, but then change their
minds quickly and maintain their desire to have their child home.
These situations usually will be coded with a "3" or a "4." Other
parents vacillate frequently, giving their child and the probation
officer mixed messages regarding their intent. Their behavior is
ambivalent also, perhaps missing appointments for dubious reasons,
etc. Overall, they appear to have a somewhat questionable commitment
to working with the court and their child. These situations most
likely will be coded "2." The extreme ratings, "1" and "4," should
be evident without much question.

Predictive Index for Foster Care Placements (Scales 1-4)

Each of the four scales of the Predictive Index for Foster Care
Placement contains between five and seven variables from the fifteen
which have been found to be most strongly related to successful
outcome of foster family or treatment group home placements for youth
whose first out-of-home placement was in one of these settings. The
Predictive Index is used to help evaluate children being considered
for placement in a foster family or a treatment group home.

Each child is rated on an appropriate set of variables. Defini-
tions and examples of the ratings are contained in the Questionnaire
described above. The probation officer can then use the computer
program, labeled "Equation 1, 2, 3, or 4" corresponding to the scales
of the same letter, to enter the "constant term," included at the top
of each scale, and the variable ratings as prompted by the computer.
Each program calculates a numerical value which corresponds to a
predicted outcome for the child being rated. The range of possible
values generated by the computer programs and their corresponding
predicted outcomes are listed below.
Directions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numerical Values</th>
<th>Predicted Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.67 - 2.0</td>
<td>Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.34 - 1.66</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 - 1.33</td>
<td>Failure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Predictive Index is intended for use as one facet of the assessment process and the "predicted outcome" should be considered a probability or estimate, not as something definite. As can be seen from the table, for scores in the midrange a prediction cannot be made regarding outcome of care. Perhaps the greatest value of the Index is to alert the probation officer that a particular youth might be at greater risk for placement failure than his or her peers in the same program. This may suggest the need for greater efforts and/or resources to maintain the youth in a family placement.

Each scale is appropriate for a different set of youth. Scale 1 is suggested for use with white boys who are being considered for foster family care. It may also be used as an alternative with white girls being considered for either type of placement. Scale 2 is suggested for use with white boys being considered for treatment group home placement. Scale 3 is suggested for use with white girls being considered for either type of placement. Scale 4 is suggested for use with minority youth being considered for either type of family placement. As an alternative, Scale 3 can be used with minority girls.
This scale should be used for predicting outcome of care for white boys being considered for foster family placement. It may also be used with white girls being considered for placement in either foster or treatment group homes. Use the Questionnaire for Predicting Appropriate Foster Placement to code each of the variables below. The variable numbers correspond to the numbers in the Questionnaire.

"Constant" value .238

4. Parents' ability to enforce reasonable consequences to rule infractions by their children

6. Race of the child (1 = white; 2 = minority)

7. Sex of the child (1 = female; 2 = male)

10. Child's previous cooperation with the treatment plan and court order

12. Child's desire to remain in parents' home

14. Degree of child's alcohol abuse

15. Child's ability to recognize and take responsibility for own behavior
PREDICTIVE INDEX FOR FOSTER CARE PLACEMENTS—SCALE 2

This scale should be used for predicting outcome of care for white BOYS being considered for treatment group home placement. Use the Questionnaire for Predicting Appropriate Foster Placement to code each of the variables below. The variable numbers correspond to the numbers in the Questionnaire.

"Constant" value .163

3. Parents' ability to establish reasonable rules and set appropriate limits for their children

10. Child's previous cooperation with the treatment plan and court order

11. The degree of aggressive behavior exhibited by this child

13. Child's relationship with peers

14. Degree of child's alcohol abuse
This scale should be used for predicting outcome of care for white GIRLS being considered for foster family or treatment group home placement. It may also be used as an alternative, or in addition to, Scale D for minority girls. Use the Questionnaire for Predicting Appropriate Foster Placement to code each of the variables below. The variable numbers correspond to the numbers in the Questionnaire.

"Constant" value 1.40

2. Quality of parent-child relationship

4. Parents' ability to enforce reasonable consequences to rule infractions by their children

5. Parents' desire to have child at home with them

6. Child's race (1 = white; 2 = minority)

9. Child's cooperation with her parents while at home

10. Child's previous cooperation with the treatment plan and court order
PREDICTIVE INDEX FOR FOSTER CARE PLACEMENTS—SCALE 4

This scale should be used for predicting outcome of care for MINORITY youth being considered for foster family or treatment group home placement. Scale C may also be used as an additional measure for minority girls. Use the Questionnaire for Predicting Appropriate Foster Placement to code each of the variables below. The variable numbers correspond to the numbers in the Questionnaire.

"Constant" value .148

1. Index of past status and criminal offense record

5. Parents' desire to have child at home with them

7. Child's sex (1 = female; 2 = male)

8. Child's school behavior record

10. Child's previous cooperation with the treatment plan and court order

12. Child's desire to remain in parents' home

15. Child's ability to recognize and take responsibility for own behavior
Questionnaire for Predicting Appropriate Foster Placement—Revised

I. NATURE OF PROBLEM(S) LEADING TO PLACEMENT RECOMMENDATION

1. Index of past criminal record of youth (Index)

   Seriousness of offenses are listed as follows:
   1 - status offense
   2 - probation violation/minor misdemeanors
   3 - narcotics and drug offenses
   4 - sex offenses
   5 - property crime (larceny, burglary, auto theft)
   6 - violent personal crime (homicide, rape, assault)

   A. previous police contacts recorded in file (no petition filed) times severity of crime (see #1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Police Contacts</th>
<th>Severity of Crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   B. previous petitions times severity of crime (see #1) times placement value (1 - parents' home; 2 - Home Detention; 3 - Kentfields)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Petitions Filed</th>
<th>Severity of Crime</th>
<th>Placem't Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   C. Index Value
   1 - Index Value = 0-10
   2 - Index Value = 11-15
   3 - Index Value = 16-20
   4 - Index Value = 21+
II. CHARACTERISTICS OF NATURAL PARENTS AND FAMILY

2. Quality of parent-child relationship (PCRelat)

1 - very poor (e.g., frequent physical fighting)
2 - poor (e.g., frequent arguments, no physical fights)
3 - good (e.g., infrequent arguments, usually able to solve problems, affection displayed)
4 - very good (e.g., frequent expressions of affection and encouragement, able to solve most daily problems)

3. Parents' ability to set limits (LimtSet)

1 - very poor (e.g., parents do not set appropriate limits with respect to all of the following areas of the child's behavior: peers, school work, household responsibilities, personal habits, social behavior.) (rule establishment)
2 - poor (e.g., parents overly lenient in 4 of these areas)
3 - average (e.g., parents overly lenient in 3 of these areas)
4 - good (e.g., parents overly lenient in 2 of these areas)
5 - very good (e.g., parents overly lenient in 1 of these areas)
6 - excellent (e.g., parents are not overly lenient in any areas—limitations are considered appropriate for the child's age)

4. Parents' ability to enforce consequences (EnfCon)

1 - very poor (e.g., parents are overly punitive and overcontrolling or excessively lenient with respect to all of the following areas of the child's behavior: peers, school work, household responsibilities, personal habits, social behavior)
2 - poor (e.g., parents overly punitive etc. in 4 of these areas)
3 - average (e.g., parents overly punitive etc. in 3 of these areas)
4 - good (e.g., parents overly punitive etc. in 2 of these areas)
5 - very good (e.g., parents overly punitive etc. in 1 of these areas)
6 - excellent (e.g., parents are not overly punitive or excessively lenient in any areas (use appropriate consequences for enforcing limits)

5. Parents' desire to have child home (NPDesire)

1 - refusal to have child at home maintained by parent(s)
2 - parents change their minds or disagree with each other
3 - parents willing to have child if no other options
4 - parents want child home
III. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE DELINQUENT YOUTH

6. Race (ChRace)
   1 - white
   2 - non-white (Black, Native American, Spanish American, other)

7. Sex of child (ChSex)
   1 - female
   2 - male

8. School behavior record (SchBeh)
   Evaluate the child's marks in "conduct areas", classroom behavior and responsiveness to teacher's discipline within most recent 9 months of school
   1 - very poor (e.g., 2 or more suspensions from school, 3 or more times sent into school's discipline system)
   2 - poor (e.g., 1 suspension, 1-2 times sent into school's discipline system)
   3 - good (e.g., no suspensions, occasional problems, responds well to teacher's disciplinary actions)
   4 - very good (e.g., no suspensions, no disciplinary action needed)

9. Cooperation of child with parents while at home (ChCoopP)
   1 - very poor (e.g., usually refuses to help in any way)
   2 - poor (e.g., frequent complaints about helping, must be asked repeatedly by parents to help)
   3 - good (e.g., few complaints, usually helpful)
   4 - very good (e.g., no complaints, helpful majority of time)

10. Cooperation of child with treatment plan (ChCoopTP)
    1 - very poor (e.g., repeated &/or major violations of court order)
    2 - poor (e.g., frequent minor violations of probation)
    3 - good (e.g., usually participates in meetings, follows suggestions)
    4 - very good (e.g., actively contributes in meetings, complies with probation)

11. Degree of aggressive behavior (ChAggres)
    1 - very aggressive (e.g., frequent fights, hostile attitude, referred to court for violent crimes)
    2 - aggressive (e.g., mild tendencies toward violence noted in record, malicious destruction of property)
    3 - no problems (appropriately assertive)
    4 - passive in relation to others' aggressiveness (e.g., allows others to take advantage)
12. Child's desire to remain in parents' home (ChDesire)
   1 - refusal to remain with parents
   2 - initial refusal, then agreement; ambivalent
   3 - willing to stay with parents if no other options
   4 - wants to stay with parents

13. Child's relationships with peers (ChRelPrs)
   1 - delinquent gang member (not necessarily "formal" gang)
   2 - negative influence, companions involved in delinquent behavior; frequent fights; few friends
   3 - good support and influence

14. Alcohol abuse by child (AlcAbus)
   1 - chronic abuse, serious disruption of functioning
   2 - occasional abuse, some disruption of functioning
   3 - no known use or no interference with functioning
   9 - unidentifiable from information available

15. Child's ability to recognize and accept responsibility for his/her behavior (ChResp)
   1 - very poor (e.g., denies most problems or responsibility)
   2 - poor (e.g., admits problems, denies responsibility)
   3 - good (e.g., admits problems, accepts limited responsibility)
   4 - very good (e.g., admits problems and accepts appropriate responsibility)
Appendix N

Sample Computer Program for the Calculation of Predicted Outcomes of Foster Care: Equation 1
Listed below is a sample program, written in basic programming language, that can be used to calculate the results of the regression formula based on the stepwise multiple regression analysis of the data from the total sample, Equation 1. When the program is run, the probation officer simply enters the constant term and variable ratings consecutively from the Predictive Index sheet as prompted by the computer.

Similar programs have been written to be used in calculating predicted outcomes with Equation 2, based on the analysis of the treatment group home sample, Equation 3, based on the analysis of the girls included in the present study, and Equation 4, based on the analysis of data from cases of minority children.

The value of the Constant term and equivalents of the other variables for Equation 1 are listed below for illustration. Variable numbers refer to the listing in Appendix M, NOT the original listing.

Constant = .238
V1 = V4 (Variable 4, parent's ability to enforce consequences)
V2 = V6 (Variable 6, child's race)
V3 = V7 (Variable 7, child's sex)
V4 = V10 (Variable 10, child's cooperation with treatment plan)
V5 = V12 (Variable 12, child's desire to remain with parents)
V6 = V14 (Variable 14, child's alcohol abuse)
V7 = V15 (Variable 15, child's ability to accept responsibility for own behavior)

10 REM REGR CALCS
20 PRINT "CONST";
30 INPUT CONST
40 PRINT "V4"
50 INPUT V1
60 PRINT "V6"
70 INPUT V2
80 PRINT "V7"
90 INPUT V3
100 PRINT "V10"
110 INPUT V4
120 PRINT "V12"
130 INPUT V5
140 PRINT "V14"
150 INPUT V6
160 PRINT "V15"
170 INPUT V7
180 EQ = CONST + (.09350*V1) + (-.124*V2) + (.188*V3) + (.179*V4) + (.06476*V5) + (.156*V6) + (.07145*V7)
190 PRINT "PREDICTED OUTCOME = ";EQ;
200 END
SAVE "EQUATION 1"
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