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ABSTRACT

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT OF A
GROUP FOSTER HOME

by

Thomas Coyne
Master of Arts in
Educational Psychology - Counseling and Guidance

The purpose of this study was to assess the social environment in terms of "press", at The Family Home. The Family Home is a group foster home in North Hollywood, California, where this writer was employed. Nine basic aspects of the environment were assessed, including involvement, support, expressiveness, autonomy, etc.

The findings were to serve as objective data indicating changes desired within the program, on the part of both staff and residents. It was the intention of the author to use the instrument described in the following pages as a stimulus for implementing the changes reflected in the findings.

The instrument used was the Correctional Institutions Environment Scale (CIES). Based on the environmental press concepts of Murray (1938) and Stern (1970) the CIES
was developed by Rudolph Moos (1968a) to give a reading of the social environment in the nine areas or subscales previously mentioned. Two forms of the CIES were used; Form R (Real Form), assessing the real or actual situation and Form I (Ideal Form), assessing the ideal setting. Both forms consisted of 90 true-false statements. Staff and residents answered exactly the same items. Ten residents and eight staff members of The Family Home were included in the sample. Residents were males ranging in age from 15 to 18.

Results indicated there was general agreement among staff and residents over the social climate as it is, as they would like it and the direction and extent of changes desired. The present study suggests that self-monitoring and "quality control" are important checks on social systems which have complex and obscure environmental factors.
The importance of environmental influences on behavior occurring within certain settings has come to be realized. Industrial, educational, medical, psychiatric and correctional are among the settings who have considered the environment in ways that will further their respective goals. For example, certain types of lighting and seating arrangements have more positive effects than others on production in industry and are therefore selected with this in mind. Psychiatric hospitals utilizing the concepts of milieu therapy are a prime example of environmental influences on behavior. Recently correctional institutions have been concerned with placing a certain type of offender in a particular environment and treating him in a particular way (Palmer, 1973).

Rationale

Along with the realization of environmental importance came the problem of environment assessment. How can various aspects of the environment best be described? Are some environmental factors more important, i.e., do they influence behavior more than others? Can environments be compared along certain common dimensions? How can changes in the environment be detected and measured?

Environments have been described in a variety of ways in an attempt to relate human environments to human be-
behavior. Techniques were developed in educational and industrial settings, were later used in psychiatric settings and recently have been utilized in correctional facilities (Wenk and Moos, 1972).

One of the earliest environmental assessments in an educational setting was developed by Withall (1948). Through a categorization of teacher statements, Withall attempted to measure the social-emotional climate of the classroom. He believed teacher behavior to be the most important single factor in creating climate in a classroom and that a teacher's verbal behavior is indicative of the total teacher behavior. Withall's seven categories of teacher statements distinguished among three different teaching styles: learner oriented, problem-oriented and self-oriented. College environments have been measured by Pace and Stern (1958) and Astin and Holland (1961) utilizing the "press" concepts of Murray (1938). Press is Murray's term to describe the characteristic demands or features of an environment.

The California Youth Authority (CYA) has conducted experiments which were aimed at matching certain types of juvenile offenders with certain correctional environments utilizing certain treatment modalities. The largest of these studies was the Community Treatment Project (CTP) which spanned a period of 13 years, from 1961 to 1974 (Palmer, 1973). The results of this and other CYA studies
(Fricot Ranch Study, Jesness 1965; Preston Typology Study, Jesness, 1971) point to the importance of environmental factors in treating juvenile delinquency and the differential effects of the environment on different juvenile types.

To further utilize the concepts of differential treatment of delinquents the CYA has expanded the use of out-of-home placement for certain types of juvenile offenders. In the Group Home Project (Pearson, 1968) different group home environments were created for various juvenile types and the differential effects on the different types were studied. Although evaluation of the project has been difficult and there have been problems with adequate matching of youths with environments, the project has done much to help better understand the many complex dimensions in the use of group homes for the treatment of delinquents.

The CYA studies illustrate the complexity of environmental factors and point to the need for assessment techniques that go beyond the readily observable environmental dimensions of census, staff-resident ratio, and "open/locked" door policy. The Social Climate scales developed by Moos (1968) allow for more than these objective indices to be considered and include the environmental press influences of involvement, support, clarity, expressiveness, etc. The present study used the scales to assess the social climate at a group foster home along
nine different dimensions. The study was originally designed with a practical orientation in mind. Results of the assessment were to serve as a stimulus for desired changes in the environment and it was hoped that through a discussion of the results steps toward change could be taken.

Delimitations

This study was limited to the residents and staff at The Family Home, in North Hollywood, California. It focused on the perceptions of staff and residents concerning their environment. These perceptions were expressed in terms of the nine press categories used in the Correctional Institutions Environment Scale (CIES) developed by Rudolf Moos (1968).

The remainder of this report is organized in the following manner: Chapter 2 is the Review of the Literature and has five sections with a summary of the chapter at the end. Section one, Person-Environment Theories, describes the various theories that authors have developed to explain the interaction of person and environment. The second section is a presentation of studies which point to the importance of environmental factors. In section three and four, Non-correctional Environments and Correctional Environments respectively, assessment techniques for these two environmental settings are presented. Section five introduces the work of Rudolf
Moos in developing the Social Climate Scales and includes the background of the scales, their applicability and how they have been utilized thus far.

Chapter 3, Design and Methodology, has three sections: the section on the setting tells the reader where the study took place and also gives background data on the subjects; the instrument section gives information about the Correctional Institutions Environment Scale (CIES) and how it was used in the present report; the last section, Administration, provides information about the CIES Administration such as when it was given, how long it took, etc.

In Chapter 4, Results and Discussion, results of the CIES Administration are presented and discussed. Chapter 5, Summary, Conclusions and Recommendation, gives a summary of the study, conclusions to be drawn from the results and recommendations for future studies.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

The present study concerns itself with the psychological aspects of the environment. A great deal has been accomplished in the area of human personality but there is a paucity of information about the "personality" of the environment which has a great deal of impact on human behavior. We do have some environmental measures, but the number of instruments is quite small when compared to the quantity of instruments designed to measure individual characteristics. Repeatedly in the literature the need for a systematic way of assessing psychosocial environmental factors is brought to the attention of the reader. The review of the literature which follows is divided into six main sections: 1) Person-Environment Theories, 2) Importance of Environmental Factors, 3) Non-correctional Environments, 4) Correctional Environments, 5) Rudolf Moos' Social Climate Scales, and, 6) Summary.

Person-Environment Theories

An environment, like a person, has characteristics. A person can be supportive, comforting or threatening; this can also be said of the environment. In the interaction of person and environment some, e.g., Alker (1971) would cast the person in the leading role and insist that the environment plays a minor part in determining human behavior. Others, Mischel, (1969); Bem, (1971) argue that situation
variables are more important in determining human behavior. However, Endler (1972) and Rausch, Dittman and Taylor (1959), consider the issue of person versus environment a "pseudo issue" with the question poorly phrased. It is the interaction of person by situation that accounts for more variance in human behavior than either does separately. In other words, neither person nor situation (the environment) contributes more to diverse human reactions in different situations, it is the interaction of the person with the immediate situation that contributes most to the particular behavioral outcome.

The literature contains many authors supporting the interactionist view of behavior (e.g. Endler and Hunt, 1966; Shontz, 1970, Rausch et al, 1959; Moos, 1968; Wicker, 1972; Wolf, 1964; Moos and MacIntosh, 1970), but only a few have developed hypotheses to explain how the interaction occurs. Most notably is the work of Murray (1938). Murray emphasized viewing behavior as the result of the interaction between person and environment. Murray hypothesized that behavior is the end product of the interaction between the "needs" of the person and "press" of the environment. Briefly, need is described as the urge to do. It is a state of disequilibrium stressing toward equilibrium. The result of internal and external occurrences. Press is the environmental counterpart of a need. It is the phenomenological world of the individual, the nature
of his environment. Press may refer to objective ecological aspects of the environment (alpha press) or to inner subjective perception of the events in which he is a part (beta press).

Lewin (1935, 1951) viewed the relationship between a person and his environment as a functional one in which the tension within a person and the valence (force field) in the environment produce behavior. "Force" is Lewin's term for the dynamic feature of the "life space". When many forces exist simultaneously at varied regions of the life space, it is called a "force field". There are driving forces (positive valence) and restraining forces (negative valence).

For Lewin, a field theorist, the most important task for psychology was to develop ways of studying human behavior in situ, i.e., as it is found in natural situations. Lewin's theory is best expressed in his formula B=F (P,E); behavior is a function of the person and the environment. The person and environment are interdependent variables occupying the same life space. Life space is a Lewinian concept and refers to the totality of factors determining behavior at a given point in time. Being interdependent variables, the state of the person influences the properties of the environment and vice versa. Lewin and Murray's theory are similar in this respect and others as well. For example, Lewin's tension concept coincides with
Murray's intrapersonal disequilibrium which he termed need; but tension creates the need. In fact, Murray believed that some day these tensions (directional tensions), occurring in the brain, could be measured directly.

Among the interactionists, Barker (1963) suggests that psychology take a look at this environment in much the same way the biological and physical sciences have, i.e., directly, what will be discovered is the active, systematic and purposeful structure underlying it. Barker begins with a "behavior episode", a basic unit of behavior. Raising your hand, talking to a friend and closing a door are all behavior episodes. Behavior episodes occur within "behavior settings"; these are the ecological environmental units encompassing behavior. People obtain satisfactions from the settings they occupy and therefore actively seek to maintain them. Included in behavior settings are both the physical components of behavior and overt behaviors. Within behavior settings "behavior forces" act on the inhabitants to produce the behavior episode.

Importance of Environmental Factors

The importance of the environment has been studied in various settings. One of the most controversial studies in the history of psychology dealt with the effects of group pressure on administering electric shock as punishment in a paired-associate learning task. Milgram (1964) dramatically illustrated that group pressure had a significant
effect on shock levels given by the subjects. In the absence of social pressure the shock level was significantly lower.

Patient reaction to the environment has been studied in psychiatric settings (Moos, 1968; Pierce, Trickett and Moos, 1972; Kellam, Shmelzer and Berman, 1966) and medical settings (Willems, 1972). Results of these studies point to the importance of ward settings and their differential effect on patients. Moos (1968), e.g., found that the "demand" characteristics of ward settings varied considerably and produced varied reactions from different patient groups. This indicates that ward settings are differentially beneficial to different groups of patients and information about this should help match an individual patient with a particular therapeutic milieu. At the same time, Moos underscores the fact that settings do have a tendency to elicit particular behaviors from all patients.

The importance of the environment has been studied in therapeutic settings (Van der Veen, 1965; Moos and Clemes, 1967; Moos and MacIntosh, 1970). These studies illustrate the significance of the interpersonal setting, i.e., the particular patient, in determining the therapeutic technique. Therapists behavior was not the result of a "trait", at least for empathy and talkativeness, but was substantially determined by the patient or situation. However, this influence is not uni-directional. Each contributes to the
environment of the other. Each is a "press" in the other's environment.

Rausch, Dittman and Taylor (1959) studied hyperaggressive children in a residential treatment center and pointed out the importance of the environment for disturbed children. Knowledge about the "social setting" increased information about interactive behavior. It was also found that with treatment and maturation, situational factors, i.e., the environment, play a more potent role for behavior.

Non-Correctional Environments

It seems axiomatic that to predict behavior efficiently the environment as well as the person needs to be assessed. But few environmental assessment techniques have been developed. The historical progression of those environments being assessed seems to be from educational institutions and industrial organizations to mental health settings and recently correctional institutions (Wenk and Moos, 1972). One of the earliest environmental assessments in an educational setting was done by Withall (1943). Withall developed a technique to measure the social-emotional climate of classrooms by categorizing teacher statements. He posited that teacher's behavior is the most important single factor in creating climate in the classroom and that teacher's verbal behavior is a representative sample of the total teacher behavior. It
followed then that a categorization of teacher statements presented a valid and reliable index of social-emotional climate for the classroom. He defined social-emotional climate as "The emotional tone which is concomitant of interpersonal interaction. It is a general emotional factor which appears to be present in interaction occurring between individuals in face to face groups." (Withall, 1949, p. 349). The social emotional climate was said to influence the individual and group spirit, purposefulness and interaction.

Seven categories of statements which seemed to encompass all types of statements uttered by teachers in classrooms were developed. They include: learner, supportive, acceptant and clarifying, problem-structuring, neutral, directive, reproving and teacher self-supporting. These 7 categories were seen as making up a learner-centered, teacher-centered continuum, with the first three categories being learner-centered, the last three being teacher centered and the middle one being neutral and not influencing either group. Four trained judges were used to categorize teacher statements into one of the seven categories. Results underscored the importance of environment in learning and showed that different patterns of verbal behavior distinguishes teaching styles, e.g., learner oriented, problem oriented or self-oriented.

Pace and Stern (1958) developed the College Character-
istic Index (CCI) to determine the characteristic "Press" and "needs" of a college environment. Press and need are concepts of Murray (1938). Press refers to the characteristic demands or features of an environment and need or drive is an organic readiness to respond in a certain way under given conditions, i.e., press (a more detailed discussion of Murray's theory will be presented in the section on Rudolf Moos' "Social Climate Scales").

The CCI contains 300 true-false items, organized into 30 ten-item scales, which correspond to the thirty needs in Murray's taxonomy. The items are statements about college life from which the "press" is inferred. Examples of items which infer a press for order are: "Faculty members and administration have definite and clearly posted hours. In many classrooms students have an assigned seat." A need for order would be inferred from such items as "Arranging my clothes neatly before going to bed. Having a special place for everything and seeing that each thing is in its place." Other scales included; achievement, affiliation, aggression-blame avoidance, counteraction, dominance, exhibitionism, harm avoidance, etc.

The CCI was administered to 423 students and 71 faculty members at five different colleges. The results clearly differentiated among the environments of the five colleges. The authors suggested potential applications of the scales, e.g., institutional self-analysis, as a way of
determining how close institutional purpose comes to institutional press. Implications for change can clearly be derived from CCI results and discrepancies. Between stated objectives and actual practices can be reduced.

A method for measuring the college environments was also developed by Astin and Holland (1961). The Environmental Assessment Technique (EAT) also utilized the concept of press and is based on the notion that a major portion of environmental forces is transmitted through other people. The authors hypothesized that the dominant features of an environment are dependent upon the typical character of its members and if we know the character of the people in a group we should know the climate the group creates. The concept of press was reduced to eight variables; number of students, intelligence levels of students, and personal orientation of the student body in terms of six personality types-realistic, intellectual, social, conventional, enterprising and artistic. Since it was posited that persons in different occupations have different personalities, a person's vocational choice can be used as a miniature personality "test" merely by identifying to which of the six orientations the vocation belongs. For example, an engineer would be considered as having a realistic orientation and it is assumed he would possess some of the characteristics of the realistic orientation-masculine, physically strong, unsocialable, aggressive etc.
Evaluations of 36 colleges showed the EAT to have moderate validity and substantial reliability. The authors found that a given social environment can, to a degree, be described in terms of the personalities (occupations) of its members. Information need only be obtained for eight variables, which revision that what has been called the college environment is reflected in the attributes of the student body. Results indicated that institutions with the highest realistic orientation are technological institutions, primarily or exclusively for men. This stands in contrast to the artistic orientation found in small liberal arts colleges for women. Another way of saying this is that a press towards realism was found at male technical schools and an artistic press was found at small liberal arts colleges for females.

Environmental assessments in hospitals have for the most part been limited to psychiatric settings, although some e.g., Willems (1972) have attempted to assess the environmental influences in a medical hospital. Jackson (1964) attempted to describe the significant dimensions in a mental hospital system and the degree to which the authority structure and processes in the hospital system affect patient treatment and recovery. This study is similar to the correctional study of Street, Vinter and Perrow (1966) and assumes that disagreement, conflict and ambiguity in authority relations will not only create
disturbances in communication and interpersonal relationships but will ultimately impinge upon patients, retarding their recovery.

Originally designed to measure six characteristics of the treatment environment, the Characteristics of a Treatment Environment (CTE) scales were oriented toward patients and their pathologies and was assumed to reflect the degree to which the environment resembled Schwartz' therapeutic community (Schwartz, 1957). The more the treatment environment developed patients' initiative and creativity, increased their self-esteem, reduced their anxieties, helped them understand their own illness, reduced their reality distortions and increased their participation and ability to participate, the more it approximated Schwartz' model.

The CTE was given to 840 staff members at four mental hospitals and was originally thought to provide a valid description of conditions of events in a treatment environment. As evidence from the author and other investigators accumulated, however, it was discovered that the CTE scales were positively intercorrelated and tended to change concurrently. Consequently a new set of scales and scoring procedures, based on orthogonal factors, was devised (Jackson, 1969). The new CTE does not measure how therapeutic an environment is but merely provides an objective profile of the treatment environment characteristics.

There are few studies which relate treatment environ-
ment to treatment outcome. Kellam, Shmelzer and Berman (1966) developed an instrument for quantifying certain elements of ward atmosphere and in a second study (1967) related those ward characteristics to treatment outcome for schizophrenic patients on 12 psychiatric wards in four different hospitals. Impetus for the study came from the need to compare 27 admission wards of 9 hospitals as part of a phenothiazine study in which treatment outcome was related to different drugs and also the type of hospital setting in which the drugs were administered.

To assess the ward dimensions of disturbed behavior, adult status, patient/staff ratio, social contact and ward census, the War Information Form (WIF) was devised. WIF dimensions were then related to outcome of treatment as indicated by a pre-and post-treatment evaluation of clinical status by a variety of methods including: clinical assessment by psychiatrist, psychologist and nurse, Inpatient Multidimensional Psychiatric Rating Scale (IMPS) and the Ward Behavior Rating Scale (WBRS). It was hypothesized that better treatment outcome would occur in wards which had less disturbed behavior, more social contact, lower ward census and patient/staff ratios and gave patients more symbols of adult status.

Authors found that the less improved patients were on the more crowded wards of higher adult status, thereby not only rejecting the original hypotheses but pointing in the
opposite direction. Original hypotheses were confirmed for disturbed behavior, social contact indices of aloneness, cluster, size and staff-patient contact, i.e., more improved patients were from wards which had low incidence of disturbed behavior and more socializing. The most frequent WIF dimension associated with improvement of symptoms is cluster size, the average number of patients present at social events. Authors suggest that the patient behavior dimensions of ward atmosphere (disturbed behavior, aloneness, cluster size) are an aspect of a far more potent social forces that influence treatment outcome than are the hospital policy dimensions (adult status, ward census and patient/staff ratio).

**Correctional Environments**

There are few studies that look at the environment of correctional institutions and its impact on inmates. One of the earliest correctional studies is reported by Weeks (1958), director of the evaluation study for the Highlands Experiment during the 1950's in New Jersey. Highlands was the unique creation of F. Lovell Bixby and Lloyd M. McCorkie, two psychologists who met during WWII while working with military prisoners. Both were equally impressed at the manner in which the prisoners responded to group psychotherapy, at that time a new tool in Psychology. Both men were convinced that this "new" method of treatment would work equally well with juvenile delinquents and decided to
use a modified version of it, guided group interaction, in a correctional setting for juveniles. However, the conventional reformatory did not offer a favorable setting for obtaining optimal effects of the guided group interaction technique, therefore, a new type of treatment setting had to be established, and was called Highlands. Highlands housed approximately 230 male juveniles ranging in age from 16 to 18. The characteristic features of Highlands can be summed up by the following: 1) Informal and intimate living for a short period of time (3 months) in a small group (20 boys), in a non-custodial residential center, 2) A regular program of supervised work, 3) Evening sessions of guided group interaction (5 times weekly) aimed at giving residents insight into the motivations for their conduct and incentive to change their attitudes, 4) Continuing group discussions outside these sessions during leisure time. The main objective was to give delinquent boys an opportunity for self-rehabilitation. To do this Highlands gave them an environment which was in direct contrast to what they would have gotten in their home neighborhood -- group pressure inducing and maintaining the boy in a life of crime, or in a typical reformatory -- informal social structure which sets residents against the staff. At Highlands, there was a powerful group influence concentrated on rehabilitation. When recidivism rates for Highlands were compared to the control group at Annandale,
a traditional long term institution providing custodial care, the Highlands group had a substantially lower incidence. This study underscores the importance of environmental factors in a correctional setting and demonstrates the effectiveness of an informal treatment organization in treating certain groups of delinquents over a conventional reformatory with its formal structure.

Fricot Ranch Study. Jesness (1965) studied the effects of small living units on parole violation at Fricot Ranch Training School, a California Youth Authority institution for young boys aged 8 to 14. A newly built residential unit, housing 20 boys instead of 50, provided the staff with the opportunity to check out their belief that they could be more effective in treating juveniles if the staff-to-boy ratio was higher. Subjects were randomly assigned to the large (50 bed) and small (20 bed) units. The only different treatment condition was the smaller living unit.

One of the basic assumptions of the Fricot Study was that delinquents differ from one another in important ways and in order to understand and treat them it is necessary to take into account these differences. In order to examine the effects of the experimental smaller living unit on different types of delinquents a typology or classification system was developed. The typology data from a variety of sources including interview behavior ratings,
background data and psychological tests, characterized the subjects according to eight delinquent types: 1. Socialized conformist, 2. Immature, passive, 3. Neurotic, anxious, 4. Immature, aggressive, 5. Cultural delinquent, 6. Manipulator, 7. Neurotic, acting-out, and, 8. Neurotic, depressed. Results from a 60 month follow-up showed that boys assigned to the smaller living unit, with higher staff-to-boy ratio, had less parole violations than those assigned to the larger control living unit with lower staff-to-boy ratio. It was also revealed that neurotics gained more from the intensive program of the small living unit than subjects of other types. "Good" discharges from the youth authority and amount of time spent in lock up were also used as indices of the higher success rate with the smaller unit subjects (Jesness, 1971-72).

Street, Vinter and Perrow (1966) studied the organizational climates of six juvenile correctional institutions whose goals were oriented towards one of three major organizational models: obedience/conformity, re-education/redevelopment or treatment. A separate questionnaire was used for staff and inmates, in addition to interviews, field observations and formal documents in an effort to understand the complex and inter-active organizational process of the institutions. The assumption being that through this they would arrive at those influences which determine the fate of the institution. The authors wanted to develop, in
cooperation with the staff, an instrument which would empirically measure certain elements of significance to social climates of correctional institutions and to provide this tool to the institutional administrators for use in developing programs. It was believed that this would provide the staff with an objective look at the significant elements of their program and an opportunity to formulate improvements. Passage of time and a re-test would then decide whether any improvements had occurred.

The authors demonstrated that different institutional goals influenced staff perceptions in four areas: 1) The inmates, 2) The staff-inmate authority relationship, 3) The patterns of social relations and, 4) The emergent inmate leadership. These results strengthened the hypothesis that the organizational context of correctional institutions (institutional environment) may shape individual behavior. The research stimulated discussions among personnel and the feedback sessions were change inducing for some institutions. Those that stressed conformity remained fixed, however, and changes were substantial in and limited to the treatment oriented programs.

Preston Typology Study. The Preston Typology Study (Jesness, 1971) has much in common with the Fricot Study. This study conducted at the Preston School of Industry, a large California Youth Authority institution which houses approximately 900 boys, aged 16 to 20, is considered a
radical innovation in corrections. Results from Fricot and the Community Treatment Project, (a project in which treating in the community was substituted for incarceration, Palmer, 1971, to be described later); indicated that environmental considerations were important and that success in treating delinquents is greater when treaters (e.g., parole agents, counselors) are "matched" with the treatment strategy. The Preston Study utilized a differential treatment rationale, which stated briefly says, that if you accept the notion that offenders differ from one another in the reasons for their law violations it follows that treatment of these individuals will also vary accordingly (Warren, 1969). To determine differential effects on various delinquent types a system of classification called the Interpersonal Maturity Level System (Sullivan, Grant and Grant, 1957) was used to place subjects into one of nine levels of maturity (I-levels). The I-level system and the differential treatment rationale make up the ideological nucleus for this and the California Youth Authority (CYA) studies which follow. The system describes a "basic core structure personality" which is composed of a somewhat consistent set of expectations with regard to the external world. As a child develops, new discriminations are made and integrated. Seven progressive levels of integration (I-levels) are hypothesized and each stage is defined by significant interpersonal problems that must be resolved if maturity is
to occur. The level of integration is manifest predominately through the individuals ability to understand intra and interpersonal events. The authors have described seven levels but for the purposes of the CYA studies only three, levels 2, 3, and 4 with their subtypes need be considered: level 2 ($I_2$) unsocialized, aggressive (Aa), unsocialized, passive, (Ap), conformist immature, (Cfc); level 3, ($I_3$), conformist, cultural (Cfm), manipulator (Mp), neurotic, acting-out (Na), neurotic, anxious (Nx); level 4 ($I_4$) situational emotional reaction (Se), cultural identifier (Ci). With the previous considerations in mind each of the 655 experimental subjects was, 1) put into one of nine I-levels, 2) homogeneously placed in one of six living units according to I-level, staffed by specially trained and "matched" personnel. Control subjects were placed in living units according to previously established institutional procedure which did not take into consideration I-level.

Evaluation of results from behavior ratings, psychometric and parole follow-up data, showed differential outcomes for those subtypes whose living units had been more successful in developing their respective treatment strategies. For example, the manipulator experimental group was less autistic and alienated and more aware of their interpersonal difficulties than control manipulators. The immature conformists and neurotic acting out experimental
group showed the greatest impact on behavioral criteria; they were rated as significantly less aggressive and alienated, more responsible and conforming than their control counterparts. Although other results are somewhat inconsistent, in general, introduction of the I-level system tended to decrease management problems with fewer reports of serious rule infractions, peer problems and significant reduction in the use of confinement. Overall success at Preston is reflected in the fact that this once radical treatment paradigm is now accepted as standard practice at Preston and two other CYA institutions.

California Youth Authority Studies. The next series of studies were also conducted under the auspices of the California Youth Authority (CYA) and continued investigation of the concept of differential treatment of delinquents. The Community Treatment Project (CTP) spanned a period of 13 years (1961-74), included youths from Sacramento, Stockton and San Francisco, and has been lauded as a pioneering approach to the concept of community treatment for the entire nation (Palmer, 1973).

Part I (1961-67) of CTP was designed to investigate the feasibility of allowing certain types of convicted juvenile offenders to remain in their home community with intensive supervision and treatment within a small-sized parole caseload (not more than 12 youths). Conditions of the experiment were as follows: experimental youths -
placed directly in the CTP program without any prior institutionalization; control youths - were institutionalized for 8 to 10 months and then returned to their home community under the routine supervision of a non-CTP parole agent working with a standard-sized case load. All youths were classified according to their Interpersonal Level of Maturity (I-level; Sullivan, Grant and Grant, 1957) and placed in experimental or control conditions. Experimental youths had a relatively individualized treatment strategy developed for him which recreated his overall I-level. As in the Preston Study (Jesness, 1971; described above) nine different subtypes are distinguished with I-levels two, (I2), three (I3) and four (I4), also referred to as lower, middle and higher, respectively.

Control and experimental subjects were evaluated in terms of six different outcome measures including parole suspensions, recidivism, favorable and unfavorable discharges, psychological test scores and post-discharge arrests. Preliminary analysis of data showed the experimentals performing better than controls in terms of recidivism, unfavorable discharge and test results; with no difference between the two groups on favorable discharges and post release arrest and controls doing better in terms of parole violations (Palmer, 1971). New and updated results, however, provide a more positive picture with CTP youths having a significantly lower rate of recidivism and
a higher incidence of favorable discharge (Palmer, 1973). Experimental-control comparisons indicate that the CTP project can handle a large majority of youths at least as effectively as traditional programs of incarceration followed by a period of routine parole.

In Part II (1969-1974) of the CTP study, the idea of using a residential facility instead of direct release into the CTP program (as per 1961-65) was explored. The question was asked: "Would many of the aforementioned youths become less delinquent if they began their CYA career within a particular type of residential setting and not within the community (as in Part I)?"

To compare the effectiveness of the CTP residential treatment program to the direct release, intensive CTP program, all eligible subjects were placed in one of the following four conditions (Palmer, 1973, p. 38-39):

RR= Status 1 youths who were appropriately placed: These individuals were diagnosed as needing to begin their program within a residential setting. Their program did begin within a residential setting (i.e., Dorm 3).

RC= Status 1 youths were inappropriately placed. Diagnosed as needing to begin in a residential setting: however, their program was initiated within a community setting, as in 1961-1969.

CR= Status 2 youths who were inappropriately placed: Diagnosed as being able to begin their program within
a community setting; however, their program was initiated within a residential setting (i.e., Dorm 3).

CC= Status 2 youths who were appropriately placed: Diagonosed as being able to begin their program within a community setting. Their program did begin within a community setting, as in 1961-1969.

Status I youths were those eligibles who were more troubled and were diagnosed as needing an initial period of institutionalization before release to the CTP program. Status II youths were less troubled and were evaluated as not requiring initial institutionalization.

Results indicated that the more troubled (Status I) youths committed less offenses on Parole when appropriately placed (RP) then when inappropriately placed (RC). Status II youths gain little if anything when initially placed in a residential facility (CR). Findings also indicated that the more troubled youths perform considerably worse when inappropriately placed (RC) then when appropriately placed (RP) while for the less troubled youths there is no difference in parole performance for either CR or CC condition.

Results suggest that careful diagnosis and placement of individuals in an appropriate treatment program can lead to a reduction of juvenile delinquency or inversely to a higher rate of success for both residential and community based programs.

Group Home Project. With the extended use of group and
foster homes in Part I of CTP, there arose questions concerning adequate placement and temporary confinement for CTP youths. The Group Home Project (Pearson, 1968) was designed to develop placement facilities with varying atmospheres for particular individuals. An important dimension of the group home project is the I-level system (Sullivan, Grant and Grant 1957) utilized in describing the homes and in the selection of group home parents.

Five different placement and temporary confinement facilities were developed with varying atmospheres. Type I, II and III were long-term placement facilities and were designed for the lower, middle, and higher I-level sub-type delinquents respectively. Group home types IV and V are temporary placements for all delinquent subtypes with type IV providing a less restrictive atmosphere. A sixth type was later added to accommodate higher I-level types (as in type III). Examples of two of the group homes types will give the reader a flavor for the different, relatively individualized environment and their intended I-level group (Pearson, 1970, p. 29-30): Type I-Protective (for four boys classified as passive associalized or immature conformist). This type of group home for very immature, dependent youngsters is intended to approximate normal family living as closely as possible. It is designed to be operated by a married couple with training and patience to offer intensive support and supervision for prolonged periods of time. (Because the number of boys classified as
low-maturity subtypes in the Community Treatment Project was smaller than anticipated, the Type I home in the project was opened in September 1967 to compatible high-maturity youngsters in the anxious and acting-out subtypes. For the most part this arrangement worked satisfactorily.) Type IV-Temporary Community Care (for six boys of any subtype. This type of home meets the need for temporary placement when custody or independent living is inappropriate or unnecessary. Support, rather than custody or restrictions, is emphasized. The home can be used for: (a) housing while another placement in the community is being changed or developed; (b) short-term counseling away from a stressful situation; and (c) housing while treatment plans are being formulated or reassessed. Group home parents were matched with particular types of youngsters and with a particular type of group home.

The goals of the Group Home Project were to determine the plausability of establishing and maintaining each of the group homes, to develop a taxonomy of relevant environments with treatment related details and evaluate the impact of group home project on CTP youths. Evaluation of the project has been difficult and there have been problems of adequate matching with the youngsters they serve. Problems of commitment to treatment procedures and adequate training of house parents (most were blue collar workers with a High School education) let to the termin-
ation of the house parents at four of the seven facilities. However, the project has done much to help better understand the many complex dimensions in the use of group homes for the treatment of delinquents. The need for adequate out-of-home placement has clearly been established and in part met by the use of group homes. In the homes currently operating Group Home Project agents feel that to a varying degree placement in each of the homes has been a positive experience and for some youths an important aid in achieving stability and growth.

Rudolf Moos' Social Climate Scale

The literature is replete with personality theories. Theories that categorize and classify people and their behavior. Until recently there has not been a theory which adequately describes the environment or rather the "personality" of the environment. Among the major ways of relating human environments to human behavior, measurement of the social climate or psychosocial characteristics is one of the principal characterization techniques (Moos, 1973). Many of the preceding authors have attempted to describe the environment along various dimensions, this section describes the development of the Social Climate Scales (SCS) and Rudolf Moos' work in assessing the "personality" of the environment.

SCS perspective assumes that environments have unique "personalities" as do people. There are personality tests
which evaluate personality traits and provide information about the distinctive ways in which people behave. Similarly, social environments can be assessed with a great deal of accuracy and detail. Some people are more controlling than others. By the same token, some social environments are more rigid and controlling. For some people order and organization are important. Likewise some social environments emphasize order and organization.

Rudolf Moos has developed the Social Climate Scales to characterize vastly different social environments using common dimensions. The scales are applicable to nine different environments each of which has common social climate dimensions. Table 1 shows the nine diverse environments and their corresponding social climate dimensions (Moos, 1975; p. 22-23). The scales are derived from the work of Murray (1938) and Stern (1970). Murray emphasized the importance of viewing behavior as the result of the interaction between person and environment. In Murray's terms, behavior is the result of interaction between environmental "press" and human "need". Press is defined as the tendency of an environment to exert some effect on a person; usually in the guise of "threat of harm" or "promise of benefit". It is the nature of the environment to which an individual is exposed. The press of an object or a situation is what it can do to, or for, the individual who is faced with that object or involved in that situation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Environment</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Personal Development</th>
<th>System Maintenance and System Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1,2) Hospital and community programs</td>
<td>Involvement Support Spontaneity</td>
<td>Autonomy Practical Orientation Personal Problem Orientation</td>
<td>Order and Organization Clarity Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Correctional institutions</td>
<td>Involvement Support Expressiveness</td>
<td>Autonomy Practical Orientation Personal Problem Orientation</td>
<td>Order and Organization Clarity Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Military companies</td>
<td>Involvement Peer Cohesion Officer Support</td>
<td>Personal Status</td>
<td>Order and Organization Clarity Officer Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) University student living groups</td>
<td>Involvement Emotional Support</td>
<td>Independence Traditional Social Orientation Competition Academic Achievement Intellectuality</td>
<td>Order and Organization Student Influence Innovation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Table 1 continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Environment</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Personal Development</th>
<th>System Maintenance and System Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(6) Junior high and high school classrooms</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>Task Orientation</td>
<td>Order and Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>Rule Clarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Social, task-oriented, and therapeutic groups</td>
<td>Cohesiveness</td>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>Order and Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leader Support</td>
<td>Task Orientation</td>
<td>Leader Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expressiveness</td>
<td>Self-Discovery</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anger and Aggression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Work milieus</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>Task Orientation</td>
<td>Work Pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer Cohesion</td>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>Clarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Comfort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Families</td>
<td>Cohesiveness</td>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emotional Support</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intellectual-Cultural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recreational Orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moral-Religious Emphasis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Murray described need or "drive" as an organic readiness to respond in a certain way under given conditions. Thus Murray posited that individuals have certain needs, the dominant ones characterizing their personality. The environment has a certain press which can potentially frustrate or satisfy these needs. In Murray's taxonomy there were 30 press categories, e.g., affiliation, dominance, aggression, etc. Moos has extracted nine dimensions (called subscales) which fall under three broad categories: Relationship Dimensions, Personal Development Dimensions, and Systems Maintenance and Change Dimensions. These dimensions and their subscales are used to categorize the social and organizational climates of the diverse groups and institutions listed in Table 1. The nine subscales and descriptions are found in Table 2 (Moos, 1975, p. 41):

TABLE 2
Correctional Institutions Environment Scale (CIES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Involvement:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measures how active and energetic residents are in the day-to-day functioning of the program (i.e., interacting socially with other residents, doing things on their own initiative, and developing pride and group spirit in the program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Support:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measures the extent to which residents are encouraged to be helpful and supportive toward other residents, and how supportive the staff is toward residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Expressiveness:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measures the extent to which the program encourages the open expression of feelings (including angry feelings) by residents and staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Autonomy: assesses the extent to which residents are encouraged to take initiative in planning activities and take leadership in the unit.

5. Practical Orientation: assesses the extent to which the resident environment orients him toward preparing himself for release from the program: training for new kinds of jobs, looking to the future and setting and working toward goals are among the factors considered.

6. Personal Problem Orientation: measures the extent to which residents are encouraged to be concerned with their personal problems and feelings and to seek to understand them.

7. Order and Organization: measures how important order and organization are in the program, in terms of residents (how they look) staff (what they do to encourage order), and the facility itself (how well it is kept).

8. Clarity: measures the extent to which the resident knows what to expect in the day-to-day routine of his program and how explicit the program rules and procedures are.

9. Staff Control: assesses the extent to which the staff use regulations to keep residents under necessary controls (i.e., in the formulation of rules, the scheduling of activities, and in the relationships between residents and staff).

The first three, Involvement, Support and Expressiveness identify the nature and intensity of personal relationships in an environment. Autonomy, Practical Orientation and Personal Problem Orientation make up the Personal Development Dimension and are used to measure the primary directions along which personal growth and self development tend to occur in an environment. The last
three subscales: Order and Organization, Clarity and Staff Control make up the System Maintenance and System Change Dimension and describes the extent to which an environment is orderly, predictable, maintains order and is responsible to change.

The Social Climate Scales questionnaire has items corresponding to each of the subscales designed to assess the press towards that subscale. For example, a press towards Involvement, a Relationship Dimension subscale, would be inferred from the following items: "Residents on this unit care about each other. Residents put a lot of energy into what they do around here." A press toward Autonomy, a subscale from the Personal Development Dimension, would be inferred from such items as: "Residents are expected to take leadership on the unit. Residents here are encouraged to be independent." A subscale from the System Change Dimension, Clarity, is inferred from items like the following: "If a resident's program is changed, someone on the staff always tells him why. If a resident breaks a rule he knows what will happen to him."

The SCS was developed in a psychiatric setting and then later used in correctional settings and seven other distinct settings. As previously mentioned, the Ward Atmosphere Scale (WAS) was the first of the scales to be developed (Moos, 1968). The WAS was developed to describe the social atmosphere within and differentiate between psy-
chiatric inpatient wards. From an initial pool of 205 items originating from a variety of sources including behavioral observations, College Characteristic Index items (Pace and Stern, 1958) and patient and staff interviews, 120 items were chosen, 10 each for the twelve subscales. The questionnaire was then administered to 365 patients and 131 staff members on fourteen different psychiatric inpatient wards.

Comparisons between inpatient wards have usually been made on the basis of census, patient-staff ratio, open or closed wards, etc. Results of the WAS administration, however, indicate there are other dimensions which need to be considered, i.e., the press categories of Support, Involvement, Order, Clarity, etc. The WAS has been used as an instrument for initiation and assessment of change (Pierce, Trickett and Moos, 1972) and to demonstrate relationships between treatment environment and treatment outcome for psychiatric inpatients (Moos and Schwartz, 1972).

Following the logic and style of the WAS, Moos (1972) developed the Community-Oriented Programs Environment Scale (COPES), which assesses the psychosocial characteristics of community-oriented transitional psychiatric settings, e.g., halfway houses, day care centers and rehabilitation centers. Most of the items in COPES were taken from the WAS. Potential application of the COPES parallel those of the WAS, i.e., assessment of diverse
programs and of one program over time, aid in program design and change, and help identify those environmental factors which are related to favorable or unfavorable treatment outcomes.

Based on the original form of the WAS, the Correctional Institutions Environment Scale (CIES) was developed by Moos (1968) to describe environmental factors within institutions and differentiate among the social climates of correctional institutions. The CIES in its original form had 194 items divided into 12 subscales and was called the "Social Climate Scales". The present form (Moos, 1972) used in this report, has 10 subscales and 90 items and is more fully described in the method section.

In the 16 correctional units originally studied and on which the CIES was normed, Moos (1968) reported that the instrument was successful in differentiating significantly between the perceptions of staff and residents. Later, in another study using the same correctional units, it was shown that diverse social climates had different and predictable effects on the residents living within them. (Moos, 1970).

Jesness (1971) in a California Youth Authority study of differential treatment of delinquents used the CIES to describe the social climate in the experimental units in the beginning of the program and after 2 years of differential treatment intervention. This study is an important
one in that it clearly demonstrates the importance of person-environment fit and also showed that the introduction of new treatment methods had immeasurable effects on the social climate perceptions of both staff and residents.

In a similar vein, Trickett and Moos (1971) used the CIES as objective evidence of the similarity of two correctional units being studied. The authors demonstrated that satisfaction with the correctional environment is related to a perception self-environment similarity. The authors further suggest that one reason for the failure of psychological replication studies might be the psychosocial climates of the institutions studies have significant inherent differences. Instruments that allow us to assess and compare the psychological environments of different kinds of institutions can allow us to either match institutions for comparative studies or provide us with information to understand differences when they occur.

Summary

A review of the literature related to environmental theories and assessment techniques has been conducted. Among the personality theorists who have shown a consistent interest in the contributions of ecological and social factors to human behavior, Murray’s concept of environmental press (Murray, 1939) seems most relevant to the present study. Murry views behavior as the result of
the interaction between environmental press conditions and human needs. Assessment techniques to measure press have been developed in educational and industrial settings, brought to psychiatric settings and recently applied to correctional settings (Wenk and Moos, 1972).

Non-correctional environmental assessment techniques have been utilized in a variety of settings. Some have not included all the inhabitants of educational environments in their assessments of educational environments (Withall, 1948) and psychiatric settings (Jackson, 1964). Other assessment techniques (Astin and Holland, 1961) have considered the person as the determinant of social climate and have not looked at environmental factors.

In correctional settings, environments have for the most part, been created (Weeks, 1958; Jesness, 1965, 1973, Pearson, 1970) but it is not until recently that assessment techniques have been used to describe more than the readily observable indexes of census, staff-resident ratio, locked-unlocked doors. The Social Climate Scales developed by Moos (1968) allows for more than these objective indices to be considered and includes the environmental press influences of involvement, support, clarity, expressiveness, etc. Recent treatment strategies for juveniles have resulted in the extended use of group homes for out-of-home placement. Although the environments are varied and utilize the concept of differential treatment, no objective,
comprehensive assessment has been done to determine if the existent conditions match the program goals.
CHAPTER 3
DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter is divided into three main sections. The first is the section on the Setting and includes information on where the study took place, the type of facility, its therapeutic orientation, the kind of program it offers and background characteristics of the staff and residents. The Instrument section describes the Correctional Institutions Environment Scale (CIES) developed by Rudolf Moos (1968) and how it was used in the present report. The last section, Administration, includes information on administration of the CIES including how long it took, how it was received.

The Setting

The present study took place at a group foster home in Southern California where this writer was employed. The setting was a residential program for fifteen young men ranging in age from 15 to 17. The home was a non-profit organization licensed by the State Department of Health. Boys came to the home through a variety of sources, including the Probation Department, Department of Public Social Services and private referrals.

Although the ethnic and socio-economic backgrounds of the boys were quite different, generally speaking they all had unstable family situations. Some have been involved in delinquent activities and all have emotional or social
problems that require extensive help.

Since its inception in the summer of 1974, the Home was evolved into a comprehensive therapeutic center. The therapy staff consists of a full time psychologist, three counselors and three master's candidates in psychology. The unusual staff-to-resident ratio of better than one to two offers the opportunity to intensively interact with each young man at the Home. This is in sharp contrast to many of their past situations in which personal contact was minimal.

The strategy in changing their patterns is twofold: One, extra staff time is devoted to personal contact with the residents; two, each resident is allowed to structure his own time outside of his full time function, i.e., work or school. This approach encourages the residents to make their own decisions and gives them room to act out their own "trips" providing the staff with a look at how they live. At the same time, the staff is finding out about those parts of the boys' life process which are hampered by their social or emotional problems. This is then worked on in individual or group therapy sessions.

The atmosphere created by this approach is more chaotic than would be the case if the boys were fit into a program totally designed by the staff, but it is the staff's intention to set up a model emancipation environment, i.e., an environment where a boy can learn how to live after he
is released. This, the staff feels, must include working with the individuals particular social or emotional problems rather than suppressing them through a prearranged program.

There are monthly all-day picnics for residents and the entire staff. A variety of activities both on and off the premises are also offered. On premises activities include table tennis, electric ping pong, television, basketball, weight lifting, pool, cards, and a variety of games. Off the premises the boys are taken to concerts, plays, movies, local amusement parks, and beaches.

Boys desiring to earn money can do so in a variety of ways while at the family home. First there is the upkeep of the house itself for which the boys are paid. This includes working inside the house, maintenance of outside grounds and running errands. Second, there are jobs in the community for those boys who are capable. The staff assists the residents in all aspects of acquiring a job. Also, there is a wood project in the San Bernadio Mountains run by the home. There the boys can earn money and get vocational training in all the areas of a firewood cutting operation.

Each resident at the home has one or two counselors assigned to making individual contact for about four hours each week. The staff meets once a week to discuss the residents and plans courses of treatment. In general, all
the business of the house and the personal interactions of the staff are aired at this meeting. There are other smaller meetings which occur, e.g., to handle discipline and crisis situations. Every resident is also in group therapy with the staff psychologist and two other staff members once a week. In general, residents have a great deal of freedom and a great deal of guidance in structuring that freedom in a way that will prove beneficial both during the stay at the family home and upon release.

**Instrument**

The instrument used to assess the social environment at the family home was the Correctional Institutions Environment Scale (CIES). Based on the environmental press concepts of Murray (1938) and Stern (1970), the CIES was developed by Rudolph Moos (1968a) to give a reading of the social environment along nine areas or subscales. Two forms of the CIES were used; Form R (Real Form) assessing the real of actual situation and Form I (Ideal Form) assessing the ideal setting as conceived by the staff and residents. Both forms consisted of 90 true-false statements. The staff and residents answered exactly the same items. The sample included ten residents and eight staff members at the family home. Residents were males ranging in age from 15 to 18.

The items on the CIES are designed to measure three main dimensions of the social environment. Each dimension
has these subscales. Involvement, support and expressiveness are the subscales subsumed under the Relationship Dimensions. The Treatment Dimensions include Autonomy, Practical Orientation and Personal Problem Orientation. Order and Organization, Clarity and Staff Control are the Systems Maintenance Dimensions. Table 3 lists the nine subscales and gives a brief description of each. (Moos, 1975, p. 41):

TABLE 3
Correctional Institutions Environment Scale (CIES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Involvement:</strong> measures how active and energetic residents are in the day-to-day functioning of the program (i.e., interacting socially with other residents, doing things on their own initiative, and developing pride and group spirit in the program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Support:</strong> measures the extent to which residents are encouraged to be helpful and supportive toward other residents, and how supportive the staff is toward residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Expressiveness:</strong> measures the extent to which the program encourages the open expression of feelings (including angry feelings) by residents and staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Autonomy:</strong> assesses the extent to which residents are encouraged to take initiative in planning activities and take leadership in the unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Practical Orientation:</strong> assesses the extent to which the resident's environment orients him toward preparing himself for release from the program: training for new kinds of jobs, looking to the future, and setting and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
working toward goals are among the factors considered.

6. Personal Problem Orientation: measures the extent to which residents are encouraged to be concerned with their personal problems and feelings and to seek to understand them.

7. Order and Organization: measures how important order and organization are in the program, in terms of residents (how they look), staff (what they do to encourage order), and the facility itself (how well it is kept).

8. Clarity: measures the extent to which the resident knows what to expect in the day-to-day routine of his program and how explicit the program rules and procedures are.

9. Staff Control: assesses the extent to which the staff use regulations to keep residents under necessary controls (i.e. in the formulation of rules, the scheduling of activities, and in the relationships between residents and staff).

The items included in the CIES are intended to identify characteristics of the correctional environment which exert press toward the subscale variables and in this way measure the social climate as perceived by staff and residents. Both residents and staff answer exactly the same items. There are four different forms of the CIES:

1) A 90-item Form R used to assess the actual (real) program, 2) a 36-item Form S (Short Form) for quick assessments of the program as it exists (Real Program), 3) A 90-item program and 4) a 90-item Form E (Expectations Form) for assessment of expectations about a program. An easily
read overview of the scales appears in Table 4, (Moos, 1975 p. 37):

**TABLE 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment Scale ('CIES')</th>
<th>Actual program (long form)</th>
<th>90 items, 9 subscales, CIES FORM R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual program (short form)</td>
<td>36 items, 9 subscales, CIES Short Form S (First 36 items of Form R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal program</td>
<td>90 items, 9 subscales, CIES Form I (parallel to Form R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program expectations</td>
<td>90 items, 9 subscales, CIES Form E (parallel to Form R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The present CIES Form R was derived from the Ward Atmosphere Scale (WAS) (Moos and Houts, 1968) and other perceived climate scales. The guidelines for item selection were the environmental press categories of Murray (1938) and Stern (1970). The developmental version of the instrument contained 194 items and 12 subscales or press categories; Involvement, Affiliation, Support, Spontaneity, Autonomy, Practicality, Insight, Aggression, Order, Clarity, Submission and Variety. The scale was reduced to 140 items and then finally to the present 90-item subscale form.

The selection of items was guided by the concept of environmental press. Press is defined as the characteristic demands or directional tendencies of an environment; the tendency of an environment to exert an effect on an individual. What press exists is inferred from the
responses of those individuals sharing the correctional environment. All the items are true-false statements. If the statement is generally characteristic of his program he answers "true" and if the statement is generally not characteristic of his program he answers "false".

The items are designed to reveal those characteristics of the correctional environment which exert a press toward clarity, autonomy, expressiveness, support, involvement, etc. A press toward clarity is inferred from the following kinds of items: "If a resident breaks a rule, he knows what will happen to him" and "Residents never know when they will be transferred from this unit". The following kinds of items indicate a press toward autonomy: "Residents are expected to take leadership on the unit," and "Residents were encouraged to be independent". A press toward expressiveness is inferred from items like the following: "Residents are encouraged to show their feelings" and "Residents say anything they want to the counselors."

Administration

There were two administrations of the CIES. Form R (Real Form) was given to both residents (N=10) and Staff (N=8) in the afternoon of June 7. In the evening residents were given Form I (Ideal Form). Staff completed Form I and returned them a few days later. In general the boys were very cooperative and curious about taking the scales.
Two of the boys required a counselor to read the items to them. Of the 15 boys officially living at the home 10 completed both forms. Two boys were in Juvenile Hall at the time of administration, one boy did not want to answer the items, one boy left the same day the CIES was given and one resident was at work at the time of administration.

The time required to complete the items (approximately 20 minutes) was long under the circumstances of completing two forms in one day. This was necessary, however, due to the fact that the home was being sold and the boys were to be informed of this on the day following the testing. I was concerned that with news of the sale and the boys' subsequent dispersement, interest and cooperation levels would drop considerably.

The positive reception of the boys to the questionnaire and their hopeful expectations of what it might accomplish can best be summed up by the statement of one young man upon completion of the forms: "I know what this is for; this is to make the house better to live in."
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Figure 1 (see following page) shows the CIES Form R (Real Form) profiles for both staff and residents as compared to the average score of the normative sample from 28 correctional facilities. This average score is shown in the profile by the straight horizontal line in the center at a standard score of 50. From this profile it is possible to see how residents and staff perceive their facility as compared to the reference group, i.e., above average, average or below average.

On the Relationship dimensions the staff views "The Family Home" as above average in emphasis placed on Involvement and well above average on Support and Expressiveness. Residents do not share staff perceptions in the area of Involvement, viewing it as below average. Emphasis on Involvement is indicated by such items as "Residents put a lot of energy into what they do around here" and "Residents are proud of this unit". Staff and residents are in close agreement over the press toward Expressiveness; both view it as well above average. Statements such as, "Residents are encouraged to show their feelings" and "Residents say anything they want to the counselors" are examples of items indicating a press toward Expressiveness. The largest disparity between staff and residents is in the area of Support. The staff perceives a well above average
Figure 1. Form R Mean Score Profiles for Staff and Residents.

- Involvement
- Support
- Spontaneity
- Autonomy
- Practical Orientation
- Personal Problem Orientation
- Order and Organization
- Clarity
- Control

Staff (N=8)
Residents (N=10)
on Support while residents see Support as being moderately above average. Following are examples of items designed to measure the Support subscales: "Staff have very little time to encourage residents" and "Staff are involved in resident activities."

For the Treatment Program dimensions, the two groups differ slightly in their perceptions of Autonomy and Personal Problem Orientation but in the Practical Orientation subscale there is considerable disagreement. Items indicating a press towards Practical Orientation are illustrated by such statements as: "Residents are encouraged to learn new ways of doing things" and "Staff care more about how residents feel than about their practical problems."

Both groups scored their program above average in Autonomy which is inferred by such items as: "Residents are expected to take leadership on the unit" and "Residents here are encouraged to be independent." Staff and residents also agree on the above average emphasis on Personal Problem Orientation which is revealed by items like the following: "Discussions on the unit emphasize understanding personal problems" and "Staff try to help residents understand themselves."

Staff and residents are in close agreement in their appraisal of the System Maintenance Dimensions. Both groups agree that there is below average emphasis on Staff Control as indicated by such items as: "Residents may
criticize staff members to their faces" and "Residents will
be transferred from this unit if they don't obey the rules".
While staff perceive emphasis on Order and Organization as
slightly above average, residents see it as being slightly
below average. Item examples of this subscale are: "The
day room is often messy" and "Residents' activities are
carefully planned". Program clarity is perceived by both
groups as being above average. Press towards this subscale
is inferred from such items as: "When residents first ar­rive on the unit, someone shows them around and explains
how the unit operates" and "If a resident breaks a rule he
knows what will happen to him".

In summary, staff and residents are in fairly close
agreement over their perceptions of the program as it
exists. However, there is some disagreement on each of the
subscales. Most noticable is the disparity over the extent
to which the residents are encouraged to be helpful and
supportive towards other residents and how much support
residents receive from staff (Support). Other areas of
disparity are Practical Orientation, the extent to which
the program orient residents toward preparing for release
from the program, and Program Clarity, the extent to which
residents know what to expect in day-to-day outline of the
program and how explicit the rules and procedures are.

Figure 2 (see following page) gives the average raw
scores of the CIES Ideal Form profiles for both staff and
Figure 2. Form I Mean Score Profiles For Staff and Residents.
residents and permits a comparison of what each desires as an ideal or most desirable program. In all areas there is agreement over what is desirable as indicated by the parallel lines of the profile. Staff and residents have somewhat parallel desires for an ideal program. As on the Real Form the staff would like to have a somewhat greater emphasis on all dimensions with the exception of Staff Control. The staff might ideally like to have less emphasis on Staff Control than would the residents, but the mean scores on Staff Control are so close, chance might explain this small difference. In general this profile suggests that staff and residents share similar value orientations in regards to what they consider an ideal program.

Figure 3 (see following page) gives the Real-Ideal program discrepancies between the two groups. This profile shows how much change is required in each of the nine subscales for the present program to become an ideal situation for staff and residents. This is accomplished by subtracting the Real CIES scores (Form R) from the Ideal CIES scores (Form I) for staff and residents. Positive numbers indicate a desired increase in that area and negative numbers indicate desired de-emphasis. Where there is no difference between the two scores no change is desired; i.e., there is no discrepancy between Real and Ideal scores. This is the "0" point in Figure 3.
Figure 3. Real-Ideal Program Discrepancies as Perceived by Staff and Residents
Change is desired by both groups in all nine areas presented in Figure 3. In the Relationship dimensions, residents agree with staff over how much change is desired in two of the three subscales. While both desire an increase in emphasis on Expressiveness residents do not desire as much change in that area as does the staff. In the areas of Support and Involvement, residents want a slightly greater increase in emphasis than desired by staff. Both groups want to see substantial change in emphasis on Involvement.

In the Treatment Program Dimensions, the residents want more of an increase in practical orientation than does the staff. For the other two subscales, Autonomy and Personal Problem Orientation, residents desire slightly less change than does staff. Both groups consider the emphasis on Personal Problem Orientation to be fairly close to Ideal, e.i., little change desired.

The areas of least discrepancy are in the System Maintenance Dimensions. Both groups would like to see a significant increase in the emphasis on Order and Organization, with residents desiring slightly more increase than staff. A moderate amount of change is desired by both groups in the area of Program Clarity, residents wanting slightly more clarity. Remarkable though it seems, staff and residents agree perfectly on how much de-emphasis they want in the area of Staff Control.
In summary, both groups are in fairly close agreement over how much change is needed to make the present program an ideal program, as conceptualized by both staff and residents. Both groups would like to see residents much more active and energetic in their day-to-day functioning in the program (Involvement). Residents agree with staff that the program should encourage the open expression of feelings by staff and residents (Expression) more than it presently does, but not to the degree to which staff aspire. Residents want more emphasis on being prepared for the future and working towards goals (Practical Orientation) than does the staff. Both groups urge a substantial increase in Order and Organization in the program and want to de-emphasize Staff Control.

Discussion

The Family Home most closely approximated the Type I or protective home used in the California Treatment Project (Palmer, 1971). The home was similar to a normal, nondisturbed family living as closely as possible and placed high emphasis on Support, Involvement and Expressiveness. It was an open facility and this was reflected in the low emphasis on staff control and high emphasis on autonomy. The staff and residents at the family home are in close agreement over the program as it exists (Form R), as they would like it to be (Form I) and the direction, and in most instances the magnitude, of
change desired to make the present program more consonant with their program ideals (Real-Ideal program discrepancies). The staff followed the general pattern, reported by Moos (1975), of viewing the home more positively than the residents.

The overall agreement of staff and residents is important in that it shows they share a common perception of what is and more importantly what changes they would like to make at the family home. The orientation of this study at the onset was practical, similar to other studies in correctional settings (Wenk and Moos, 1972) and psychiatric settings (Pierce, Trickett and Moos, 1972). One of the potential uses of the CIES is a four step process described by Moos (1975) as: 1) Assessment of environmental factors, 2) Discuss implications for program change, 3) Initiate measures to effect change, 4) re-evaluation after a period of time to determine if change has occurred. Although temporal considerations precluded a post-evaluation it was the intention of the author to carry out the first three steps of the process so that an assessment of the social environment was made, staff and residents could discuss the results and their implications for change and some measures could be taken toward making the program more consonant with staff and resident ideals. The owners and program directors at The Family Home were quite enthusiastic about the project and agreed to try and
effect changes based on the CIES results. This was at a
time when the owners were considering selling the home or
turning it over to someone else to maintain. For 3 years
this small, communal group of young people had been sharing
the burdens of running the family home, with long hours,
monetary and beauracratic difficulties, in addition to the
frustrations and difficulties inherent in working with the
troubled, angry juvenile residents.

The decision to sell the home was made just prior to
the CIES administration. The program directors agreed to
postpone advising the boys of the decision until after the
questionaires were completed. Staff was impressed with the
questionaire items and somewhat chagrined by the fact that
they would not have an opportunity to utilize the results.
The boys were most receptive to the questionaire and hope­
ful about the changes that might come of it. The CIES was
received by the residents as an instrument that dealt with
their situation and could potentially help them. This
reception to the CIES is a testimony to its pertinence in
dealing in a practical way with human environments. This
is important to a group of individuals, like the residents,
who feel they have been "over-tested" at school, in institu­
tions, by psychiatrists, social workers and parole agents.

It is this writer's opinion that the unexpected ending
for this particular study serves to underscore the impor­
tance of an objective environmental assessment technique
which can point to areas of dissonance and provide an opportunity to make changes and create a more effective system. This is suggested by Moos (1972) as a possible application of the Social Climate Scales in general. "Quality control" is an important aspect of any system which is attempting to create certain environmental conditions or have some outcome dependent on those environmental factors which have possibly been inadequately described. This was one of the problems in the Group Home Project (Pearson, 1971). Within the 2½ years the program was in effect four of the seven pairs of group home parents were terminated. Social systems analysis, e.g. CIES, could have been used to provide the project with an opportunity to monitor itself and identify those environmental factors which were areas of disagreement.

With the increased awareness of environmental factors and implementation of person-environment fit approaches as exemplified by the Fricot Ranch Study (Jesness, 1965), the Preston Typology Study (Jesness, 1971), the Community Treatment Project (Palmer, 1973) and the Group Home Project (Pearson, 1970) assessment techniques that measure more than the objective, readily observable environmental factors will have to be utilized. Environmental influences go beyond the objective in dices of census, staff/resident ratio, and open/locked door policies. The CIES goes beyond these indexes and indicates that there is a whole
range of other dimensions which need to be taken into account when describing environments. The CIES measures an aspect of organizational dimensions which fall under the rubric of social-cultural environment, while to some extent assessing the prevailing philosophy and value system.

The CIES can be used as a "quality control" tool to help determine if existing press is consonant with program goals, as a tool for assessing the effect of certain programs on existing social climate and to facilitate and measure attempts at change. Important progress has been made in developing badly needed alternatives to treatment and assessment of salient environmental factors. While this is encouraging, more work must be done in the development of these and other measures aimed at the assessment of social systems which constitute a major aspect of treatment environments.
Summary

The social environment at a group foster home was assessed using Rudolf Moos' Social Climate Scales. The scales are based on the work of Murray (1938) and describe the environment in terms of nine different environmental press categories. Results indicated there was general agreement between staff and residents over the environment as it exists, their ideal version of it and the direction and magnitude of changes desired. The unexpected termination of the home was viewed as evidence of the need for quality control and self monitoring of social systems, assessment techniques that go beyond the readily observable environmental factors. A review of the literature revealed a recent interest in matching techniques in the area of corrections. This is especially true for the California Youth Authority. Implications for improved environmental assessment measures in light of this recent interest were discussed.

Conclusions

The following conclusions seem warranted based on the preceding report:

1) There have been significant changes in the way human behavior is viewed, especially in relation to the importance of the environment in influencing human
behavior.

2) This relatively novel approach to person-environment interaction has had substantial impact in educational industrial and mental health settings and has recently made its way to the area of corrections, especially in California as reflected in the experimental programs or the California Youth Authority.

3) Along with this "new" approach to corrections there arose the need to assess and measure the environment to determine if environmental press is consonant with program goals.

4) Rudolf Moos' Social Climate Scales seem to meet this need and have applicability in a variety of settings. They have practical applicability and are potentially useful in describing environments in terms of the perceptions of the inhabitants and at least by the subjects in this report, are viewed as capable of initiating needed and desired changes.

Recommendations

The findings of this report point to the need for further research in the area of environment assessment. Not only is there a need for the extended utilization of environmental assessment techniques such as Moos' Social Climate Scales, needed also are other assessment techniques which would work in conjunction with existing measures. The areas of human environment and human be-
behavior are complex and intricate and require a variety of data gathering and assessment techniques.

Refinement of existing techniques and development of conjunctive measures may appear to be a banal recommendation but there are more environmental dimensions to be considered than was previously believed and probably still more than is currently realized.
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Appendix A

Correctional Institutions Environment Scale - Form R
1. The residents are proud of this unit.
2. Staff have very little time to encourage residents.
3. Residents are encouraged to show their feelings.
4. The staff act on residents' suggestions.
5. There is very little emphasis on making plans for getting out of here.
6. Residents are expected to share their personal problems with each other.
7. The staff make sure that the unit is always neat.
8. Staff sometimes argue with each other.
9. Once a schedule is arranged for a resident, he must follow it.
10. Residents here really try to improve and get better.
11. Staff are interested in following up residents once they leave.
12. Residents tend to hide their feelings from the staff.
13. Residents are expected to take leadership on the unit.
14. Residents are encouraged to plan for the future.
15. Residents rarely talk about their personal problems with other residents.
16. The day room is often messy.
17. If a resident's program is changed, someone on the staff always tells him why.
18. Residents may criticize staff members to their faces.
19. Residents on this unit care about each other.
20. The staff help new residents get acquainted on the unit.
21. Staff and residents say how they feel about each other.
22. The staff give residents very little responsibility.
23. Residents are encouraged to learn new ways of doing things.
24. Personal problems are openly talked about.
25. The unit usually looks a little messy.
26. When residents first arrive on the unit, someone shows them around and explains how the unit operates.
27. Residents will be transferred from this unit if they don't obey the rules.
28. There is very little group spirit on this unit.
29. The more mature residents on this unit help take care of the less mature ones.
30. People say what they really think around here.
31. Residents have a say about what goes on here.
32. There is very little emphasis on what residents will be doing after they leave the unit.
33. Discussions on the unit emphasize understanding personal problems.
34. This is a very well organized unit.
35. Staff are always changing their minds here.
36. All decisions about the unit are made by the staff and not by the residents.
37. Residents put a lot of energy into what they do around here.
38. Residents rarely help each other.
39. Residents say anything they want to the counselors.
40. The staff discourage criticism.
41. Staff care more about how residents feel than about their practical problems.
42. Staff are mainly interested in learning about residents' feelings.
43. Things are sometimes very disorganized around here.
44. Staff tell residents when they're doing well.
45. The staff very rarely punish residents by restricting them.
46. The unit has very few social activities.
47. Staff go out of their way to help residents.
48. Residents are careful about what they say when staff are around.
49. Staff encourage residents to start their own activities.
50. This unit emphasizes training for new kinds of jobs.
51. Residents are rarely asked personal questions by the staff.
52. Many residents look messy.
53. If a resident breaks a rule, he knows what will happen to him.
54. Staff don't order the residents around.
55. Very few things around here ever get people excited.
56. Staff are involved in resident activities.
57. When residents disagree with each other, they keep it to themselves.
58. Staff rarely give in to resident pressure.
59. Residents here are expected to work toward their goals.
60. The staff discourage talking about sex.
61. Residents' activities are carefully planned.
62. Residents are always changing their minds here.
63. If one resident argues with another, he will get into trouble with the staff.
64. Discussions are pretty interesting on this unit.
65. Counselors have very little time to encourage residents.
66. It is hard to tell how residents are feeling on this unit.
67. Residents here are encouraged to be independent.
68. New treatment approaches are often tried on this unit.
69. Staff try to help residents understand themselves.
70. Counselors sometimes don't show up for their appointments with residents.
71. Residents never know when a counselor will ask to see them.
72. The unit staff regularly check up on the residents.
73. Residents don’t do anything around here unless the staff ask them to.
74. Staff encourage group activities among residents.
75. On this unit staff think it is a healthy thing to argue.
76. There is no resident government on this unit.
77. Residents must make plans before leaving the unit.
78. Residents hardly ever discuss their sexual lives.
79. The staff set an example for neatness and orderliness.
80. Residents never know when they will be transferred from this unit.
81. Residents can call staff by their first names.
82. This is a friendly unit.
83. The staff know what the residents want.
84. Residents on this unit rarely argue.
85. Residents are encouraged to make their own decisions.
86. There is very little emphasis on making residents more practical.
87. Residents cannot openly discuss their personal problems here.
88. Residents are rarely kept waiting when they have appointments with the staff.
89. The residents know when counselors will be on the unit.
90. The staff do not tolerate sexual behavior by residents.
Appendix B

 Correctional Institutions Environment Scale - Form I
1. The residents will be proud of the unit.
2. Staff will have very little time to encourage residents.
3. Residents will be encouraged to show their feelings.
4. The staff will act on residents' suggestions.
5. There will be very little emphasis on making plans for getting out of here.
6. Residents will be expected to share their personal problems with each other.
7. The staff will make sure that the unit is always neat.
8. Staff will sometimes argue with each other.
9. Once a schedule is arranged for a resident, he will have to follow it.
10. Residents will really try to improve and get better.
11. Staff will be interested in following up residents once they leave.
12. Residents will tend to hide their feelings from the staff.
13. Residents will be expected to take leadership on the unit.
14. Residents will be encouraged to plan for the future.
15. Residents will rarely talk about their personal problems with other residents.
16. The day room will often be messy.
17. If a resident's program is changed, someone on the staff will always tell him why.
18. Residents will criticize staff members to their faces.
19. Residents on the unit will care about each other.
20. The staff will help new residents get acquainted on the unit.
21. Staff and residents will say how they feel about each other.
22. The staff will give residents very little responsibility.
23. Residents will be encouraged to learn new ways of doing things.
24. Personal problems will be openly talked about.
25. The unit will usually look a little messy.
26. When residents first arrive on the unit, someone will show them around and explain how the unit operates.
27. Residents will be transferred from the unit if they don't obey the rules.
28. There will be very little group spirit on the unit.
29. The more mature residents on the unit will help take care of the less mature ones.
30. People will say what they really think.
31. Residents will have a say about what goes on.
32. There will be very little emphasis on what residents will be doing after they leave the unit.
33. Discussions on the unit will emphasize understanding personal problems.
34. It will be a very well organized unit.
35. Staff will always be changing their minds.
36. All decisions about the unit will be made by the staff and not by the residents.
37. Residents will put a lot of energy into what they do.
38. Residents will rarely help each other.
39. Residents will be able to say anything they want to the counselors.
40. The staff will discourage criticism.
41. Staff will care more about how residents feel than about their practical problems.
42. Staff will be mainly interested in learning about residents' feelings.
43. Things will sometimes be very disorganized.
44. Staff will tell residents when they're doing well.
45. The staff will very rarely punish residents by restricting them.
46. The unit will have very few social activities.
47. Staff will go out of their way to help residents.
48. Residents will be careful about what they say when staff are around.
49. Staff will encourage residents to start their own activities.
50. The unit will emphasize training for new kinds of jobs.
51. Residents will rarely be asked personal questions by the staff.
52. Many residents will look messy.
53. If a resident breaks a rule, he will know what will happen to him.
54. Staff won't order the residents around.
55. Very few things will ever get people excited.
56. Staff will be involved in resident activities.
57. If residents disagree with each other, they will keep it to themselves.
58. Staff will rarely give in to resident pressure.
59. Residents will be expected to work toward their goals.
60. The staff will discourage talking about sex.
61. Residents' activities will be carefully planned.
62. Residents will often change their minds.
63. If one resident argues with another, he will get into trouble with the staff.
64. Discussions will be pretty interesting on the unit.
65. Counselors will have very little time to encourage residents.
66. It will be hard to tell how residents are feeling on this unit.
67. Residents will be encouraged to be independent.
68. New treatment approaches will often be tried on the unit.
69. Staff will try to help residents understand themselves.
70. Counselors sometimes won't show up for their appointments with residents.
71. Residents will never know when a counselor will ask to see them.
72. The unit staff will regularly check up on the residents.
73. Residents won't do anything unless the staff ask them to.
74. Staff will encourage group activities among residents.
75. Staff will think it is a healthy thing to argue.
76. There will be no resident government on the unit.
77. Residents will have to make plans before leaving the unit.
78. Residents will hardly ever discuss their sexual lives.
79. The staff will set an example for neatness and orderliness.
80. Residents will never know when they will be transferred from the unit.
81. Residents will call staff by their first names.
82. It will be a friendly unit.
83. The staff will know what the residents want.
84. Residents on the unit will rarely argue.
85. Residents will be encouraged to make their own decisions.
86. There will be very little emphasis on making residents more practical.
87. Residents will not be able to discuss their personal problems there.
88. Residents will rarely be kept waiting when they have appointments with the staff.
89. The residents will know when counselors will be on the unit.
90. The staff will not tolerate sexual behavior by residents.