INTEGRATION DEVELOPMENT DYNAMICS:

A TREATMENT APPROACH IN A COMMUNAL GROUP HOME SETTING

Prepared for Presentation

at the

Eighteenth National Institute

on Crime and Delinquency

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

---

by

Valdar Linn

and

Howard Busse

June 1971

YOUTH ADVENTURES, INC.
P. O. BOX 02221
PORTLAND, OREGON 97202

INTEGRATION DEVELOPMENT DYNAMICS:

A TREATMENT APPROACH IN A COMMUNAL GROUP HOME SETTING

INTRODUCTION

The residential treatment program of Youth Adventures (Y.A.) has evolved over a six-year period of operation. When this program began operation in 1964 the concept of rendering treatment to juvenile offenders in the community in lieu of state training school commitment was new in the Northwest, and literature dealing with community treatment was either negligible or not readily accessible to the practitioner who was not also working in an academic setting. As literature in this field has been developed, the Y.A. staff has examined it and incorporated new ideas and techniques into their program. Many of the techniques developed here intuitively were found to be similar to those being used by others. In some respects Y.A. treatment techniques were more comprehensive in scope than those in use in better-publicized programs. The treatment program which has evolved appears to be unique in its comprehensiveness.

The materials that have been published to date on other residential treatment programs often fall into the pitfall of describing primarily technical program elements and scheduling. As Patterson (1966, p. 504) has said, "The essence of emotional disturbance [and of most problems encountered during adolescence]

is disturbed human relationships," so it is felt by the writers that descriptions at the "data level" of communication miss the real essence of our concern. This paper will attempt to describe the interpersonal interaction between the people, at an emotional level, which occurs in this treatment program.

The standard social-work perspective which approaches each case as unique made discussions of treatment interactions with a diverse population of youngsters so general as to be nearly meaningless in many instances.

With the advent of sophisticated typological approaches, a framework has been supplied and much more specificity and precision has become possible in describing treatment modalities and their differential application. Y.A. is a private agency and therefore does not need to be overly concerned with the necessity of being "all things to all people," as do a large percentage of juvenile courts and state institutions.

The agency has adopted the Interpersonal Maturity Level Classification (Warren, 1966 a) system for differential treatment planning and has determined by experience that it is best suited to treat only one-half of the total number of delinquent subtypes described by this system.

The Y.A. treatment program is designed to effect:

1. Change in the individual's value system and attitudes which tend toward exploitation or abuse of others, from previously anti-social norms and perceptual sets to that achievement of

socialization normal to the non-delinquent and well-integrated peer.

2. Change in their ability to empathize with and to perceive others as motivationally and emotionally complicated personalities, in order to better predict the responses of others to the expressions of their needs and to their characteristic techniques of interacting.

3. Change in their emotional integration, to better effect the resolution of the dysfunctional anxieties and emotional stresses which have motivated much of their deviant behavior, and the development of a non-delinquent identity, and techniques for coping with emotional and interpersonal conflict, to prevent the future occurrence of disturbing "unfinished life situations."

4. Change and improvement in self-perception from the usual incomplete and simplistic delinquent self-description with a heavy proportion of "bad-me" factors, to a more complete and complex self-knowledge integrating and accepting of both good and bad personality traits in the self, with some perception of inner motivations of behavior; and enhance individual perceptions of how past influences and experiences effect present and future responses.

In a word, the Y.A. program attempts to make delinquents into non-delinquents, and also into strong enough human beings to be able to cope with the stresses and temptations of everyday life without choosing anti-social solutions to their problems.

A brief description of the I-Level Classification system and the characteristics of the delinquents at the several levels, along with the subtypes, are provided below:[1]

> The classifications which are used at CTP_2 are one part of a general theory of individual development.[2] This theory distinguishes seven levels of increasing interpersonal maturity, known as "I-levels". The vast majority of adolescent delinquents fall within the second (I_2, or low), third (I_3, or middle) or fourth (I_4, or high) levels of maturity.[3] Each given I-level refers to certain dominant ways in which given individuals interpret their environment. For each I-level, a classification manual provides detailed descriptions of many of the central personal concerns and interpersonal desires of individuals who are currently functioning at the particular level. Additional distinctions are made <u>within</u> each of the three I-levels. These concern certain noteworthy ways in which delinquent youths who are functioning at any given I-level <u>express</u> their underlying needs when interacting with their external environment. In all, nine kinds of youth ("delinquent subtypes") are thus distinguished. Each subtype appears to be associated with certain broad, recurring patterns of development during childhood and adolescence. Thus, in the case of any given youth, delinquency is viewed as an expression of one of the nine broad patterns of need-response development. In general, then, each of these classifications is a way of focusing-in on "where the client is at", both in terms of his overall development and that of his outstanding or at least distinguishing modes of adaptation to his environment.
>
> The following is a capsule account of the low, middle and high maturity levels, together with the nine respective subtypes: . . .
>
> <u>Maturity Level 2</u> (I_2): An individual at this level views things outside of himself either as sources of supply or of frustration. He has very little feeling of being able to predict or control persons and events within his immediate environment. He distinguishes among others primarily in terms of their being "givers" or "withholders", and has little concept of

---

[1] [From Palmer, 1969 a.]

[2] [Sullivan, Grant and Grant, 1957]

[3] [Warren, 1966 a.]

interpersonal refinement beyond this. He has an unusually low level of frustration-tolerance together with a poor capacity to understand the reasons or rationale for the behavior or attitudes of others towards him - particularly those which are in response to his generally impulsive actions. The delinquent subtypes are:

(1) Asocial, Aggressive (Aa) - responds with active demands or open hostility when frustrated.
(2) Asocial, Passive (Ap) - responds with complaining, whining or withdrawal when frustrated.

Maturity Level 3 (I_3): More than the I_2, an individual at this level recognizes that certain aspects of his own behavior do have a good deal to do with whether or not he will get what he wants from others. However, an individual at this level interacts primarily in terms of oversimplified, external rules and formulas rather than from a set of relatively firm, internalized values. Although he has learned to play a few stereotyped roles, he cannot understand very many of the needs, feelings and motives of individuals who are organized differently than himself. As a result, he is likely to underestimate the differences which exist between himself and others - and among others, as well. He commonly, indiscriminantly assumes that peers and adults operate on a power and rule-oriented basis. The delinquent subtypes are:

(3) Immature Conformist (Cfm) - responds with strong compliance to persons whom he thinks have "the power" at the moment. Sees himself as being weak.
(4) Cultural Conformist (Cfc) - responds with conformity to delinquent peers or to a specific reference group. Likes to see himself as delinquent and tough.
(5) Manipulator (Mp) - often attempts to undermine or circumvent the power of authority-figures, and/or usurp the power role for himself. Typically does not wish to conform to peers or adults.

Maturity Level 4 (I_4): An individual at this level has internalized a set of standards in terms of which he judges the behavior and attitudes of himself and others. He is quite concerned about status and respect, and is strongly influenced by people whom he admires. He can perceive a level of interpersonal interaction in which individuals often have numerous expectations of one another, and attempt to influence one another by means other than power, compliance, manipulation, etc. He shows moderate-to-much ability to

understand underlying reasons for behavior, and has some ability to relate to peers or authority-figures emotionally and on a long-term basis. The delinquent subtypes are:

(6) Neurotic, Acting-Out (Na) - frequently responds to underlying fears or guilt with attempts to "outrun" or deny conscious feelings of anxiety or self-condemnation.

(7) Neurotic, Anxious (Nx) - frequently responds in the form of various symptoms of emotional disturbance, which result from conflicts produced by feelings of inadequancy, fear or guilt.

(8) Situational-Emotional Reaction (Se) - responds to immediate family, social or personal crisis by acting-out - although his development, particularly that of pre-adolescence, seems fairly normal in most respects.

(9) Cultural Identifier (Ci) - expresses his identification with an anti- or with a non-middle-class value system by acting-out his delinquent beliefs and/or by "living out" in commonly unacceptable ways. Often sees himself as competent, and sometimes as a leader among peers.

Experience has demonstrated that the approach that Y.A. utilizes seems to be most effective with youngsters diagnosed within this system as high maturity neurotics (I-4 Na's and Nx's; these subtypes accounted for 46% of the total C.T.P. population) or youngsters in "transition" (Palmer, 1969 b) from the I-3 perceptual integration level to the I-4 level (roughly the more mature I-3 Cfm and Cfc's), with an occasional manipulator.

The agency operates two facilities for boys and one for girls. One of the homes for boys (population six or seven) would parallel the characteristics of Pearson and Palmer's (1968, p. 4) Type II "containment" home, as its population is composed primarily of lower maturity (I-3) or transition stage (I-3 to I-4) youngsters who are in need of "concrete and realistic demands by the staff

for conforming, productive behavior." The other facility for boys (population seven or eight) would parallel the Pearson and Palmer (1968, p. 6) Type VI "Individualized" home intended for higher maturity youngsters "who may benefit from having a 'family-like' situation and healthy adult relationships made available to them while resolution of conflicts with self and family take place." The facility for girls (population 10 to 12) would also resemble most closely the Type VI home and has predominantly a high-maturity "neurotic" population. However, it has been determined from experience that each home can tolerate and be therapeutic with one manipulator at a time, and also that the Type VI homes can be successful with a population of up to 25 percent Cfm's or Cfc's.

In Oregon the corrections law which provides for "Youth Care Centers" (group treatment homes rather than enlarged "foster homes") has until recently stipulated that youngsters be placed in these homes by the county juvenile courts "in lieu of" commitment to the state training schools for persistent delinquents. As Palmer (1969 a., p. 5) noted, the juveniles which "the county probation departments have in effect 'given up on,' and have committed to the state correctional system," have "fairly serious problems" on the whole. Palmer goes on to state that "more than 90% of all commitments (to the Community Treatment Program--C.T.P.--of the California Youth Authority--C.Y.A.) are disturbed, conflicted or developmentally lacking beyond what can normally be expected among adolescents, irrespective of background or subculture"

(Palmer, 1969 a., p. 18). He notes in a footnote referring to this passage that "this figure would probably change very little in the case of State correctional populations outside of California." Our experience with court-committed youngsters in Oregon over the past seven years collaborates this assessment. In spite of, or perhaps because of, the agency policy of screening our referrals (and ultimately accepting approximately two out of every three that proceed through the referral process), this program has worked with a highly abnormal and disturbed population with approximately ten percent diagnosed as borderline psychotic. The "normal" youngsters which are estimated to comprise approximately thirty-two percent of the usual county juvenile court counselor caseload (Palmer, 1969 a., p. 24) are almost completely absent.

The referral letters and case summaries of youngsters such as we are describing usually contain some comment recommending group home care for this particular youth, because of his or her need for more "structure" than is available through any other non-institutional placement. Yet when the youth arrives at our center we often find that hostilities toward, and methods of avoiding, externally imposed "structure" are the areas of his greatest sophistication and manifested ingenuity. Most often we find that inconsistently applied or irrational authority has solidified a firm resistance to "structure," which in most programs polarizes the participants into a "staff versus kids" division.

Y.A. deals with this polarization by focusing on "opportunity" rather than "structure." Through use of the guided group interaction (Empey, 1961; and Turner, et al., 1967) techniques of allowing the youngsters to interpret what few rules there are, respecting their ability to form rules for themselves and giving them the power to apply sanctions to those in the group who violate these rules, the program is able to function almost entirely free of the "staff versus kids" type of polarization. This type of opportunity also forces the youngsters to make their own decisions and to take responsibility for them, providing supervised "independence training" usually denied them previously.

The four basic rules are explained to youngsters when admitted to the program and are so general that they require the development of the ability to interpret internally, if not apply internally, their meaning. They are:

1. Go to school and do whatever is necessary to stay in school.

2. Participate in the process of change by honestly examining and working on problems of your own and of others.

3. Quit breaking the law.

4. Refrain from doing anything that could hurt the reputation or endanger the existence of Y.A., and take responsibility in seeing that others observe this rule.

In addition to these rules, there is a large body of tradition which would usually be considered rules, but which Y.A.

staff approaches as "routine" which can be more flexibly applied than a "rules-structure." This tradition exists primarily in the areas of housekeeping and safety and is subject to question and modification in the group meetings.

On the basis of experience dating from the early days of this program and observation of the functioning of other programs, it would seem that "structure" is often developed in a residential program primarily to assuage the anxieties of the staff. The staff is generally more comfortable if problem situations can be handled by referral to a rule rather than to the needs and exigencies of the individual and the immediate situation. The principle of having a more or less flexible "routine" provides the staff with guidelines but makes it possible to innovate as each emerging problem would seem to require. A flexible structure also makes it difficult for the youngsters to manipulate the "rules"--pitting one rule against another or using the literal black-and-white interpretation to cover behavioral lapses of a "borderline" nature. This also creates constructive anxiety in them because of the lack of "predictability" of the system. This anxiety is usually resolved by forming meaningful relationships with others in the group more quickly and by elevating the individual's level of communication.

Several elements of the Y.A. treatment program contribute to the anxiety and discomfort of the residents. The youngsters are routinely confronted in group meetings with any portion of their behavior which is either socially inept or objectionable to the

group members because of the violation of group norms. Many of these youngsters have been fleeing close relationships all their lives. Being compelled to work through the irritations and problems arising within interpersonal relationships, or the consequences of a negative evaluation toward them by others in the group due to their anti-social behavior, is quite anxiety-inducing. As Grant and Grant (1959, pp. 4-5) express it,

> The task in treatment becomes one of putting the offender in a nonpanic-producing correctional situation, which keeps him concerned about and facing his problems, in an attempt to bring about personality change in him. Acceptance of a need to grow results from a challenging uncomfortableness. Since this prerequisite for personality change--this uncomfortableness--is absent or easily dissipated, it needs to be created or maintained for the acting-out person.

This treatment discomfort tends to be dissipated by completely predictable programs (such as "token economies," etc). Discomfort is kept below the "panic" level and is made "challenging" by the rewards inherent in the "family" closeness and affection. (Often this is the first non-conflicted warmth that the youngster has experienced.) "Payoff" is also supplied through other elements of the program. These inclusion, affectional, and status rewards are a powerful leverage on the individual resident to evaluate and perceive himself in agreement with the group consensus, and to attempt to change himself as the group requires in order to insure the continuation and increase of these rewards.

INTAKE AND TREATMENT PLANNING

The Y.A. program accepts referrals of persistently delinquent youngsters from juvenile courts of Oregon that meet minimum screening requirements of not being grossly psychotic, mentally retarded, homosexual or having a history of arson. The referrals must also have a sufficient history of delinquent behavior to be commitable to the state training schools. These referrals are subjected to a screening interview which attempts to pick the youngster most likely to be of homogeneous maturity level and personality type with the group in the group home having the vacancy. In this initial interview the necessity of learning to "level" (tell the complete truth), the importance of doing the required work toward "change" and solving their problems within the treatment program, is emphasized with the youngster. This is explained as a program requirement which they must commit themselves to in order to be accepted into Y.A. ("All of our kids--and the staff too--have problems and help each other to solve them, and you would be out of place with no problems to work on.") With the other alternative of training-school commitment facing them and the desirable recreational factors of the Y.A. program enticing them, there are strong pressures to give this commitment, even though they do not know just how real and far-reaching this demand is going to become. After the youth is accepted and transported to the facility, he has a week of "pre-placement" to observe the Y.A. program and possibly change his

mind. The staff is observing the youth during this same period to make certain that he does meet the above-mentioned criteria and that he does show some intention to "level" and work on his problems (though "willingness" may be minimal initially).

During this pre-placement week the youth completes a battery of personality and diagnostic tests for both treatment and program evaluation purposes. The Jesness Inventory is one of this battery, and it is computer-scored for I-level diagnostic information. This is one of the factors contributing to the diagnosis of I-level subtype soon after intake. Other sources of diagnostic information for this determination are the C.T.P. Sentence Completion Form, impressions gained from a recorded structured diagnostic interview, and a staff meeting where the impressions and personal knowledge of all the staff that interact with the youngster are pooled. Based on this initial I-level diagnosis, a counselor from the staff, which can be anyone capable of fulfilling this role, whether it be executive director, treatment supervisor, group supervisor (house parent), or maintenance man, is selected who "matches" (Palmer, 1965, 1967) the new youngster as well as possible and has an opening for an additional counselee. This assignment is usually made during the second or third week of residence so that the youth has had time to gain some acceptance and support from the peer group and family constellation prior to being exposed to the added stress of forming this close revealing relationship.

The initial treatment plan is worked out at the time of the I-level diagnostic staffing as a personalized application of one of the manual (Warren, 1966) treatment programs.

TREATMENT MODALITIES

Family Setting and Atmosphere

Demographic studies have consistently shown that delinquent youngsters come from families with a disproportionate number of problems, separations, broken marriages, and alcoholism. One recent study of the male failures of one treatment program concluded that "all came from 'disturbed' homes; not only is parental support and control lacking, but also there is severe conflict between the minor and at least one of his parents or parent-substitutes" (Hunter, 1968, p. 22). This same study found that of the total county juvenile court caseload studied, only thirty percent lived in homes where both natural parents were present. This contrasted to the sixty-two percent total for the remaining youngsters of the non-white area from which the juvenile offenders were referred (p. 21). These figures are referred to only for the purpose of illustration. This phenomenon is too common to require detailed documentation.

The Y.A. program treatment utilizes a communal family type of structure for the residential unit which is different from most residential correctional programs. This difference is by design, for, as Shaw commented in his favorable evaluation of the Highfields experiment,

> We have tended to attach too much importance to formal programs and buildings and not enough to the personality of the staff and particularly of those members who come into the closest and most continuous contact with inmates. We have even at times fallen into the superstition that academic degrees are a guarantee of an effective and mature personality. It is a truism, or at least it should be, that there is no rehabilitative force more powerful than the positive influence of somebody who cares and who, while retaining prestige, can suitably express his care for a youngster. . . . In this country [this truism] has a certain force of novelty and needs constantly renewed emphasis. Since the project is housed in a former private residence, the physical surroundings are noninstitutional, and maintaining an atmosphere of informality is greatly facilitated. Much has been said and written about 'institutional atmosphere.' That it can have a powerful depressing effect on both inmates and staff cannot be questioned [Weeks, 1958, p. 147].

The provision of an informal substitute-family instead of the usual dormitory tends to trigger the kinds of responses that the boys and girls have learned within their own troubled parental homes in order to define these responses as problem areas. Once these inappropriate or ineffective types of responses are defined, progress can be made toward working-through the trigger emotional-reactions and the relearning of more effective interpersonal and coping techniques. During this progress the youth is surrounded by strong sexual-role modeling, caring adult and peer support, and security-ensuring limits. It is questionable whether the deficits in the parental home can ever be "made up" to developmentally deficient youngsters, but this program provides confrontation and treatment for residual problems and maladjustments, as well as pressure toward autonomous functioning and independence-training to prepare for adult responsibility and freedom.

The types of youths which we are best able to serve tend to have similar types of families and family problems. This tendency of certain types of families to produce characteristic emotional problems or developmental deficiencies was strongly confirmed by the conference of the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) in 1966. Six outstanding researchers and theorists in the field of typologies for adolescent offenders were in attendance. Warren reports on this conference and notes that the participants had all observed four or five types of offenders whose characteristics they could agree on (Warren, 1966 b.). This group also discovered that the families of these agreed-on categories of offender personalities tended to have characteristics in common. Dr. Warren notes that

> this much consistency in the data of various studies is a most encouraging finding, leading us to feel that the identifiable subtypes of offenders reflect at least a partial 'truth' about the population rather than simply a convenient fantasy in the mind of the criminologist . . . Additionally, it is important to note that, not only is it possible to find similarities in descriptions of <u>offender characteristics</u> across typologies, but also consistency is evident in descriptions of <u>etiological and background factors</u> and treatment prescriptions for seemingly similar subtypes [Warren, 1966 b., p. 28].

The middle-maturity I-3 youngsters represent the lower limit of treatment capabilities of the Y.A. program. Early treatment planning for these youngsters focused on "containment" and control, but C.T.P. researches found that they are more successful when "personal, meaningful relationships are . . . given more emphasis than are controlling efforts" (Pearson, Palmer, 1968, p. 20). The family backgrounds of these youngsters tend to fall into a pattern.

> Investigators who have studied etiological factors for the conformists [I-3] have found patterns of family helplessness or indifference (rather than open rejection), inability to meet dependency needs of the children, inconsistent structure and discipline, absence of adequate adult models. Treatment recommendations for offenders in this classification band include a clear, consistent external structure in which 'concern' for the offender can be expressed via controls of his behavior, use of group treatment to increase social perceptiveness, use of peer group as a pressure toward nondelinquency, teaching of skills in order to help change self-definition in direction of adequacy and independence [Warren, 1966 b., p. 22].

The Y.A. staff has also noted this tendency toward "helplessness . . . indifference . . . inability to meet dependency needs . . . absence of adequate adult models" in the parental homes of the middle maturity youngsters in our program. The warm, accepting family-like setting of the residential units at Y.A. attempts to replace this indifference with caring by a substitute parent live-in couple (which also means that usually the younger children of the couple are also included in the "family," adding authenticity and occasionally friction to the picture). With both parent substitute figures present, adequate family role models are provided with both adults able and practiced at expressing "caring" and other feelings, rather than the more stereotyped but inadequate role models usually provided by natural families. These frequently include that of a threatened, occasionally brutal, male who is often physically absent and usually unable to express feelings, especially of tenderness. Y.A. male staff are non-threatened, patient individuals who show both physical and verbal warmth toward the family members, yet have the strength to refuse to be manipulated and to express appropriate anger.

The remaining I-3 subtype of manipulator usually has a different family history. The typologists found this type to have

> distrustful and angry families in which members are involved in competitive and mutually exploitive patterns, parents who feel deprived themselves and who expect the children to meet their dependency needs, alternating parental patterns of overindulgence and frustration of the children, inconsistent parental patterns of affection and rejection. Treatment recommendations take . . . distinct paths--one path . . . being an attempt to allow the offender to work through the childhood trauma in a treatment relationship which will revive his capacity to depend on and be concerned about others [Warren, 1966 b., p. 23].

This treatment approach to the manipulator involves a serious and possibly long-term individual treatment effort. The manipulator has many childlike dependency needs, but coming from a destructive home where control by others has always equaled "being destroyed," these needs are necessarily denied and reliance on others rejected. The parent figures need to apply strict controls initially to focus attention on themselves as persons who feel that the youth is worth the effort of control. Typically, in the parental families, the same-sex parent is the most destructive influence, with the fathers of boys often being emasculated, pathetic, contemptible, phony or brutal; and the mothers being pitiless, distant and "treacherous." For this reason the same-sex substitute-parent in the treatment program has the burden of enhancing the value of his role to this youngster. These youngsters will initially seldom accept open emotional support and affection because of their distrust and the inaccessibility of their dependency feelings. Through substitute family experience and carefully timed approaches by staff personnel,

the manipulator can become involved in learning to express his dependency needs and to use direct non-manipulative modes of reaching his goals.

The neurotic or high maturity youngsters derive from a distinctly different type of family than those usually producing the lower maturity youth.

> Investigators of etiological factors suggest that this type of offender is often the victim of parental anxiety or neurotic conflicts between the parents, with the offense viewed as a masculine identity striving. Some investigators have found a fairly typical role-reversal phenomenon in which the child, at an early age, has found himself expected to play a mature, responsible role with a child-like parent. . . . Treatment recommendations for the Neurotic offender focus on the resolution of the neurotic conflict (insight into family and individual dynamics which lead to the offense behavior)--by family group therapy and/or by individual or group psychotherapy for the offender [Warren, 1966 b., p. 24].

This is the group that is most ideally suited to the straight-forward non-conflicted substitute-family situation provided by Y.A. In this permissive and supportive atmosphere, the anxious and well-defended youngster "tests" the group supervisors, and if the tests are passed satisfactorily he often learns to relate to the supervisors in a very satisfying relationship almost equal to a peer interaction. With these youngsters the primary treatment goal, at least initially, is the penetration of their psychological defenses. Nothing can be accomplished toward that goal until a trust level is established that makes "opening up" less than a mortal risk. The family setting at Y.A. helps materially in establishing a climate of trust and provides continuing support

(and often treatment-relevant conflict material) as the frightening content or causes of the youngster's anxieties are exposed, pieced together, and resolved.

It seems clear that the dynamics of the parental families are often of great significance in the causation of the delinquent behavior of persistent juvenile offenders, with different patterns of dynamics producing different delinquent subtypes. A change of these patterns of family dynamics that seem associated with delinquent behavior should contribute to the growth of the individual youth and distance him from the previous motivations toward offense behavior. This seems true in all of the subtypes that we treat at Y.A.

The family setting provides learning situations in the assumption of responsibility for group betterment rather than individual gain through the assignment of routine chores and "work days" for the maintenance and improvement of the physical plant. Everyone learns the significance of the rule, "No workee, no eatee!" The performance of the youngsters of their daily chores is checked by one of their own group so that it remains a peer-group responsibility. The group supervisors only have to intrude into this arrangement when the person checking is falling down on the job or is too weak a personality to confront the other youths with their poor workmanship.

The group supervisors have regular days off which require that alternate coverage be provided in their homes. The Y.A. staff

has several members who are not directly involved in the residential care program: a camping director, a mechanic, a maintenance and construction director, and several single men fulfilling Conscientious Objector obligations, doing primarily maintenance work. Days off are scheduled so that the same relief personnel are assigned each week to the same facility, using these staff members; and we have in effect interlocking staff coverage. The advantages of this arrangement are obvious--these relief staff members are regular full-time employees and interact with the youngsters regularly throughout the week, as well as being in attendance at the group-therapy meetings for the home in which they are involved. They are constantly aware of what is going on in the home and of the emotional status of each youth in care. At Y.A. there is no "substitute teacher" effect during relief coverage.

Individual Counseling

As noted above under the heading of "Intake and Treatment Planning," an individual counselor is assigned to each youth entering the program within the first couple of weeks of his stay. The model of counselor personality and interaction that the staff attempts to learn and emulate is taken from Charles Truax, who describes the characteristics of the ideal counselor, which have been isolated by research in this way:

> (1) The effective therapist much more frequently confronts clients with both their strengths and weaknesses than the

> ineffective therapist; (2) that the effective therapist is more persuasively potent--has more social influence--than the ineffective therapist; (3) that the effective therapist is more likely to focus specifically on significant others in the patient's life and to make more specific responses in the "here-and-now" than the ineffective therapist. (4) Indeed, it is apparent that the warm and genuine therapist no longer fits the image of the kindly mother who accepts all. (5) What is emerging from research is a picture of a warm but strong therapist who can call a spade a spade and show his warmth in active and challenging ways.

This describes a relationship and a process between two participating human beings, not a correctional manipulation wherein a superordinate expert "does" something to a pliable subordinate.

The assignments of counselors to counselees are finalized by either the director of residential care for boys or the director of residential care for girls, who function in the roles of supervisors of the group supervisors (G.S.'s) and are the group session leaders. Though in the prior section on "Family setting," much was said about the warmth and rapport developed by the G.S.'s for their young charges, a serious attempt is made to match the youngsters with counselors other than the people they live with. There are several reasons for this. The "all-seeing" kind of relationship that the counselor often develops with his counselees can be very threatening and leave the youngster feeling very vulnerable when he is dependent for his day-to-day home interaction and social approval upon this same person. Also, there is a very real danger that this youth will seem, in the eyes of the other youths, to be closer to and therefore a favorite of the G.S. This kind of relationship can effectively split the group in a home.

Often a counselor has to be confrontive, and most counselors find this at least mildly unpleasant because it jeopardizes the relationship that both parties rely on, as well as occasionally gaining for the counselor a blaming or angry response from the youth. It becomes doubly unpleasant to the counselor to have to return home and live with a youth who thereby gains the opportunity of stretching out his interpersonal punishment of the G.S. over a period of hours or days. Usually this is only a potential problem, as counselors confront in tolerable doses, and youngsters are usually honest enough to accept the confrontation when it fits; but it remains in the back of the G.S.-counselor's mind nonetheless.

To be effective the individual counseling sessions must be at a regularly scheduled interval (once a week) and at a set time and place.

Empey and Rabow (1961) were early contributors to the research literature on the use of guided group interaction (G.G.I.) and they felt that this technique which gives status and decision power to the working group "excludes . . . individual counseling" since "the peer group should be seen by delinquents as the primary source of help and support." More recent research by the C.T.P. with differential treatment utilized close relationships with matched agents (counselors), as well as a prescription of G.G.I. twice a week in a homogeneous group for each of the I-3 subtypes (Warren, et al., 1966).

In spite of the theoretical objections of Empey and Rabow, the combination of individual counseling with twice a week G.G.I. sessions in the Y.A. program seems to be imminently successful. The individual counseling is defined as a personal rather than a "role" relationship so the conception of counselor "power" or status is minimized. The group is still defined as the primary decision-maker regarding both negative sanctions or "consequences" and decisions regarding privileges. The youngsters often attempt to manipulate the counselor or supervisor into granting them privileges, but these requests are usually referred back to the group for decisions.

As indicated above, much emphasis is placed on "leveling" about personal feelings, intentions, behavior, and especially breaches of program rules. The Y.A. staff has found that trust relationships are facilitated if youngsters in the program have at least one adult that they can talk to about conflicts that develop with their G.S.'s. This factor increases the trust in both of the adults, as such confidences or problems usually can be worked out so that they result in decreased tension and a better relationship and understanding between the parties, making the counseling process a rewarding one. As this trust develops, and the youth is caught a few times in breaches of trust, he finds that though he receives consequences, he is still accepted and his catastrophic expectations surrounding being "busted" are not realized. At this point he generally begins to believe the definition of leveling

proposed by the group and his counselor. Leveling is rewarded, and if he levels with the group before he is actually caught by them, the group will treat his "offense" behavior as a "problem" to be dealt with, and the consequences will be less and in some cases nonexistent.

At this point in the youngster's initiation into the treatment program, the counselor becomes almost crucial. The youth is closest to his counselor, or at least sees him in private. The first instances of a youngster's leveling usually take place in individual counseling sessions. Since the counselor is not in a position to protect him from consequences the group will impose if those in the group discover the offense before he levels to them, the counselor applies pressure for him to level. The counselor often gets a commitment from the youngster that he will level regarding his situation with his G.S., so that the matter will be priority material for the next group meeting or in the group meeting itself. Youngsters often seem more fearful of the group censor than that of the adults, but when a cohesive group has evolved in this "open community," it becomes very natural to communicate openly to both the significant adults and the group. The counselors are careful not to give promises of the confidentiality of information. Requests for such treatment are always handled with a comment from the counselor that the youth will have to trust the judgment of the counselor in this matter if he chooses to tell, but that the counselor cannot be limited by such a promise if the situation

might appear to the counselor to be dangerous to the welfare of the counselee or others. This might be modified by the counselor to a promise not to tell for one week or a set period of time, to give the youth the opportunity to level to the group or to mend some wrongful or problem situation, after the counselor has determined that there is no danger implicit in the information. The counselee soon finds that the counselor will genuinely attempt to help and will deal with him in a warm and kindly way, within the set limits and definitions of the program.

In the early phases of the Y.A. program individual counseling was optional with the youngsters. The staff found that some residents were present but remaining inconspicuous in the family interaction and group meetings and then leaving the program with their emotional hang-ups and delinquent attitudes basically unexamined and unchanged. This is literally impossible in the present program because of this combination of group work and individual counseling. Now each youth is forced into this intimate counseling situation, and his ability to deal constructively with this intimacy is very instructive for treatment planning in and of itself. If a youngster attempts over a long period of time to keep the interaction on a superficial level or to avoid problem areas, either his level of interpersonal maturity is so low that it is impossible for him to interact in any other manner or the counselor needs to become more confrontive and demanding of emotionally significant content for the sessions.

The theoretical underpinnings of the Y.A. counseling approach is thoroughly eclectic, probably coming the closest to what is called "pathognomic counseling" by Soares, et al. (1969) which combines elements of the psychoanalytic, perceptual, rational, and behavioristic approaches. The Y.A. staff has been influenced most heavily by the interpersonal and perceptual systems of Gestalt Therapy (Perls, 1969; Fagan and Shepherd, 1970), Reality Therapy (Glasser, 1965), Psychodrama (Blatner, 1970), and Sullivan (1953) and Warren (1966. 2.). Since, according to Stone (1971, p. 13), the Gestalt approach combines elements of most of the more contemporary therapeutic systems, it might be safest to throw one overriding mantle over this collection and call it "Gestalt counseling."

The Gestalt counseling or therapy is suited primarily for dealing with emotional disturbance or anxiety, and this is the reason that the Y.A. program deals most effectively with the I-4 neurotic subtypes of delinquents. In Gestalt counseling every piece of "here-and-now" interactional behavior--tone of voice, unconscious mannerisms, movements of limbs--is looked at for a pattern, a gestalt, that is typically operating outside the counselee's awareness. The past need not be remembered to furnish clues, as it is carried with us and is repeated in the present. These clues in the here-and-now are often revealed by non-verbal physical stances, as the unfinished life situations from the past (traumatic situations with their unresolved needs, together with our defenses against them) are reflected by our bodies. Through action techniques

focusing on these patterns or cues, the counselee experiences feelings appropriate to the gestalt--feelings that can then bring to memory the previously "unfinished" situation and permit its resolution or integration into the conscious personality.

There is a mixture of psychodramatic techniques in Gestalt counseling such as the quasi-role playing technique of the "empty chair" dialogue. Where a youth experiences a conflict which is disturbing to him with a person who is inaccessible (a deceased parent, a boss that fired him, etc.) to the counseling situation, the youngster "puts" the antagonist into a chair facing himself and moves back and forth playing both parts as he plays out the conflict situation and different ways in which it might have been resolved. One advantage to this technique is the expression of the youngster's guess as to the antagonist's perception of him. This often provides sufficient material to reassure him, as his catastrophic expectations appear exaggerated even to him when they are expressed. Also, this technique has the advantage of forcing the youngster to be on the receiving end of his own expressed hostility, or other ineffective interactional techniques, to give him some idea of how his approach makes another person feel and react. This is a good jump-off point for questions such as, "Is that the way you wanted to make him feel? . . . If not, what could you do differently to get the effect you wanted?" Because of the lack of insight in I-3 youngsters, and their usual self-consciousness arising from a poor self-concept, this technique generally works

best with involved high-maturity youths. Actual role-playing and psychodrama in the group setting are possible and very educational for I-3 youngsters, for the reasons mentioned above. Riggs, et al. (1964, p. 15), in the early C.T.P. pioneered the use of psychodramatic techniques with very primitive infantile offenders and found that they were very useful in making up the learning of interpersonal skills necessary for adequate socialization. They found that the first goal on this road toward socialization was the ability to bring into awareness the youngsters' own felt emotions. We encounter some of the same difficulties with our higher maturity youngsters. Both psychodramatic and gestalt techniques deal extensively with perceptions of both self and others, thus offering the kinds of perceptual learning which are all-important for the further improvement of interpersonal maturity.

The Y.A. staff is initiating a program of training in which counseling sessions of each counselor will be recorded, then portions played back in a staff seminar for purposes of suggestion and the discussion of techniques.

Group Settings

1. The integration of guided group interaction, group psychotherapy, gestalt therapy, psychodramatic techniques, and sensitivity techniques. In any of the group meetings that are conducted for the Y.A. youths by the Y.A. staff, the skill of the leader is the only limitation set on the techniques used, and the

techniques which will best help a youngster to see and understand his interaction with others or areas of conflict, is chosen by the leader for use. Since all of these techniques are interpersonal and heavily phenomenological in perspective, they all contribute to the goals of enhancement of socialization, interpersonal maturity and functioning, personal emotional integration and conflict resolution, and self-esteem.

Delinquent youngsters are typically deficient in verbal abilities and tend to be expressive in acting-out nonverbal ways. The focus of much attention in the different groups at Y.A. is learning to label and express feelings rather than act on them. This is typically a very threatening alternative to persistent delinquents because it often involves starting at a stammering level and by trial-and-error (and these youngsters are usually very sensitized to failure) learning, with support and praise for each effort, learning a whole new approach to life. ("Talk about it? But man, I want to punch him in the mouth!")

The base line, or starting point, of most of our meetings is the G.G.I. technique of "discussion" of day-to-day here-and-now problem situations and interpersonal conflicts. The assumption here is that "although a 'bad' home may have been instrumental at some early phase in the genesis of a boy's delinquency, it must be recognized that it is now other delinquent boys, not his parents, who are current sources of support and identification" (Empey, 1961). Attempts to change such individuals must also involve the

change of the norms of the delinquent subgroup from which he obtains support. Delinquents are aware of the norms of the dominant culture around them and are "profoundly ambivalent" about their delinquent behavior, a factor which is capitalized on by the G.G.I. emphasis on the "ultimate" lack of utility of the delinquent system and positive utility of the conventional system. This technique changes the pro-delinquent norms of the entire group over a period of time by means of this emphasis and gives rewards to those in the group who begin to show this change by their willingness to attempt to convince or help others in the group shed their delinquent rationalizations. These rewards include social acceptance for such expressions and the granting of status and recognition to those showing change.

The group meeting itself is given status by being granted the power to make decisions regarding negative sanctions, and privileges, for its own members. Only when the group has proven itself over a period of time to be incapable of dealing with a problem, or unwilling to, does the adult staff begrudgingly take the decision out of the hands of the group. The group often starts out being overly severe in its disciplinary role toward its members but soon learns the more mature "logical consequences" (Dreikurs and Grey) approach to breaches of the group norms or rules.

The factors of delinquent norms and subcultures may only be the "outer layer" of ideology or belief system to those customarily taking a depth-psychological approach to the treatment

of delinquency, but the interaction involved in G.G.I. has been shown by means of the Hill Interaction Matrix (Hill, 1965, p. 56) to be in the 80th percentile among the many types of group techniques studied, in "relationship," the most desirable of the four "content" categories for group therapy. There is little emphasis on psychodynamics or intrapersonal introspection in traditional G.G.I. and a great deal of emphasis on the relationships that each youth has with his peers. This emphasis does place heavy stress on labeling and expressing feelings, and at Y.A. this factor receives much attention and focus as it becomes a primary learning experience in "talking out" rather than "acting out."

The emphasis of G.G.I. on the here-and-now fits in favorably with the Gestalt approach. We often find our youngsters themselves asking the meaning of a wagging foot, clenched fist, or other nonverbal cue, and then proceeding to help the individual in expressing feelings he was previously unaware of and in moving toward a gestalt. This here-and-now orientation also fits the emphasis at Y.A. on correcting distorted perceptions with "perception checks" and paraphrasing regarding interactions in progress and educating the youths in more complex differentiated perceptual abilities in viewing the motives and personalities of others. Such complex perceptions by others in the group of the participant's own personality and effectiveness often lead to a favorable group consensus that comes as a surprise to the individual with a poor self-image and low self-esteem, and which suggests and supports a new more favorable self-definition.

Another technique that fits effectively into the here-and-now emphasis of G.G.I. is psychodrama. Psychodrama encompasses a number of different techniques now, but the primary one is the role-playing situation with antagonist and protagonist and "doubles" or alter-egos. The double sits or stands to the side, and a few inches back from the person he is doubling for, and attempts to "tune in" to his body tone, movements, and expressions in order to feel empathetically what he is feeling. The double then "doubles-in" or interjects in the first person feelings that he thinks his partner is experiencing. The "contract" that the main character, who usually picks his own double, has with the double is that he will disagree with the interjections which do not "fit" his actual feelings and will use in the dialogue those that do fit. If the double results in a disagreement, or "no," the one doubling can then reverse his double (from "I'm feeling scared right now" to "I'm not scared at all by this") which usually results in a compromise. Such a compromise injects new emotional material for comment and reactions even though the original double was not "right on."

Our western culture requires us to hide our feelings and even lie about them so often that this technique for unmasking genuine reactions and feelings is a powerful therapeutic tool in skilled hands. Again, it aids in learning the words and skills necessary for expression of the real feelings the youngster has, as well as illuminating for him the feelings of the other party. A

psychodramatic technique that is especially useful in experiencing how the other person feels is the "role reversal." In this technique the director asks the parties to reverse roles (and actually switch chairs and assume the posture and voice that the other party was using) after one has asked a question or made a particularly provocative statement. The comment just preceding the reversal is repeated, and the party then has to respond, as he thinks the other party really would, to the interaction. As in the other interpersonal techniques, it is plain to see that this procedure is a powerful tool in the improvement of interpersonal perception and understanding, which contribute indirectly to socialization and directly to integration level advancement.

Psychodrama would be the technique of choice to resolve an existing personal conflict between two peers, youngster and staff, or for role-training in dealing with conflicts or sensitive situations between family members or arising in the community. It can be used to deal not only with immediate types of interactions but to relive and resolve unfinished life situations. Appropriate anger can safely be vented in this sheltered environment and often adds a new dimension, not to mention considerable relief, to a wobbling adolescent identity.

These elements of gestalt, psychodrama, and conventional group psychotherapy fit in naturally with the G.G.I. framework and are necessary for the treatment of the primarily neurotic population we serve. The essentially nonverbal delinquent is trained within

the program to label and express his feelings, and even to serve as therapist to other youngsters. There are also those action techniques included under the headings of psychodrama and sensitivity procedures which facilitate this expression by lending movement, excitement, and authenticity to what would otherwise be strictly verbal encounters. There is some feeling amont the psychiatry faculty at the local University of Oregon Medical School that a purely verbal recounting is not adequate to obtain satisfactory abreaction in cases where severe disturbance has resulted from deeply hurtful and disturbing life situations. Action techniques make accessible a greatly expanded range of feelings and therefore are peculiarly powerful as tools in obtaining abreaction in psychotherapy, whether group or individual.

2. Types of group meetings at Y.A. There are three basic group meetings at Y.A.,which are conducted with youngsters for purposes of treatment, and numerous staff meetings. A brief description of each follows.

a. Family meetings.--Since Y.A. is structured on the substitute-family model, the G.G.I. meetings in which all the interpersonal conflicts and irritations are aired are called "family meetings." To a degree the meetings follow the conventional G.G.I. model (Empey, 1961; Scarpetti and Stephenson, 1966; McCorkle, 1952; Turner, et al., 1967), but digress, as noted above, into different techniques of psychotherapy when appropriate to deal with

psychological defenses or disturbances. These meetings are normally held twice a week for an hour and a half, but often extend beyond the time limit and can be called by anyone, youngsters included, at any time, to address an immediate problem.

The conventional G.G.I. goal of developing group norms is still basic, but an added element is the task of consensual validation of perceptions of the participating individuals regarding their experience, their approaches to other people and life, and their personality characteristics and worth.

G.G.I. has always been "directive," and the Y.A. version is probably directive in ways more comprehensive than usual. The G.S.'s, both full-time and relief, are present at all these meetings and their relationships with their "children" are both felt and dealt with. Occasionally a G.S. will assume group leadership on an issue but usually the program supervisor will fill the role of "director." He attempts to be permissive and to allow the youngsters to "sail their own ship," yet is also present to "call a spade a spade," prod occasionally, facilitate with questions and possible alternatives, and to suggest variations in techniques.

This type of approach has resulted in an extremely cohesive group, and one which is very loyal to the adults in the program as well. When a youngster runs away, which occurs on the average of once a month, the group gets busy calling friends and developing the necessary informants to find the youth. When the staff go out in a car to follow-up on leads, the most involved

youngsters invariably want to go, and are included in the "posse." Often the adults will stay in the car a block or two away from a suspected hideout and the youngsters will go and check it out and entice the runaway out if he is found. Using these methods, we have been able to find all of our runaways in the past year, and have needed police assistance only twice. Another evidence of the cohesiveness of the group is the fact that the youths have recommended that a group member be permanently rejected from the program and sent back to the juvenile court twice in the past six months. The members of the group had substantial evidence, after working with each for a matter of months, that these boys were interested only in avoiding change rather than maximizing it. The staff acted affirmatively on their recommendations in both cases.

b. Complex meetings.--On alternate Thursday evenings everyone involved with both the boys and girls treatment programs meets together in a joint meeting. It is in this meeting that the girls have the opportunity to air their complaints regarding the boys and vice versa. This meeting serves as a forum for discussing policy and the overall routine and functioning of the program, as well as the place to bring together all the treatment input on any one youngster for the sake of confrontation or clarification.

It is in this meeting that the benefit of a coeducational program can be seen most clearly. Boys, even high maturity (I-4 or I-5) boys, often retain low-maturity perceptual sets regarding

the opposite sex, seeing them as sexual "objects" to be "used" rather than as complex and often hurting persons. In our experience lower maturity (I-3) boys experience this same perceptual set, with an added tendency to idealize girls who give evidence of some adequacy in an almost "earth-mother" or "goddess" role. This kind of adoration has strong sexual overtones, yet an expectation that the girl will "take care" of or mother them. These perceptual sets, with modifications, are repeated on the part of the higher and lower maturity girls.

These perceptual sets account for much of the grief that delinquent sexual acting-out brings to these youngsters. The girls are embittered about being lied to, then exploited sexually and dropped. The boys complain of the disillusionment and abandonment they experience when they discover that a girl they care for and depend on does not genuinely reciprocate the feeling and is "going out" on them.

The boys and girls in the program participate in social activities together constantly so naturally form friendships and date each other. The conflicts arising in these relationships are discussed, and action techniques are used, to draw out the usually non-expressed feelings ranging from vulnerability to hatred regarding relations with and being used by the opposite sex. Boys rarely see the girls' point of view expressed in such depth and with a full range of feelings, even at home with mother and sisters. These sessions, then, have a powerful educational impact on immature

perceptual sets regarding sexual experimentations. Many boys begin to see girls as "persons" for the first time in this program.

Soon after the girls program was initiated there were a couple of these "sexual experimentations" that had to be dealt with in the complex meetings. As a result of the open discussion and exposure of feelings over these incidents, the boys themselves defined the girls in the program as "sisters" and have become very protective of them, even among themselves. There have been no further experimentations. The girls continue to be expressive in the complex meetings and even somewhat more verbal than the boys, so this feeling on the boys' part has been perpetuated without reinforcing sexual-incident discussions.

With the full complement of the staff and youngsters attending the complex meeting, the participants generally number between forty and fifty. The size of the group and the frequent observers do not seem to dampen the expression and flow of intense feelings over embarrassing or sensitive situations. Psychodramatic or action techniques help considerably to overcome any dampening factor. The size also has the occasional effect of creating confusion with many people trying to talk at once. This problem is controlled by having the one person that has the floor and permission to be talking get up and walk around the circle, describing his feelings or ideas in the form of a soliloquy. The action of walking helps to dissipate self-consciousness and facilitates self-expression with most youngsters. Other youngsters can get up and

walk with the one who is soliloquizing to "double in" feelings that they think are present but not being expressed, or to give support when he seems to be "stuck."

c. Multiple family therapy group.--On the alternate Thursday evenings from the complex meeting, the parents who desire to improve their communication and relationship with their youngsters come to the facility for a group therapy session with their children.

The parents of youngsters committed to Y.A. are interviewed at the time of the committal for the purpose of describing the Y.A. program and defining the limitations that they will be expected to place on the youngster during visits with them. During this interview the multiple family group is described to them and the staff endeavors to obtain a commitment from them to attend for a prescribed period of time. Many parents reject their delinquent children and will not commit themselves to attend at all. These parents generally do not want the child to return to their home and the reason for this desire is explored with each parent in the interview. Those parents who are still involved with their children and do expect them to return home are told that the agency recommendation to the court in this regard will be dependent upon the interest they show behaviorally, not just verbally, by attending and participating in this group.

The conduct of the group sessions themselves usually involves psychodramatic techniques or role-playing. Volunteers are solicited to work on whatever problem situation is fresh in their minds or particularly troublesome to them. The director generally invites the protagonists to move their chairs into the center of the circle of participants, then conducts the play-through of the conflict situation with the expression of feelings and perceptions receiving the focus of attention. The actual content of the conflict or disagreement is usually secondary to the way that they experience each other in the situation. This focus helps cut through the usual defensiveness, defiance, and manipulations, and the parties to the conflict usually end up perceiving each other as kindred human beings. When the role-play is over and the participants have pulled back into the group, the other members have a chance to express their feelings and perceptions. Though there is generally sufficient time for only one or two such work-throughs in an evening, the remainder of the group seems to stay intensely involved seeing many of their own feelings and mannerisms mirrored in the parties to the conflict. Even though the participants have chosen doubles, other group members can walk over to them, take the position of a double and express the feelings which they believe exist beneath the surface of the conflict. Member involvement is often so intense that the director has to limit this spontaneous doubling or there would be a constant parade of doubles beside both parties.

The effects of this type of session are difficult to evaluate technically but seem obvious enough when formerly snarling antagonistic family members end a session in a tearful embrace. After a period of six months the results of this expressive and perceptual training can be seen in the exchange of much more casual, free and honest dialogue between members of participating families. Sometimes situations come to light which are just too threatening to be dealt with honestly by the participants (such as incestuous advances or propositions, participation in a murder, etc.). Even in these cases the focus and exploration of the feelings in the relationship and the processes evident in the interactions has resulted in improved relationships in every case to date, where parents actually participated in the therapy.

d. Staff meetings.--The staff of the boys program meets separately from that of the girls for their residential care meeting, which requires one morning per week. In this meeting the status and treatment planning for the respective programs is reviewed.

A three-hour afternoon meeting once a week is devoted to working through inter-staff conflicts and problems, as well as for psychiatric consultation and training by the psychiatric consultant in both talk-therapy and psychodramatic techniques. This session is called the psychiatric meeting.

One morning per week the staff meets for approximately two hours to share personal goals, religious ideals, and inspirational

thoughts and experiences, and just generally to unwind and socialize with each other without the ever-present prod of a task demanding immediate performance. This helps the staff to supply some of each other's emotional and spiritual needs that in all probability would not otherwise be met in a fast-moving program.

WORK, VOCATIONAL PREPARATION, AND RECREATION

Work

All of the youngsters in care have the opportunity to work. A bulletin board is kept in each home with tasks listed on it which can be done by any of the residents for pay. The more ambitious youngsters put in fifteen to twenty hours a week working, and even at one dollar an hour that mounts up fairly quickly.

Several of the youngsters participate in Neighborhood Youth Corps (N.Y.C.) programs, both for in-school and out-of-school teenagers. A few of the youths in care have part-time jobs, independently of the agency, in private industry. These jobs are a privilege, and the right to hold them is conditional upon overall treatment progress in the program as evaluated by the family meeting group.

Vocational Preparation

Planning for vocational choice or training becomes a real concern to the older boys, and especially the thirty to forty percent who leave the program to become independent. The Y.A.

organization has a working agreement with the State Vocational Rehabilitation Division (V.R.D.) which provides vocational testing, counseling, and training, where appropriate, to these older youngsters.

All youths in the program are expected to attend school as their primary "occupation." Delinquent youngsters traditionally have a difficult time with public school discipline and college-preparation subject matter, and those at Y.A. are no exception. With V.R.D. assistance those youngsters which find it impossible to adjust to public school are now able to attend a full-time adult education G.E.D. preparation course, or the high school continuation program at the local community college.

After completing high school, passing the G.E.D. exams, or passing their eighteenth birthdays, the Y.A. youngsters are able to obtain vocational training, attend college, or receive V.R.D. and State Employment Service assistance in obtaining suitable employment.

Recreation

Y.A. owns a 35-acre estate, which includes a forested island in the Clackamas River in semi-rural northwest Oregon. On this estate, or "complex," the agency maintains six horses, a regulation Army obstacle course, a go-cart, six canoes, camping equipment too copious to list, and two swimming holes. All of these recreational opportunities are utilized by the youngsters-in-care regularly.

Group participation activities (G.P.A.'s) are planned approximately once a month, at which attendance is mandatory. The kinds of activities included in these recreational outings have included sports events, circuses, rock festivals, hunting trips (an annual event with girls included), parties, picnics, shooting the rapids in canoes, and just about everything else that a group of teenagers might be interested in doing.

This variety of activities is desirable and necessary to the immature or acting-out youngster to retain interest and involvement in the total program. Most of the youngsters are frightened by at least some of these activities but gain self-worth and confidence by being pushed beyond what they considered their limits of skill and endurance to be.

CONCLUSION

The Y.A. residential treatment center obtains referrals of persistently delinquent boys and girls from local juvenile courts for placement in lieu of commitment to the state training schools. These youngsters are accepted after committing themselves to work on their problems, delinquent and emotional, in a treatment program which includes G.G.I. meetings, individual counseling, and multiple family group therapy. Warmth and emotional support are given to the youngsters in a substitute-family setting, but treatment pressure is applied and maintained to break down and change psychological defense mechanisms and anti-social attitudes. The goals of the

program include not only the acquisition of pro-social attitudes, but the improvement of emotional integration and growth in the level of interpersonal maturity so that human adequacy is achieved. These goals seem to have been met in a high percentage of youngsters treated through the Y.A. program. The percentage of youngsters who have not been referred to law enforcement agencies after Y.A. treatment stands at seventy-four percent for the total population of six years.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Blatner, Howard, M. D. Psychodrama, Role-Playing, and Action Methods: Theory and Practice. Thetford, England: September, 1970. (Mimeographed.)

Dreikurs, Rudolf, M. D., and Loren Grey, Ph.D. Logical Consequences. New York: Meredith Press, 1968.

Empey, Lamar T., and Jerome Rabow. "The Provo Experiment in Delinquency Rehabilitation," American Sociological Review, XXVI (October, 1961), 679-695.

Fagan, Joen, and Irma Lee Shepherd (eds.). Gestalt Therapy Now: Theory, Techniques, Applications. Palo Alto: Science and Behavior Books, 1970.

Glasser, William, M. D. Reality Therapy. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1965.

Grant, J. Douglas, and Marguerite Q. Grant. "A Group Dynamics Approach to the Treatment of Nonconformists in the Navy," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CCCXXII (March, 1959), 126-135.

Hill, Wm. Fawcett. Hill Interaction Matrix; A Method of Studying Interaction in Psychotherapy Groups. University of Southern California, Youth Study Center, 1965.

Hunter, E. Farley. Reduction of Delinquency Through Expansion of Opportunity (RODEO). Los Angeles County Probation Department: Research Report No. 33, June, 1968.

McCorkle, Lloyd W. "Group Therapy in the Treatment of Offenders," Federal Probation, Vol. V, No. 4 (Dec. 1952), 22-27.

Palmer, Ted. "Types of Treaters and Types of Juvenile Offenders," California Youth Authority Quarterly, Vol. 18, No. 3 (Fall, 1965).

Palmer, Ted, Ph.D. Personality Characteristics and Professional Orientation of Five Groups of Community Treatment Project Workers: A Preliminary Report on Differences Among Treaters. California Youth Authority, Community Treatment Project Report Series, 1967, No. 1.

Palmer, T. California's Community Treatment Project in 1969: An Assessment of its Relevance and Utility to the Field of

Corrections. Prepared for the U. S. Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, March, 1969.

Palmer, Ted, Ph.D. "Stages of Psycho-Social Development as Reflected in Two New Levels of Interpersonal Maturity," California Youth Authority Quarterly, Vol. 22, No. 3 (Fall, 1969).

Patterson, C. H. Theories of Counseling and Psychotherapy. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.

Pearson, John W., and Theodore B. Palmer. The Use of Group Homes for Delinquents in A Differential Treatment Setting. Group Home Project Interim Progress Report, California Youth Authority, July, 1968.

Perls, Frederick S., M. D., Ph.D. Gestalt Therapy Verbatim. Lafayette: Real People Press, 1969.

Riggs, John E., et al. Interpersonal Maturity Level Classification: Juvenile; 1. Diagnosis and Treatment of Low Maturity Delinquents. C.T.P. Research Report No. 4, California Youth Authority, February, 1964.

Scarpitti, Frank R., and Richard M. Stephenson. "The Use of the Small Group in the Rehabilitation of Delinquents," Federal Probation, Vol. 30, No. 3 (September, 1966), 45-50.

Soares, Louise M., et al. Innovative Treatment Procedures: The Rehabilitation of Disturbed Youth. Bridgeport: The Bridgeport Vocational Rehabilitation and Cooperative Education Project. Monograph No. 6, 1969.

Stone, Alan A. "Play: The 'Now' Therapy," Psychiatry and Social Science Review, Vol. 5, No. 2 (February, 1971), 12-16.

Sullivan, C. E., M. Q. Grant, and J. D. Grant. "The Development of Interpersonal Maturity: Applications to Delinquency," Psychiatry, XX (1957), 373-385.

Sullivan, Harry Stack, M. D. The Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1953.

Truax, Charles B. Group Counseling and Therapy Symposium.

Turner, James K., et al. The San Francisco Experiment. C.T.P. Research Report No. 8, Part 2, California Youth Authority, 1967.

Warren, M. Q., et al. Interpersonal Maturity Level Classification: Juvenile. Diagnosis and Treatment of Low, Middle and High Maturity Delinquents. 1966 edition. California Youth Authority.

Weeks, H. Ashley. Youthful Offenders at Highfields. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1958.