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ABSTRACT

An Analysis of the Effectiveness of a Behavior Modification Program on Adolescents Leaving a Residential Care Facility

By Tiffany North

May, 2003

This mixed methodology design uses two methods (qualitative and quantitative) to study, describe, examine, and analyze the effectiveness of the Teaching Family Model, a token economy teaching method, on male adolescents leaving care, in regards to behavior and self-esteem. The convenient sample consisted of ten male adolescents living in Florida.

The researcher used the Self-Evaluation Scale Form A (Cautela et al, 1983) to determine the level on each of its seven domains (body image, perception of own learning, others' perception, adaptive functioning, self-worth, self confidence, and social skills). The results of this scale for each participant were analyzed and compared. The analysis included a correlational analysis identifying significant relationships between the domains.

The researcher used an audio-recorded interview of each participant. Each participant was asked 17 questions about their demographic information, including housing, employment and academics, level of self-esteem, level and time on motivational system, length of time at facility, Family Teacher contact, and behaviors. Each participant described their current status and what they liked or disliked about the home in regards to the components of the model. The
components consisted of: a token economy motivation system wherein youth earn points and exchange them for privileges, a self government system that allows youths to participate in development of the rules and structure of their daily life, a focus on teaching social skills from a standardized social skills curriculum, an emphasis on normalization, and a continuous evaluation system, part of which involves the youth evaluating the teaching family couple. (Friman, 1999).

The analysis included a within case and across case identifying common threads in regards to their current status and the components of the model. The responses to these questions were compared with the results of the Self Evaluation Scale Form A (Cautela et al, 1983).

All of the participants report an increase in social skill use and self-esteem. One respondent reported an increase in aggression which was not an original behavior to work on. All of the respondent reported a moderate to high level of self-esteem. The model is effective on social skills and self-esteem; however there are deficits in relationship skills as reported by the respondents. All of the respondents are acclimated in their communities through the financial support from their employment, relatives, or government subsidiaries. There was corroboration between the Self Evaluation Scale Form A and self report data from the interviews. Four of the respondents also did not graduate from high school. Because there are factors that affect the success of this model, it is important that studies be conducted which contribute to the understanding of the overall effectiveness of this model.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

More than half a million children are in out-of-home placement in the United States with the numbers steadily increasing. Residential care placement is an "expanding mode of care" for these children due to the increased number of children coming into care, especially when they are adolescent, emotionally disturbed, and/or delinquent (Chamberlain & Friman 1997; Friman 1996, & Friman, Osgood et al., 1996).

Residential treatment is one component in the continuum of services that are offered to families who are unable to successfully and appropriately deal with their children's behavior in the home; some of the others offered consist of: foster care, emergency shelter services, in home services, independent living, relative care, and adoption. Residential care is the most restrictive and expensive form of service, costing $100-$300 per day (Landsman et al, 2001).

According to the Child Welfare League Association (1982), group care services are described as child welfare services providing 24-hour care for children in residential facilities, which are environmentally therapeutic. This definition has not changed to date. "Within this setting are integrated treatment services, educational services, and group living on the basis of an individual plan for each child who cannot be effectively helped in his or her own home, (or) with a substitute family" (p.29).

Throughout history there has been concern about youth in care, or in institutions, dating back to the mid nineteenth century (Whittaker, 2000). This
has included big institution style-like programs with many children, few staff, and multiple and repeated threats to the child’s health and well being (Chamberlain & Friman 1997; Friman 1996, & Friman, Osgood et al., 1996).

“Contemporary psychotherapeutic residential treatment has tried to cope with the sociological conceptualization via semantic changes” (Cohen, 1998) (p.121). The term “institution” went through several metamorphoses as it gradually changed into residential treatment. With this change, the definition of the worker was also changed to avoid negative connotations (Cohen, 1998). A residential treatment center “is not merely an alternative facility for those children who, for socioeconomic or other reasons, lack the proper conditions for normal development” (Cohen, 1998).

Throughout the first half of the nineteenth century, the number of orphanages grew substantially. Every epidemic created orphans and new orphanage efforts. The Civil War also greatly expanded the demand for orphanages which also resulted in a change of the characteristics of these children (Olasky, 1996).

In a study conducted by McKenzie (2002), orphans were interviewed and their mean length of stay was nine years. Some, and not all, of the reasons they were sent to these orphanages consisted of physical abuse (10%), mental health concerns (9%), and sexual abuse (5%).

Cohen (1998) proposes a taxonomy of children who require residential treatment:
- Children who exhibit great difficulty in detaching themselves from an objectively distorted relationship with primary “care taking” figures or with objects and values that have come to represent them.

- Children who have difficulty in forming intimate relationships.

- Children who cannot perceive themselves or others well and who show minimal self reflectiveness or “insight.”

- Children who exert no control over their impulses, especially their verbal and motoric aggressiveness (p. 128)

As the numbers of youth coming into care increased, so did the need for services and quality services to impact behavior. Barnes (1993) claims that the goal of residential care is to provide a “structured environment” and an “integration of services” that include education, leisure activities, developing skills, and nurturing care.

In the University of South Florida’s Health Care Reform Tracking Project: 1999 Impact Analysis, it is predicted that an increased number of adolescents coming into care will lead to fewer residential treatment beds being available. In addition, there will be long waiting lists for residential treatment, and difficulty in obtaining longer term residential treatment even when it is judged to be clinically appropriate.

At the end of 1993, there were approximately 450,000 children living in out of home care, the greatest number since the mid 1970’s, with 25% of that being in residential group care facilities (US General Accounting Office 1995a;
USDHHS, 1997; Friman, 1999). By 1994 the median age of children in care in 20 states was 8.7 years, with males representing 51% of children and females representing 49%. Of those in care, 47% were African American (non Hispanic); 32% were Caucasian (non Hispanic); 14% were Hispanic; 6% from unknown racial or ethnic backgrounds, and less than 1% each were Asian/Pacific Islander and American Indian (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1996).

In 1990, more than 50% of children entered out-of-home care because of abuse and neglect. From this, 21% entered due to a condition of a parent, 12.5% entered care for other reasons, 11% was due to delinquency or the commission of a status offense, 2.4% entered care for unknown reasons, approximately 2% entered care due to a child’s disability, and less than 1% entered care following "relinquishment" by parents (Tatara, 1993).

According to the Florida Department of Children and Families (2002), there were 198,489 calls to the Abuse Hotline that met statutory criteria, suspected abuse or neglect, for initiating a child abuse and neglect investigation. Out of these calls, 31,398 children received out of home care or were placed in out of home care. In Florida in 2000-2001, 3,124 parents lost their parental rights forcing their children into care for a variety of reasons, including substance abuse, parenting concerns, and abandonment. Another referral source is that of youth requiring mental health services. In residential mental health services, youth receive case management, mental health treatment, and also transitional services when discharged. In this classification there are four levels of care with varying degrees of care and restrictions. The least restrictive level of care is
Level 4 which consists of residential services, 24 hour supervision, yet unsupervised access to the community; Level 3 is a moderate risk (to public safety) residential placement still requiring 24 hour supervision but with greater restrictions in a secured facility. Level 2 is high risk and requires close supervision such as a “locked down” facility and there is no access to the community. The most restrictive level of care is Level 1, which is a maximum risk facility with each person having his or her own secured room. Level 1 is reserved for committers of violent crimes. (Florida Department of Children and Families, 2002). In addition, youth can be court ordered if the placement is appropriate, or can be sent to a facility until they become competent to stand trial (Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, 2002).

Out of this need for appropriate placement came a desire for a concept of care involving operationalizing target performances for the youth and providing direct teaching- instruction and consequences- for relevant performance. Included in this is a token economy or a point system. There were not many programs that fit this need. Some of the programs available were behaviorally oriented or family style, but not both. This resulted in the family style environment, based on the Teaching Family Model (Friman, 1999).
Statement of the Problem

One of the most important concerns about residential care is its effect on the youth in its care. In the White House Conference on Children in 1909 and 1919, the issue of youth in out of home placement was first addressed. This effort was carried out in collaboration with Charles Loring Brace, a reformer. Mr. Brace was dutifully committed to developing an alternate system of placing children in out of home placements where they might be "rescued" from their institutional confines or from the dangers of the city streets and given a wholesome and healthy new life (Bremner, 1970).

By the mid twentieth century, less than 10% of children in group care settings fit the description of “true orphans.” By far, the greatest proportions of purely dependent children were being served in family foster care, a reversal from the beginning of the century (Whittaker, 2000). Group care settings were left to the behest of specialists to develop "specialized treatment programs" for children with conduct problems and/or emotional disturbances in which family foster care was not beneficial (Whittaker, 2000).

In 1967, Judge Charles Rankin, a juvenile court judge in Lawrence, Kansas, decided his community needed a new program for the youth. He came to the realization that he was doing an injustice by sending all boys who came before him to large institutions, such as the Kansas Boys Industrial School, due to the abuse, expense and ineffectiveness of these institutions (Wolf et al, 1995). This effort was further supported by research which in Massachusetts forced Jerome Miller, the Director of Youth Services to release “virtually all
institutionalized juvenile offenders" due to all the cases of abuse in their state
reform schools (Bakal, 1973; Ohlin, Coates, & Miller, 1974).

In *Morales v. Turman*, (1973), a federal judge closed a state reform school
in Texas, due to abuse, and prohibited the state from placing youth in that facility
ever again. The characteristics of a daily life in this institution were "monotony
and regimentation." In the institution, rooms were like cells and there was limited
time for socialization if any, as youth were confined to their rooms. These court
cases have brought national attention to many child care problems and "raised
the level of social awareness regarding the need for better, more humane
treatment" (Fixsen et al. 1981).

Even at the national level these institutions were criticized by the
Presidential Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice
(1967) for being "inhumane, ineffective, and expensive, and recommended that
community-based alternatives be tried." The late Morris Fritz Mayer, a leading
advocate for high quality residential services, coined the term *pariah care* in
response to the growing concern of group care programs for troubled youth.
(Mayer, 1975; Whittaker, J.K., & Pfeiffer, S.I., 1994; Whittaker, 2000). Mayers
wanted to describe "both the marginalization and the stigmatization of acting out
youths and the group services designed to meet their needs." (Whittaker, 2000).
His view reflected the frustration at the "field’s inability to raise the level of
discourse about group care." (Whittaker, 2000).

Before further reform took place, there was a consensus that residential
facilities were being set up to fail. This consensus was reflected by Fixsen et al. (1981) as they:

... built institutions that are more or less isolated from normal social monitoring or control, either because of physical isolation in rural areas or social isolation via imposing structures, fences, or lack of outside people coming through. Next, we collect a large number of youths who, for one reason or another, have been banned from their homes because of their misbehavior or their inadequate home life. Then we add staff who are often recruited from the area near the institution, and, with little preparation, ask them to “help the children.” Next we hire professionals to make treatment policy, supervise staff, monitor progress of youths, establish budgets, write reports, and carry on the myriad tasks required to operate an institution. And we ask the professionals to do this “in their own way” based on their experience and expertise (p. 87).

Due to the efforts of Judge Rankins in 1967, a program development mission was defined, developing a community based group home program for troubled youth that would be an alternative to the Kansas Boys Industrial School (Wolf et al, 1995). Out of this initiative, the Teaching Family group home treatment approach, originally designed for delinquent teenagers, was created at The Achievement Place, a boy's group home in Lawrence, Kansas (Braukmann et al, 1984).
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the behavior modification program of a well-known residential facility employing an adapted version of the Teaching Family Model. In looking at residential care, behaviorally-orientated family-style programs for youth were studied. These residents own families were untenable, and were either unsuitable for foster care or had no foster care options.

In designing the evaluation, the literature on one of the best practices for behavior modification in residential care was analyzed. The first goal was to identify one of the existing best practices in residential care which was the Teaching Family Model. The second goal was to examine how the residential program of the ten youth in the study compared with those of established best practices. And finally, the characteristics of the program will be studied to determine how they affect adolescents in care.

The overall goal for this study is to determine the effectiveness of the Teaching Family Model on adolescents coming out of residential care.
Research Questions

1. How effective is the Teaching Family Model on reducing the negative behaviors of residential children coming out of care?

   1a. How has their behavior changed since exiting the program?

2. What is the effect of the Teacher Family Model on self-esteem and social skills?

   2a. What sustainable relationships have been formed?

   2b. How are the needs of the individuals met in their community?

   2c. What is their level of self-esteem?
Significance for the study

Not enough is known about residential treatment programs to provide a clear and concise picture of “which kinds of treatment approaches work best or about the effectiveness of the treatment over the long term. (N)o consensus exists on which youths are best served in residential care....or on how residential care should be combined with community based care to serve at risk youths over time” (USGAO 1994). Following the prior consensus of the 1920"s, the Child Welfare League of America and other groups, emphasize the quality of links between the “child, the residential setting, and the family” (Braziel 1996: CWLA 1990).

It is very difficult to compare treatment strategies in residential programs. Some studies rely on self report data (Bale, 1979: Reed, 1978) or retrospective data with no reporting baseline (Velasquez & Lyle, 1985). The criteria for judging the success of youth’s outcomes is poorly defined and lacks standardization (Beschner & Friedman, 1985: Curry, 1991: Durkin & Durkin, 1975: Lewis and Summerville, 1991).

Due to the complexity of different behavioral treatments, the ethical drawbacks to random assignment, “the tendency of client groups to be small and heterogeneous, and the considerable latitude given to front-line staff” in applying the treatment planned research has been discouraged. One of the greatest obstacles to research has been that it is only recently that front-line staffs have begun to see themselves as skilled professionals providing treatment that can be evaluated (Whittaker, 2000).
Social historians, such as Rothman (1980), believe that institutions are un-reformable and as a result of this, research for at least the last twenty-five years has been off limits to serious inquiry (Whittaker, 2000). As a result of this, many tragedies have taken place. In the late 1980's, a major division of the American Psychological Association commissioned and then declined to publish a thoughtful, balanced, and substantive report on the state of the art in residential treatment, presumably because it might in some way be promoting residential treatment. The US Children's Bureau, long a beacon for standard setting for the children's field, focused only on group care services during the late 1970s and 1980s when, by contrast, an impressive network of regional and national centers was created around adoption services, child abuse and neglect, and in home services. (Whittaker, 2000).

In addition, the National Institute of Mental Health did give support in the early 1970s for the development of a model group home program, called Achievement Place, but has since redirected its attention to developing community-based systems of care. In comparison to the 1950's, when Fritz-Redl (1966) developed a laboratory model for residential treatment in Bethesda, Maryland, and in the early 1960's, when Hobbs developed Project Re-Ed (1982), in part with the support of NIMH support. There has also been a negative stereotype surrounding residential services due to the lack of hard indicators of successful long term outcomes to inadequately developed models of residential group treatment, to high unit-service costs (Pecora et al., 1992).
Research has also been limited due to a lack of adequate funding for pilot testing of new residential models, as in the case of Project Re-Ed and the Teaching Family Model. This is in contrast to the exhaustive research on other services, such as family preservation and treatment foster care (Whittaker, J.K. & Pfeiffer, S.I., 1994). Further research needs to be conducted on the success rate of residential facilities and treatment programs as the "evidence on the effectiveness of group child care is inconclusive at this time" (Whittaker, J.K. & Pfeiffer, S.I., 1994).

The existing research shows that there were several variables in relation to successful residential treatment programs. These included a supportive post discharge environment and a "non-psychotic and reactive symptology" (Whittaker, J.K. & Pfeiffer, S.I. 1994).
DEFINITION OF TERMS

Behavior is a response or an action. It is what people do and the way that people respond.

Behavior Analysis is the scientific study of behavior. It emphasizes careful measurement of observed behavior, along with an appreciation of the role of environment immediately before and after the response.

Behavior management is the conscientious and active management of the behavior and the environment and antecedents to prevent the occurrence of the problem.

Behavior modification are techniques that can be used to modify a student’s behavior such as token economy, punishment, and others.

Consequences are the conditions which follow the occurrence of a behavior that have a powerful influence on behavior, since a change in the consequence of a behavior typically results in a change in behavior.

Contingency contracts is a tool, which states if x happens then y happens.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

Best Practices using the Teaching Family Model

The Teaching Family group home treatment approach was created in Lawrence, Kansas at Achievement Place, a boys group home in 1967 (Braukmann et al, 1984). This approach was originally designed for delinquent teenagers, and has also been adapted to serve autistic children (McClannahan, Krantz, McGee, & MacDuff, in press), and retarded adults (Sherman, Sheldon, Morris, Strouse, & Resse, in press).

This model incorporated a set of teaching parents (a married couple) living in a family style home in a community. Each home averages six young people between the ages of 12-17 years of age, with the average length of treatment at 10 months (Braukmann et al, 1984).

The goal of this treatment approach was to develop mutually rewarding relationships between the teaching parents and the youth. Research suggested (Braukmann et al, 1980) that delinquent behavior is decreased by increasing positive reinforcement, as well as “such relationships are thought to facilitate the teaching parents” teaching (Braukmann et al, 1984). The teaching family approach engulfs “various teaching procedures and a flexible, individualized, token economy motivational system, along with a self government system where the youths are involved both in deciding what to do and in the teaching itself” (Braukmann et al, 1984) (see Appendix A).
Within this original model, token economies are used which are points that are earned for specific appropriate behaviors and lost for inappropriate behaviors. A token economy is a behavioral therapy technique in which the desired change is achieved by means of tokens administered for the performance of predefined behaviors according to a program. These points are written on a point card (3 by 5-inch index card) which is carried with the youth. At the end of the day the total number of negative points are subtracted from the total number of positive points and the “resulting point difference” is used to buy privileges for the following day or accumulated for the end of the week (Phillips et al, 1971).

Within the Teaching Family Model there was originally only one point system which was weekly, in which points were accumulated for the week and privileges were bought for the week. In this scenario, the youth were not motivated and were not earning enough points. To help remedy this, even though a youth might have bought his privileges for the day he had to earn additional points (1500) to use them. Another change was that the weekly point system might be too difficult for a new youth or a lower functioning youth, and thus the daily point system was introduced. With the daily point system, the point difference at the end of the day was used to buy points for the next day (Phillips et al, 1971).

Many facilities using this model incorporate a set of guidelines for their admission process. In a residential program the criteria selection is often very vague and is inconsistent. Three factors, however, are forefront: characteristics
of youth; available resources within family; and type, quality, and availability of alternative resources (Apsler and Bassuk 1983; Wells 1991).

Lane (1993) lists eight needs that serve as positive indications for referring youth to a residential treatment facility. These are: "socializing, peers, personal space, independence, interdependence, specific activities involving residence, alternative or additional culture, and close supervision or control" (p.109).

In a typical admission procedure for a residential facility, initial inquiries come from many sources: relatives, friends, schools, clergy, juvenile courts, and social service agencies. When the actual procedure for application begins, however, it is usually required that a professional family counselor, a social service agency, or a juvenile court/probation office coordinates the procedure. This provides unbiased and objective information to work from in making a decision, and is a requirement to make certain that a child does not leave his or her home area until all local resources have been exhausted (Whittaker et al, 2000).

Depending on the referral source and admission criteria, i.e. parents, state, court and others the funding source varies. Residential programs usually have some type of admission criteria, which excluded youth who are considered inappropriate for care. Children in residential treatment are usually, "clients of all or most of the major children’s service systems (child welfare, juvenile justice, mental health)" (Whittaker et al, 2000).
The initial step in seeking application to a residential program is for the family counseling or social service agency, or the juvenile court to send referral information to the admission department. The information should include the following: a descriptive social history, pertinent school information, clinical psychological evaluation, and a handwritten letter from the youth (Girls and Boys Town admission procedures 2002).

The social history is prepared by a social service, mental health, or family counseling agency, or a juvenile court (if the child is on probation). The social history should be current, descriptive, and comprehensive, and should include: the reason for referral (including a relevant history of problems, reason for long-term placement being sought, anticipated length of stay, and current place of residence); legal custody and planning responsibility; family background (parent's marital history, interpersonal relationships in family, economic, cultural, social, health, financial, religious, and other factors, past history and presence/absence of alcoholism and/or drug use, suicide attempts, criminal behavior (i.e., felony) (Girls and Boys Town admission procedures 2002).

If the youth is currently in a placement, descriptive information regarding the youth's adjustment should be included: social functioning (a descriptive explanation of the youth's behavior, personality, recreational/vocational interests, peer and social relationships and strengths and weaknesses, and how they apply to the youth's day-to-day functioning at home and in the community); sexual development, history of sexual activity, history of sexual abuse, and other sexually related problems, significant medical, dental, and nutritional issues,
presence/absence of psychiatric conditions (e.g., history of psychotropic medications, record of past or present treatment), presence/absence of substance abuse, presence/absence of suicidal behavior, and presence/absence of delinquent behavior; and school history (Girls and Boys Town admission procedures, 2002).

A clinical psychological evaluation (administered within the past 12 months) is a necessary part of the application process. This evaluation should include: any individual administered intelligence test, any individually administered achievement test, and one or more personality tests. In addition, a mental status examination is required. The examination should include a description of appearance; behavior; speech; mood; affect; sexual perceptions; thought process; thought content; and cognitive functioning (Girls and Boys Town admission procedures, 2002).

Once all of the material is submitted, the Admissions Committee evaluates the information and determines whether the applicant meets the Admission Guidelines and whether the program can help them. This entire process can take anywhere from two weeks to two months, depending on when the referral agency gets all the necessary documents. After the Admissions Committee makes its decision, the referring agency/court is notified in writing. If the decision is to deny admission, alternative suggestions are provided, when appropriate. If the decision is to accept the youth, the agency/court receives a tentative acceptance letter and the Phase II admissions forms. Also, a request for a pre-admission interview for certain youth from the immediate area may be
requested. An Admission’s Coordinator will have telephone contact with each youth prior to making a final decision. This gives the youth an opportunity to ask questions (Girls and Boys Town admissions procedures, 2002).

For Phase II, the following items are required: documents that describe the legal status of the youth, including orders of temporary or permanent custody, as well as any court order of probation, parole, or continuance of a case; the youth’s original birth certificate or a certified copy of the certificate; all religious certificates, particularly the baptismal certificate; current or most recent school grades. For high school students, a complete transcript is necessary before admission; the youth’s Social Security card; and Interstate Compact approval, is necessary if youth is coming across state lines (Girls and Boys Town admission procedures, 2002).

Once all of the required material is returned to the Admissions Department, the third and final phase of the admission procedure begins. Phase III involves a Family-Teacher couple or Clinical Director contacting the agency worker, probation officer, and/or parent by phone to arrange an admission date. In summary, the admission process is a thorough, comprehensive process with decisions regarding a youth being made only after the necessary information is received and reviewed (Girls and Boys Town admission procedures, 2002). The Admission criterion is an extensive exercise requiring a face-to-face interview with the child and referral person once the child is accepted. (Girls and Boys Town admission procedures, 2002).
The Teaching Family model (TFM) became to be known as such because the adolescents lived in a house with two “teaching parents” and the “social structures and activities were like those of a family” (Sarafino, 1996). The TF model, which was referred to as the “Achievement Place model” is a residential service delivery system based in group homes that each care for six to eight troubled adolescents (Maloney et al, 1983).

The Teaching Family Model is used by many organizations both in its entirety in at least 22 programs across the country, with the Boys Town Family Home Program in Omaha, Nebraska (FHP) being the largest (Coughlin & Shanahan, 1991); and in at least 100 programs using a modified version. The model itself consists of the following components:

- A token economy motivation system wherein youth earn points and exchange them for privileges
- A self government system that allows youth to participate in development of the rules and structure of their daily life
- A focus on teaching social skills from a standardized social skills curriculum
- An emphasis on normalization
- A continuous evaluation system, part of which involves the youth evaluating the teaching family couple. (Friman, 1999).

Token economies require planning and implementation, along with a higher level of commitment, time and skill. They are only used when less
In planning a token economy system, target behaviors must be identified. In addition, reinforcers must be selected and must be specific. Token types and schedules must be identified; the token economy system must be initiated and implemented, along with planning inflation” (Myles et al, 1992).

In identifying target behaviors there are usually three different categories. There are behaviors that need to be decreased, behaviors that need to be increased, and behaviors that need to be maintained. Target behaviors should be observable, countable, and measurable, and applicable across settings (Myles et al, 1992).

Bandura (1969) identified three sets of variables that were involved in effective implementation of a reinforcement principle. These consisted of: maintenance and sustainability of responsiveness; reinforcing events contingent upon occurrences of desired behavior; and methods to teach that are consistent and strong to establish positive reinforcement.

“Reward systems can only be as effective as the selection of appropriate reinforcers,” and youth must want to earn the reinforcers (Myles et al, 1992). These reinforcers should be individualized and available at different times and levels. The token system used should be easily managed and inexpensive. Youth should know the system as well as their target behaviors. Finally, fading is appropriate in which the youth is moved to self reinforcement, and where token values are decreased and some reinforcement selections are removed. An
effective token system reduces the inappropriate target behaviors and increases or maintains the youth's behavior that supports a behaviorally sound environment (Myles et al, 1992).

There are many advantages to using a token economy system. These advantages include:

- It allows the consequation of any response at any time
- It bridges the delay between target responses and backup reinforcers
- It can maintain performance over extended periods of time when the backup reinforcers cannot be administered
- It allows sequences of responses to be reinforced without interruption
- The reinforcing effects of tokens are relatively independent of deprivation states and less subject to satiation effects
- It allows the use of the same reinforcer for subjects with preferences for different backup reinforcers (Hersen et al 1975) (p. 65)

According to Alvord (1973), for a token economy system to be successful certain rules must come into play. These rules include:

- No "millionaires": a child should not accumulate more tokens that can be spent in a short time.
- No credit: pay as you go
- No bankruptcy: must work themselves out of debt before using any privileges
- Immediate delivery and withdrawal of tokens
- Strong fines
- No arbitrary fines used for punishment
- No leniency
- Use frequently occurring behaviors
- Probability of behavior
- When possible, use as privileges events that are not time locked (p.109-110).

Another important aspect of this adapted model is the self-government component, which allows youth to share in the responsibility of the program operation. Fixsen, Phillips, and Wolf (1973) elaborate that “many youths and adults in correctional settings develop an “informal type of self-government dependent upon group coercion and punishment that often is more severe than that allowed by formal rules” (p.31).

A major component of this approach is the training which all new employees must go through. This is a yearlong, pre service, and in-service “education sequences” that are composed of “skill -focused workshops, ongoing treatment consultation, and systematic performance feedback” (Braukmann et al, 1975). Currently there are six regional training sites serving over 170 group homes in the United States (Collins, Maloney & Collins, 1981). The ongoing quality control of these sites and homes are governed through a recently developed national organization, the National Teaching Family Association (see Appendix) (Braukmann et al, 1984).
Training is very important, as it helps to eliminate any inappropriate boundaries that may occur, as well as the fact that all staff members are trained in the same way with the same information (Zirkle et al, 2002). The training is a yearlong training “with a pre-service and in-service education sequence composed of skill focused workshops, ongoing treatment consultation, and systematic feedback” (Braukmann et al, 1975).

The training begins with a weeklong workshop which is the first intensive exposure to this approach. This first workshop “provides instruction in the requisites for directing and administering a group home treatment program, including procedures for teaching youths new skills; strategies for relationship building; techniques for motivating youths to learn and change behavior; steps in developing a self government system; techniques for working with parents and teachers; guidelines for adhering to ethical and legal criteria; skills for developing positive, professional relationship with community agencies; and skills in organizing and managing the overall program. These workshops include oral instruction; rationale use and they provide instructions with emphasis on feedback” (Braukmann et al, 1984, p.57-60).

The Teaching Family Parents implement their training in the residential homes, and with constant evaluation at 6 months, a year, and every year following that, to determine progress. Another important component of this model is the feedback or evaluation which is “integral to the treatment program.” The Teaching Family model is defined operationally so to allow for easier evaluation,
as well as the administrative staff for evaluation exists at all administrative levels (Braukmann et al, 1975).

The staff evaluation begins when the couple is undergoing training and continues throughout. The primary use of evaluation data is at the individual home level, where the teaching parents use the results to make decisions about the ways in which they can improve their program and enhance their professional development (Braukmann et al, 1975).

With this model, social skill teaching is essential as it allows us to “continuously and intensely monitor, prompt, and give negative feedback to the youths in a way that would not evoke counter control or running away” (Wolf et al, 1995). The Teaching Interaction Elements in the Teaching Family Handbook (Phillips et al, 1974) are defined below:
The Teaching Interaction Elements

1. Expression of affection (a smile, special greeting, joke, appropriate physical contact).

2. Praise for what has been accomplished.

3. Description of the inappropriate behavior.

4. Description of the appropriate behavior. (a demonstration may be necessary).

5. Rationale of the appropriate behavior.

6. Description of the present consequences.

7. Request for acknowledgment.

8. Practice.

9. Feedback during the practice: Praise and correction.

10. Reward: Praise and points. (p.35-36)
The teaching interaction is the “active ingredient” in any Teaching-Family treatment program (Fixsen & Blasé, 2002).

Within the token economy system is the motivation system, which is part of the teaching process (see Appendix B). The youth in care have many privileges that they can choose from, depending on which system the youth is on (see Appendix C). The privileges are the real reinforcers for the youth and the points are the medium of exchange (Coughlin & Shanahan, 1991).

The Motivation System is very important in the teaching process, as it provides structure for the youth and this structure is eventually faded out to encourage greater independence by the youth. Eventually the “youth must maintain his or her good behavior with only the usual, natural consequences that are available to them” (Coughlin & Shanahan, 1991).

For a motivation system to work effectively for the youth, certain factors must come into play. Privileges must be contingent on behavior; privileges must be earned to be effective. All teaching and privileges should be individualized for each youth as the more important the event is to the youth the more effective the teaching and privileges will be as there is more “buy in” from the youth. A motivation system should not be used alone but should be incorporated into the teaching and used along with behavior principles, as it helps this process. In addition, the youth should be very familiar with the motivation system and should also lose privileges as they need to know that they will not always be “bailed out” (Coughlin & Shanahan, 1991).
A new youth entering this residential program will start on the daily motivation system with a set number of points to work off, usually 300,000, and having 15-18 teaching interactions per day, which involves him/her earning and losing points contingent on their behavior within a 24 hour period which can be used to purchase privileges for the next day. This system allows the youth to learn the connection between behavior, earning and losing points, and exchanging points for privileges (Coughlin & Shanahan, 1991).

After advancing through the daily point system, whether it is through working off the original points or working off additional points due to their behavior, the youth goes to the weekly system. This system is very similar to the daily point system, except the youth has to earn points over a seven-day period and has 8-12 teaching interactions per day. On this system “the immediacy of point exchanges for privileges is reduced as the treatment focus shifts to more difficult and longer-term behaviors” (Coughlin & Shanahan, 1991).

Lastly, a youth graduates to the Achievement system where their daily privileges are earned without points and “greater independence is expected and granted.” This is the time for the youth to “learn to deal with greater ambiguity, achieve greater independence,” and prepare for his/her return to the “outside world.” An extension of the achievement system is that of natural and logical in which the youth is no longer on a point card and consequences are naturally occurring. (Coughlin & Shanahan, 1991).

An additional specialized system is the subsystem, the most intense teaching system, with about 20 to 25 interactions per day. This specialized
system is used for serious behavior problems, such as property destruction, law violations, and physical injury to others. The goal of the Family Teacher is to teach alternative behaviors "as quickly as possible so that the youth won't be in a similar situation again. A youth on any system can be placed on a sub system where they earn fewer privileges with more points being needed, through teaching interactions of the appropriate behavior" (Coughlin & Shanahan, 1991).

The system that the youth is on determines the number of teaching interactions that the youth will have for that day. Each of these teaching interactions is recorded on the youth's point card (Coughlin & Shanahan, 1991).

The field of applied behavior analysis is in part defined by the necessity to analyze behavior and impart meaningful behavior change in natural settings (Baer, Wolf, & Risley, 1968). Reinforcement is very important and it is the most widely used principle of behavior analysis. Without B.F. Skinner's "radical behaviorism" and detailed laboratory analyses of reinforcement there would be no field of "applied behavior analysis" (Vollmer & Hackenberg, 2001).

In Skinner's (1956) research involving rats, he showed that "when a single lever instance of a lever pressing by a rat is followed in close temporal proximity by food, the behavior persisted for an inordinate amount of time." Skinner related this to a child's behavior; for example, banging the head against a wall for an unknown reason, then stops when followed by attention. Skinner (1956) also went on to show that if the response, i.e. head banging was no longer followed by a reinforcer, i.e. attention, the behavior would extinguish or stop. In addition if
a reinforcer intermittently followed the response it would not extinguish (Vollmer & Hackenberg, 2001).

In addition to Skinner's research, Hammond (1980) involved himself in behavior research with rats and arranged the reinforcers so that the rat's lever presses either "increased the probability of food (positive contingency) or decreased the probability of food (negative contingency)." The positive contingency arrangements yielded a reinforcement effect. Hammond's research allowed for the evaluation of the conditional probability of some potential reinforcer given the occurrence of target behaviors compared to the nonoccurrence of the target behavior (Hammond, 1980).

Behavior modification includes identifying the inappropriate behavior, identifying the appropriate behavior, rewarding instances of the appropriate behavior, and then using extinction procedures to help eliminate the inappropriate behavior (Palardy, 1980; Palardy & Palardy, 1987). The most important component of behavior modification is the reward. "Behaviorists claim that students can be conditioned to act in an appropriate way if teachers will reward them for acting in these ways" (Palardy, 1992, pg. 135-136). As students begin to behave appropriately, supposedly their need for the external reinforcers fades. Gradually, behaviorists state, students become self-satisfied with the internal reinforcement of good behavior itself (Palardy, 1992).

Behavior modification techniques were developed to serve youth with whom the traditional approaches were not successful, such as "autistic children and older, as well as, severely delinquent youth. "For the behaviorist, treatment
usually involves four phases: identification and specification of the behavioral
difficulty, clarification of the determining conditions (reinforcement patterns,
learning history, environmental factors), specification of the behavioral goals, and
the application of any of a number of behavioral techniques, with a subsequent
detailed measure of behavioral change or progress” (Zimmerman, 1990).

According to research, there are limitations in behavior modification in that
it only treats the symptoms of problems and not the causes. In addition, its
limited transfer value, short-term effects on maladaptive behavior is seldom
permanent, and it devalues self-discipline as an ultimate goal in favor of
management of conduct (Palardy, 1992).

To help alleviate some of these concerns, functional behavioral
assessment (FBA) was introduced. What happens right before and after a
behavior is extremely important for behavior change. “Functional behavior
assessment is a systematic process for understanding problem behavior and the
actors that contribute to its occurrence and maintenance” (Sugai et al, 2000,
p.34-42). Functional analysis and functional relationships began with the works
of Ivan Pavlov, John Watson, Edward Thorndike, Fred Keller, B.F. Skinner, and
other early psychologists. This concept was further heightened by Individual with
Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) 1997, which began looking at behavior within
the context in which it is observed (p.149).

The FBA process is a problem solving strategy that identifies the problem,
collects information and analysis, plans intervention, and monitors with
evaluation. The four key components of FBA are: "identifying the problem behavior, triggering antecedents or events that predict when the behavior is likely to occur, maintain consequences or events that increase the likelihood of the behavior happening in the future, and setting events for factors that make the problems behavior worse" (Sugai et al, 2000).

Within behavior modification is also the ecological model, which is a "comprehensive health promotion model this is multifaceted, concerned with environmental change, behavior, and policy that help individuals make healthy choices in their daily lives" (Sugai et al, 2000, p.5). This model takes into account the physical environment and its relationship to people at "individual, interpersonal, organizational, and community levels" (Sugai et al, 2000,p.3). This model emphasizes that behavior does not occur in a vacuum and should not be treated as such.

Within the TF model, social skills are also taught, "allowing the use of a structured, but flexible, behavior modification program to overcome weaknesses in a child's social development"(Sugai et al, 2000). It has a specific goal of increasing skills useful for social interaction in the future.

Research involving direct observations of behaviors, applied behavior-analytic designs, and social validity assessments were used to determine the effects of social teaching. This research showed positive effects on academic and vocational skills, as well with the social skills of negotiating and accepting criticism (Wolf et al, 1995). These social skills are very important in the

Research has also shown a correlation between social skills and self-esteem (Bijstra, Bosma, & Jackson, 1994; Bockoven & Morse, 1986; Rihggion, Throckmorton, & DePaola, 1990; Thompson, Bundy, & Broncheau, 1995; Verduyen, Lord, & Forrest, 1990; Wright, 1995), and self-esteem and locus of control (Enger, Howerton, & Cobbs, 1994; Hillman, Wood, & Sawilowsky, 1992; Long & Sherer, 1985; Wood, Hillman, & Sawilwowsky et al., 1996) which links social skills and locus of control. Youth that are in residential care who receive structured social skills training would show an increase in their internal locus of control (Newberry & Lindsay, 2000). In addition, this training of social skills could increase their independence during their adolescent years (Mallon, 1992) as well as be effective in their adult life (Weissbourd, 1996).

Social teaching consists of "four behavior classes directed toward the teaching of academic, social, or independent living skills" (Braukmann et al, 1984). In the first behavior class, there is "describing, demonstrating, or
explaining what to do and how to do it. This encompasses being behaviorally specific and breaking down complex skills into simple steps” (Braukmann et al, 1984).

The second behavior class is providing a reason for why something is being done or why it is done in a certain way. Baumrind (1968) describes reason as “democratic, authoritative parenting”, which she contrasts, to “authoritarian parenting” (Pikas, 1961). Research has shown that parental authority is accepted more when reasons are given (Pikas, 1961). The third component consists of “supervising opportunities for practicing behaviors” (Braukmann et al, 1984). This component allows the family teacher to verify if the youth understands the instructions and also to help the youth feel more comfortable with the skills. The final behavior class is “providing positive feedback, including praise and token economy consequences.” Reinforcing positive behavior increases the likelihood that particular behavior will be repeated. (Braukmann et al, 1984).

In studies conducted at the original Achievement Place group home (Braukmann et al, 1974 & Minkin et al, 1976), the social teaching procedures, i.e. describing appropriate behaviors and giving reasons for those behaviors procedures, was implemented with both males and females, leading to an increase in the desired behaviors. The “more that social behaviors of a teaching parent functioned as reinforcers for a youth, the more the youth would be likely to engage in behavior producing the reinforcing social behaviors of the teaching parent” (Braukmann et al, 1984).
Token economies were first developed by Cohen, Filipczack, and Bis (1965) to correct and preserve the academic skills of delinquents that were institutionalized; Birnbrauer, Wolf, Kidder, and Lague (1965); Clark, Lachowitz, and Wolf (1968); and Wolf, Giles, and Hall (1968) to decrease behavior problems and increase academic behaviors of children contained in special classrooms; and Ayllon and Azrin (1968) to begin and maintain the work and self care behaviors of psychotics that are institutionalized allowing them to be more self sufficient. Though token economy programs were widespread in the 1970s, they became largely restricted to wards, where long-stay patients from institutions were prepared for transfer into the community and were particularly aimed at changing negative symptoms of schizophrenia - poor motivation, poor attention and social withdrawal.

According to Ayllon and Azrin (1968) token economy motivation systems have several advantages. These include: “the token is a tangible conditioned reinforcer that bridges the delay between the response and the conditioned reinforcer; the token allows the response to be reinforced at any time, whereas an unconditioned reinforcer is often restricted as to time and place.”

Within the Teaching Family Model there was originally only one point system, which was weekly, in which points were accumulated for the week and privileges were bought for the week. It was found that the youth were not motivated and were not earning enough points. To help motivate, even though a youth might have bought his privileges for the day he had to earn additional points (1500) to use them. Another change was that the weekly point system
might be too difficult for a new youth or a lower functioning youth, and thus, the daily point system was introduced. With the daily point system the "point difference at the end of the day was used to buy points for the next day (Phillips et al, 1971).

The token economy motivation system was designed so "points" can be earned or lost immediately due to appropriate or inappropriate behavior. These points were then traded for a slew of unconditioned "back up" reinforcers such as free time, allowance, and extra television time. These back up reinforcers were earned on a daily basis, then, as the youth progressed, they earned these reinforcers on a weekly basis. This token economy motivation system was flexible, positive and individualized. This system was eventually faded out so the youth can learn to maintain the appropriate behavior under a more natural condition of "achievement" and "natural and logical," where back up reinforcers were contingent upon behavior rather than the points (Wolf et al, 1995).

In the research on token economies, it shows that contingent token consequences could develop behaviors that were more "important for success in the community, school, and home, as well, as reduce behaviors that might create problems in those areas" (Wolf et al, 1995, p.79). In Phillips (1968); Phillips, Phillips, Fixsen & Wolf (1971) contingent point consequences were shown to "reduce youth's aggressive language, and to increase their rate of following instructions, saving money, cleaning their bedrooms and bathrooms, acquiring knowledge, and completing homework assignments."
In preparing for a token economy it is important to identify the target behaviors, specify and select the reinforcers to be used, identify token types and schedules, plan token distribution and redemption, initiate and implement the token economy system, and plan for inflation. In addition, behaviors are to be decreased, increased, or maintained. A target behavior should be “observable, countable, and measurable, and should be applicable across all settings” (Myles et al, 1992).

Positive Reinforcement and Token reinforcement are means of increasing desired behaviors, such as staying on task or completing assignments. Positive reinforcement refers to the act of presenting a reward after a child has exhibited a targeted behavior. An example of positively reinforcing behavior would be praising a child for cleaning her room. Token reinforcement occurs when the child receives an item (e.g., a poker chip) whenever he engages in the targeted behavior (e.g., completing an assignment). Incorporated in this is shaping, or behavior-shaping, which is a variant of operant conditioning. Instead of waiting for a subject to exhibit a desired behavior, any behavior leading to the target behavior is rewarded. For example, B. F. Skinner (1904-1990) discovered that in order to train a rat to push a lever, any movement in the direction of the lever had to be rewarded, until finally, the rat was trained to push a lever (Myles et al, 1992). Once the target behavior is reached, however, no other behavior is rewarded. In other words, the subject behavior is shaped, or molded, into the desired form (Myles et al, 1992).
Mann-Feder (1996) conducted a study to compare "the course of change of two groups of conduct disordered adolescents in two theoretically distinct residential treatment programs: a Therapeutic Community and a modified Token economy." Despite an overall trend toward improvement in both these groups, there was little significance between the rates of progress over time.

An important aspect of the Token economy system model is the self-government component. Research has shown that token economy consequences could be effectively used not only by the teaching parent but also by the youth themselves (Bailey, Timbers, Phillips, & Wolf, 1971: Phillips, Wolf & Fixsen, 1973). In Phillips et al (1973) the youths used their token economy systems to affect each other's behavior. "Of several "peer manager" systems tried, a reversal design revealed that the most effective and youth preferred system involved a democratically elected peer manager (1) who had the authority both to give and take points from his/her peers, depending on their performance on routine household tasks; and (2) who also earned or lost points from the teaching parents depending on how well the managed task were accomplished" (Wolf et al, 1995).

Another important component of the self-government system is a group decision-making system that is centered on the family conference. The family conference is a half hour to one hour daily meeting with the youths and the teaching parents. In this family meeting, the youth learn rational problem solving, as well as, how to make, change and live by rules, determine rule violations with
consequences, and to discuss their case without "anger, aggression, or intimidation" (Wolf et al, 1995).

Research in Fixsen et al (1973) has shown the importance of semi self-government systems and peer reporting and youth accepting responsibility for their own behavior. Kifer, Ayala, Fixsen, Phillips, & Wolf, (1974) has shown the importance of substantial participation in family conference in regard to the youth's satisfaction with treatment fairness, pleasantness, and educational value. In addition, Minkin, Minkin, Goldstein, Taylor, Braukmann, Kirigin, & Wolf (1981) show the importance of the effectiveness of "the procedures in teaching important, socially validated, self government skills to the youths."
Best Practices of Teaching Family Model

According to the literature, some of the more recognized behavioral programs mentioned, included Achievement Place (Kansas), which marks the beginning of the development of the Teaching-family prototype treatment program; the former National Training School Project (Washington, DC), the Robert F. Kennedy Youth Center (Morgantown, West Virginia) for delinquent youths, and the Children's center in Madison, Wisconsin (Zimmerman, 1990).

In the literature surrounding the Teaching Family Model, two important variables surface: consistent guidance and developing and maintaining a mutually reinforcing relationship (Braukmann et al, 1980). “The correlation data has suggested that where such teaching and relationship variables are present at some strength, adolescents are more likely to achieve autonomy and self confidence and to avoid delinquent behavior (Conger, 1977). In other words, effective, positive teaching can increase the likelihood and strength of a mutually reinforcing relationship, in that this relationship can increase the opportunities for and effectiveness of teaching (Braukmann et al, 1984).

The development of a mutually rewarding relationship between the teaching parents and the youths is another essential component of this model. “The effectiveness of a teaching parent is related to the reinforcing value that she or he has for that youth” (Wolf et al, 1995). In Solnick, Braukmann, Bedlington, Kirigin, & Wolf (1981), positive staff-youth relationships were shown to be important in producing desired treatment outcomes. Direct observations
were made of youth behaviors that were assumed to be indicators "of the extent to which they found their teaching parents to be reinforcing," in particular the youth's proximity to and talking to their teaching parents during unstructured time in the home (Wolf et al, 1995). This data indicated that high levels of reinforcement value were related to low levels of delinquency (Wolf et al, 1995).

A second set of eight homes were studied (Solnick, Braukmann, Belden, Kirigin Ramp, & Wolf, 1981) and the results were again replicated that reinforcing relationships play a significant role in programs directed at reducing and preventing delinquency (Braukmann, Kirigin, & Wolf, 1980).

The treatment approach solidifies the youth preferred and effective treatment. "The teaching parents utilize various teaching procedures and a flexible individualized, token economy motivational system, along with a self government system where the youths are involved both in deciding what to teach and in the teaching itself" (Braukmann et al, 1984).

In a study conducted by Bedlington et al. (1981) observational data was collected from several boys home in Kansas in 1980. Out of these homes, seven were of the Family Teaching model and the other seven were of "matched comparison groups." The study observed that the Family Teaching model homes were more consistent with teaching, talking and proximity, and the differences were significant for all but proximity. This study was repeated again in 1981 showing the same significances. These two rounds of data suggest that training emphases on teaching and relationship development may be making a difference. If the training produces higher levels of these variables, and if they
are indeed functional variables, we would expect there to be less delinquency in the Teaching Family homes (Braukmann et al., 1984).

Initially the Teaching Family Model had to be modified to what it is today by the agency using it. In the original model there was only one point system, which is weekly. This system allowed the youth to earn points each day that were then accumulated for one week at which time, privileges were purchased for the following week. This system proved not to be effective or motivating for every youth, as they had nothing else to work on when they made their points. To help remedy this, each youth was required to earn a point difference of 1500 points each day in order to be able to use their privileges the following day. Another concern was the delay between earning the points and purchasing the privileges; this was remedied by a daily point system, which allowed the youth to use their daily point difference to buy privileges for the next day (Phillips et al., 1971).

This refined point system was evaluated to see its effectiveness on the outcomes of the respondents who had left residential care. This point system was refined by the residential facility where these youth have come from.

This facility is also a member of the Teaching Family Association (TFA), in addition to being the first successful replication of a Teaching Family site and the site of the Teaching Family Dissemination program. The TFA was formed in 1975 to ensure the quality of care provided by professionals who actively pursue the goals of “humane, effective, individualized treatment for children and families and dependent adults using the common framework of the Teaching Family
model for treatment and support." To continue being members of the association, agencies must be certified every three years to be recognized as user of the TF model (Fixsen & Blasé, 2002) (see Appendix D).
In 1959, Campbell and Fiske first initiated the concept of mixing different research methods when they used multiple methods to study the validity of psychological traits (Creswell, 2003). This mixed-method approach was used to evaluate the Teaching Family Model at a well-known residential facility in Florida. Both quantitative and qualitative data will be collected. This allowed the "researcher to base knowledge claims on pragmatic grounds, such as, consequence oriented, problem-centered, and pluralistic" (Creswell, 2003). With the mixed method approach, data was collected either simultaneously or sequentially to help best understand the research problem. The data was collected using both numeric information, through the use of an instrument (see Appendix F) and text information, through the use of interview questions (see Appendix E), which allowed for a mixed method approach to research employing both the qualitative and quantitative methods (Creswell, 2003).
Research Questions

The following research questions for this study are:

1. How effective is the Teaching Family Model on reducing the negative behaviors of residential adolescents coming out of care?

   1a. How has their behavior changed since exiting the program?

2. What is the effect of the Teacher Family Model on self-esteem and social skills?

   2a. What sustainable relationships have been formed?

   2b. How are the needs of the individuals met in their community?

   2c. What is their level of self-esteem?
Design

The researcher’s prior experience working in residential care helped in the design of this study. The researcher’s background was in behavior modification, particularly in residential settings. Due to this, it was possible that bias may come from the researcher. To help eliminate the researcher’s bias, a mixed method approach was be used.

According to Creswell (2003), the first phase in any qualitative study consists of the researcher looking at bias and preconceived notions of what will be found before the research begins. Here, preconceptions about residential care and its components were looked at in an attempt to gain clarity of vision. According to Ihde (1977), this required that looking must precede judgment and that judgment of what is “real” or “most real” be suspended until all the evidence (or at least sufficient evidence) is in (p. 36).

The impetus for the study was my active and continued belief that adolescents coming out of residential facilities were not acquiring and sustaining the necessary skills they needed to succeed outside the facility on their own. Since 1997, I used and promoted the use of the Teaching Family Model. My interests and professional expertise with behavior modification techniques was extensive and was both positive and productive. I regularly saw many children “successfully graduated” from the facility but constantly calling for support or getting themselves in legal or financial trouble. Having had these experiences with this model and children coming out of care, I was led to research the effectiveness of this model.
Another bias that I brought to this research project was my interest and belief in active teaching and learning practices. Learners must be active respondents in the construction of knowledge (Bruner, 1966). Thus, they must be given opportunities to engage in sense making. Good learning situations require students to engage in their learning processes through experiential activities. I was able to overcome this bias as I was not the direct teacher.

In this research, concurrent procedures were employed which allowed the researcher to converge quantitative in the use of a survey, and qualitative data, in open ended interview questions in order to provide a comprehensive analysis of the research problem. Both forms of data were collected with a one-week interval between the assessment and the interview questions; the information was then integrated in the interpretation of the overall results. In addition, “in this design, the researcher will nest one form of data within another, larger data collection procedure in order to analyze different questions or levels of units in an organization” (Creswell, 2003).

The selection of a qualitative design for this study presented the bias that the data must be interpreted by the researcher through inductive and/or intuitive processes (Bogdan & Taylor, 1975). Erickson (1986) states that "the object of interpretive research is action . . . [and] because actions are grounded in choices of meaning interpretation, they are always open to reinterpretation and change" (p. 127). To help eliminate this bias, member checking occurred in which the interviewees reviewed the interviews and checked the results for validity. In
addition triangulation which collected different sources of data was used to eliminate any bias (Creswell, 2003).
INSTRUMENTATION

Quantitative:

A self-evaluation scale was administered to the group, of approximately 10 respondents (see Appendix G). This self-evaluation scale, form A, was taken from *Forms for Behavior Analysis with Children* (Cautela et al, 1983). This scale measured self-image and allowed this information to be broken down into certain behaviors that were manipulated. The statements were worded on a positive note and teaches what behavior is desirable, rather than what is undesirable. The items on the scale were worded positively and contained 44 Likert-type questions. The breakdown of questions were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-17, 19-24, 37</td>
<td>Perceptions of how others view him or her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 10, 12, 13</td>
<td>Perception of overall self-worth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 8, 9, 11, 18, 25, 27, 32, 35</td>
<td>Adaptive functioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38-42</td>
<td>Body image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-31</td>
<td>Perception of own learning ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 3, 7</td>
<td>Self confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 6, 33, 34, 36</td>
<td>Perception of own social skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Most liked characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Least liked characteristics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When using this form, the overall self-image can be “more specifically related to the amount of reinforcement in the client’s environment, and often to the degree of severity and the duration of the presenting complaint” (Cautela et al, 1983).

This scale was chosen because research showed a correlation between social skills and self-esteem (Bijstra, Bosma, & Jackson, 1994; Bockoven & Morse, 1986; Rihggion, Throckmorton, & DePaola, 1990; Thompson, Bundy, & Broncheau, 1995; Verduyen, Lord, & Forrest, 1990; Wright, 1995), and self-esteem and locus of control (Enger, Howerton, & Cobbs, 1994; Hillman, Wood, & Sawilowsky, 1992; Long & Sherer, 1985; Wood, Hillman, & Sawilwowsky et al., 1996) which links social skills and locus of control. Youth that are in residential care who receive structured social skills training would show an increase in their internal locus of control (Newberry & Lindsay, 2000).

The results of these respondents self evaluation on behavior and their level on the program’s motivation system after leaving the facility was looked at in helping to determine the success rate of the Teaching Family Model on these adolescents’ behaviors. This scale matched up with the research questions on the adolescent’s level of self-esteem, social skills, and sustainable relationships.
Qualitative:

One-on-one interviews were conducted, with open-ended questions, as a tool of study for the qualitative data. This allowed for better control over the line of questioning as well as provides historical information. In addition, the researcher maintained a journal during this time for any incidental information (Creswell, 2003). The interviews identified additional factors to the respondents' success rates in the behavior modification program, as well as background information.

This study encompassed interviews with 10 respondents who left a residential care employing the Teaching Family Model no less than six months ago. The respondents in the research study are all now living in North Florida. Consent forms (see Appendix G) were used to assure and specifically spell out the guidelines and responsibilities of confidentiality. Interviews were audio taped and transcribed. This data was analyzed using the QSR N"Vivo software. A section of tables and graphs outlined the in case and across case analysis from both the qualitative and quantitative data.

This interview helped answer the questions concerning any sustainable relationship, the ability to access services in the community, the respondents' current level of self-esteem and their current behavior.
Participants

A single stage sampling procedure occurred in this research since the researcher had access to the names in the population and can sample them directly (Creswell, 2003). There are some populations that are difficult to access so that only a sample can be used. People in residential care fall into this category due to legal, economic or time related issues. In qualitative research, the idea was to purposively select respondents that best “help the researcher understand the problem and the research question” (Creswell, 2003, p.185). Purposive samples occurred allowing the researcher to purposefully take a sample of 10 adolescent males due to accessibility.

Sampling error comprises the differences between the sample and the population that are due solely to the particular units that happen to have been selected. There is the error that occurs just because of bad luck, which may result in untypical choices. Unusual units in a population do exist, and there is always a possibility that an abnormally large number of them will be chosen. The main protection against this kind of error is to use a large sample. Because of the small sample size, no inferences were made which will help to eliminate sampler bias, as purposeful sampling occurred.

The second bias is a sampling bias. Sampling bias is a tendency to favor the selection of units that have particular characteristics. In fact, purposeful sampling produced this. A means of selecting the units of analysis must be designed to avoid the more obvious forms of bias (Creswell, 2003).
Selection Criteria

The respondents were 18 years of age or older and were selected due to their accessibility to the researcher and their willingness to participate. Gender was not a factor due to the small sample size of 10 respondents, who were all male. Recruitment was through previous experience working in the residential field, in addition to further recruitment by former residents who were local to Florida. Bias was reduced due to the researcher not having worked directly with these respondents.

Respondents resided in this residential facility for a minimum of seven months. These respondents also successfully completed the program and were not removed from the program due to disruptive behaviors. There were ten male adolescents due to the researcher being able to readily assess this sample. This sample size gave an indication of the success of the program, but generalization did not occur due to the sample size.

The respondents were not on any psychotropic medication as this can affect the results, which could also contribute to the success of that adolescent. In addition, youth were excluded who had any suicide attempts or threats or hospitalizations due to this. Adolescents had a normal intelligence with no mental or physical handicaps. The respondents live in the State of Florida.

The respondents were recruited through word of mouth by a former employee of the facility. Each respondent signed a confidentiality and consent forms to begin the study. Attrition rate was anticipated and further recruitment
was not necessary. Limitations of this sample size were external validity, as the results could not be generalized to another population.

The sampling strategy was effective as the former residents have remained in contact with each other which allowed for easy locating. Limitations consisted of members talking with each other during this process or after on their own, which could skew their answers or responses. To help remedy this, confidentiality was stressed and two instruments were used to enhance validity.
Data Collection

Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected. This allowed the "researcher to base knowledge claims on pragmatic grounds, such as, consequence oriented, problem-centered, and pluralistic" (Creswell, 2003). With the mixed method approach, data was collected sequentially to help best understand the research problem. The research was collected using both numeric information (an instrument) and text information (interviews) to allow for a mixed method approach to research employing both the qualitative and quantitative methods (Creswell, 2003).

In the literature surrounding the Teaching Family Model, two important variables surface: consistent guidance and developing and maintaining a mutually reinforcing relationship (Braukmann et al, 1980). The correlation data has suggested that where such teaching and relationship variables are present at some strength, adolescents are more likely to achieve autonomy and self-confidence, in addition to avoiding delinquent behavior (Conger, 1977). Effective, positive teaching can increase the likelihood and strength of a mutually reinforcing relationship, in that this relationship can increase the opportunities for and effectiveness of teaching (Braukmann et al, 1984). These variables are very important and constitute the independent variables for the research. In addition, social skills are another important independent variable as there is also a relationship between social skills and self-esteem.

The dependent variables consisted of success rate, social skills, and self-esteem and level on motivation system, as these are the measurements that are
dependent on the manipulation of the model and its components. Success rate is operationally defined as being self sufficient in a community, with sustainable and appropriate relationships and working or attending school. Confounding variables were those that we could not control for such as attitudes and beliefs of the Family Teachers who implemented the model. This however did not pose a problem as the model had specific guidelines to follow that the Family Teachers were trained on.

The discrete variables consisted of age, housing, school, employment, and criminal activity. The continuous variables, consisted of the domains of the questionnaire instrument, Self Evaluation scale Form A. These consisted of: adaptive functioning, body image, self-esteem, self-worth, social skills, others' perception, and perception of own learning ability; as well as the level and the time on the motivation system; length of time at facility, level of Family Teacher support, and their perception of whether they graduated the program successfully.
Data Analysis

The researcher used a mixed methodology approach involving both quantitative and qualitative measures, to show evidence of the success rate of behavior problems through the use of the adapted Teaching Family Models program of token teaching. A correlation analysis of the results of the self-assessment scale and the level on the motivation system that was a part of the token teaching, was completed using SPSS software. SPSS software is a modular, tightly integrated, full-featured product line for the analytical process—planning, data collection, data access and management, analysis, reporting and deployment. (George and Mallery, 2001).

Qualitative data was collected using interviews that were coded and analyzed using the QSR N"Vivo software. QSR N"Vivo was designed from the ground up to integrate coding with qualitative linking, shaping and modeling. This software allows you to choose the ways of linking data and ideas that suit your methods, and also embeds links to external multimedia data, websites or internal documents or concepts. In addition, it stores ideas flexibly in annotations and rich text memos that can be coded, linked and searched as well as manage rich data in rich ways with flexible sets. Sets for grouping and attributes for organizing ideas and information in tables that can be imported from or exported to statistics packages are also created. It also allows you to explore relationships in the data and add desired items to the model. These integrated tools support searching that is qualitative, not merely mechanical. Results are saved in context and can be explored or built on in further inquiry (QSR International Pty Ltd, 1988-2000).
The qualitative data also had aggregated scores on a scale of 1-5 for level of self-confidence and self-esteem. This was compared with the quantitative scores for self-esteem to determine a correlation.

The quantitative data was analyzed using a 3-point Likert scale consisting of 42 questions ranking in order from 1-3 with three being not at all and 1 being most likely. In this, a descriptive analysis occurred with a frequency-spread table of means. A frequency spread table lists "categories or classes of scores, along with counts or frequencies of the number of scores that fall into each category" (Creswell, 2003). The data was broken into the seven categories, i.e. perceptions of how others view him or her, perception of overall self-worth, adaptive functioning, body image, perception of own learning ability, self confidence, and perception of own social skills. For each respondent the score was aggregated and the total score calculated for each category the higher the score the higher the level of self-esteem.

In addition, the level on the motivation system at the time of discharge was looked at to see if this was an indicator of success rate. A correlation analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data occurred. This showed any relationship between self-esteem and behavior. A section of tables and graphs outlined the in case and a cross case analysis, from both the qualitative and quantitative data.
Triangulation

The triangulation method was used when there are different data sources to "conform, cross-validate, or corroborate findings within a single study (Greene et al., 1989; Morgan, 1998; Steckler, McLeroy, Goodman, Bird, & McCormick, 1992). This strategy integrated the results of the two methods during the interpretation phase (Creswell, 2003). Triangulation is a very familiar strategy to many researchers and can result in "well - validated and substantiated findings" (Creswell, 2003). Triangulation took place through interviews and questionnaires of the respondents in an attempt to reduce bias.

Within the triangulation method, member checking was utilized to ensure the credibility of the interviewees responses. According to Lincoln and Guba (1985) this technique is crucial in establishing credibility. Member checking allowed for the respondents of the study to look over their responses for clarity, expansion, and interpretation. "Member checking was carried out in regard to the constructions from the triangulated data," and helps with reliability (Erlandson et al, 1993).

In the concurrent strategies, data transformation was used to quantify the qualitative data. This encompassed creating codes and "themes qualitatively, then counting the number of times they occurred in the text data (or possibly the extent of talk about a code or theme by counting lines or sentences)." This allowed the researcher to compare quantitative results with the qualitative data (Creswell, 2003).
Reliability and Validity

Reliability and validity are essential to measurements and research procedure designs. These two concepts are distinct yet related. While high reliability does not warrant validity, a study cannot achieve validity without reliability. Reliability is the consistency of your measurement, or the degree to which an instrument measures the same way each time it is used under the same condition with the same subjects and the testing procedure is free from random errors of measurement (Creswell, 2003). This survey instrument, measures what is purports to measure, i.e. social esteem and social skills. The authors, Cautela et al(1983) have already established the reliability and validity of the instrument and the instrument is widely used.

Within reliability there will be internal consistency of the coefficient of tests scores obtained from a single test or survey. For example, in this survey respondents who respond strongly to feeling confident will most likely respond strongly to having control over their actions, and vice versa (Creswell, 2003).

Validity is how close what is being measured on the paper is to what we intend to measure in our theory. In this research, we are measuring socials skills, self-esteem, and adaptive functioning; this also correlates to the theory of token economy and social skills. It eventually leads to how close our conclusion based on the measurement results are to the truth. While high reliability does not warrant validity, a study cannot achieve validity without reliability (Creswell, 2003).
Limitations of the Study

All studies have limitations and considerations. In qualitative studies and in particular this study is of the small sample size of ten adolescent males, which makes it impossible to generalize the findings (Croswell, 2003). The literature is expansive with best practices using the Teaching Family Model and this gives readers a clear understanding of the model, allowing them to make appropriate judgments on their own on the success of the model. The best use of generalization in qualitative research “is analytical rather than from the sample studied to other populations” (Miles and Hubberman, 1994).

By limiting this study to one population and not having a comparison sample, this helped to control variables which could have serious effects on the study itself. Respondents had resided in a residential facility employing the Teaching Family model, with no comparisons to other treatment methods used.

The quantitative data encompassed a 42-questionnaire form with a Likert scale of 1 to 3 with seven domains to be looked at. The domains consisted of: perception of own social skills, perception of how others view him/her, perception of overall self-worth, body image, adaptive functioning, perception of own learning ability, and self confidence.

The qualitative data encompassed an interview with seventeen questions. This information was analyzed to determine the effectiveness of the Teaching Family Model on the success of its residents coming out of the care of a residential facility.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Chapter IV presents the results of a correlational study that evaluated the effectiveness of a behavior modification program, on ten male adolescents coming out of residential care. Specifically, the researcher investigated the Teaching Family Model in its adapted form. A convenient sample of ten male adults participated in the study. These individuals previously resided in a residential living facility and are now living in North Florida. All ten respondents participated in a descriptive interview and completed the Self-Evaluation Scale, Form A, from the "Forms for Behavior Analysis with Children" (1983). The selection criterion for this population was defined in Chapter III. SPSS 11.0 statistical software was used to analyze the quantitative data, i.e. self-evaluation scale, while QSR N"Vivo was used to analyze the qualitative data, i.e. Interview questions.

Factors identified, as best practices of the Teaching Family Model (TFM) included: (1) self government, (2) teaching social skills, (3) standardized social skills curriculum, (4) an emphasis on normalization, and (5) a continuous evaluation system, part of which involves the youth evaluating the teaching family couple. (Friman, 1999).

The characteristics identified by the Self Evaluation Scale Form A (Cautela, 1993) included: (a) perceptions of how others view him or her, (b) perception of overall self-worth, (c) adaptive functioning, (d) body image, (e) perception of own learning ability, (f) self confidence, and (g) perception of own
social skills. Each area was explored through levels ranging from 1 to 3, with 3 being the strongest degree of confidence. Under each domain are individual questions. In the domain perceptions of how others view him or her consists of questions 14-17, 19-24 and 37. The domain of perception of overall self-worth consist of questions 1, 10, 12, and 13. The domain of adaptive functioning consists of questions 4, 8, 9, 11, 18, 25, 27, 32, and 35. The domain of body image consists of 38-42. The domain of perception of own learning ability consists of questions 28-31. The domain of self-confidence consists of questions 2, 3, and 7. The domain of perception of own social skills consists of 5, 6, 33, 34, and 36.

The descriptive analysis of the variables in the following research revealed: out of the ten adolescent males of which all responded, the mean age and range was 18.48 and 1.1 respectively. The mean length of stay living in the residential facility was 2.21 years ranging from 7 months to 7 years. In addition, six out of the ten males were African American, three were Caucasian, and one was biracial.

According to the research on residents of residential care facilities, 47% were African American (non Hispanic); 14% were Hispanic; 32% were Caucasian (non Hispanic); 6% from unknown racial or ethnic backgrounds, and less than 1% each were Asian/Pacific Islander and American Indian (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1996). Even though this is a small sample, the sample is representative of previous research distribution in regards to race.
Six of the respondents were originally referred to the residential facility by caseworkers, three by parents, and one by the court. Out of the ten adolescent males, seven previously lived with family and friends, four previously lived in a group home or foster home, one in a shelter, and one in a detention center. According to the research, in 1990, more than 50% of children entered out of home care because of abuse and neglect. Out of this, 21% entered due to a condition of a parent, 12.5% entered care for other reasons, 11% was due to delinquency or the commission of a status offense, 2.4% entered care for unknown reasons, approximately 2% entered care due to a child’s disability, and less than 1% entered care following “relinquishment” by parents (Tatara, 1993). By knowing the referral person or agency and knowing where this participant lived before, allows the researcher to know the reason the adolescents was originally in care. For example, The Department of Children and Families refers cases of abuse and neglect (Florida Department of Children and Families, 2002); The Department of Juvenile Justice refers adolescents due to legal issues or implications, as adolescents can be court ordered if the placement is appropriate, or can be sent to a facility until they become competent to stand trial (Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, 2002); and foster care usually refer adolescents that have improved their behaviors to be stepped up to residential care, or have no family (Florida Department of Children and Families, 2002). This sample is representative of the research.
QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

Using a 3-point Likert scale, the respondents answered the Self-Evaluation Scale with answers which ranged from "not at all" (1) to "very much" (3). Table 1 displayed the respondents' mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) scores for domains and individual questions on this instrument. Mean and standard deviation scores on all individual questions ranged from 2.4 to 3.0 and .316 to .707 respectively.

A chi-square analysis of independence was performed to assess whether various independent factors, which existed in the study, interfered with the scores that were derived from this instrument. The principal investigator found that the results for age ($X^2 = 1.20$, df = 7; $p = .991; > .05$), race ($X^2 = 3.80$, df = 2; $p = .150; > .05$), financial assistance ($X^2 = 1.20$, df = 4; $p = .901; > .05$), school history ($X^2 = 1.40$, df = 2; $p = .497; > .05$), type of work ($X^2 = 1.00$, df = 4; $p = .910; > .05$), and work history ($X^2 = 6.20$, df = 2; $p = .095; > .05$) to be inconclusive. However, the researcher did find an association between the model and criminal activity ($X^2 = 6.40$, df = 1; $p = .011; < .05$). This result may be attributed to the small sample size.

The domain of adaptive functioning had a mean of 24.60 with a standard deviation of 1.59. The range of these questions is 18. This score indicated that many of the adults were similar in their results of being able to adapt into the community. There was not much volatility in the scores. These scores are surprisingly consistent despite the small sample size. This gives a good indication that the respondents were able to be independent in the community.
and are at the expected level for their age, in regards to academics and social aspects. Under this domain, the questions concerning humor and being happy had the highest mean score of 2.90 indicating that this had a high positive correlation on the model, and many of the respondents agreed with this question. Under this domain, the question concerning being calm and realized had a mean of 2.50 which indicates a variability as it is .707 standard deviation from the mean.

This is not surprising as the literature states that adaptive functioning is very important in obtaining social competence and interpersonal relationships (Gresham, 1997). Adaptive functioning is defined as "the degree, which an individual met the standards of personal independence and social responsibility expected of his or her age and cultural group" (Hickson et al, 1995). In addition, academic concerns are also a component of adaptive functioning (Hickson et al, 1995).

In addition, social skills as behaviors correlate with the criterion of social competence skills, which is a class of adaptive functioning (Grisham, 1997). Many of the respondents in the sample had a high level of adaptive functioning indicating an increase use of social skills. This is a component of the Teaching Family Model indicating that this population acquired the necessary skills to adapt in the community.

The domain of body image had a mean of 17.30 with a standard deviation of .948; however, this did not have any relationships in the model. This was surprising that this domain had no effect on the model. There was also not much
volatility in this score. Body image indicates a level of self-esteem and confidence. The sample did indicate however a high level of satisfaction in regards to body image, as the means were 2.80 and 2.90 for the questions.

The domain of others' perception had a mean of 28.70 with a standard deviation of 2.59 from the mean, indicating variations in responses. The question concerning appreciated by family and can be counted on were .699 standard deviation from the mean. This result was not surprising as this domain correlates to self-esteem. However, the individual questions were surprising as there were many variances in the mean. The question of "people tell problems to you" had a mean of 2.40 with a standard deviation of .516. It is very hard to control what others think of you however this indicates the level of confidence another person has in the respondent.

The domain of own learning ability had a standard deviation of .843 from the mean, which was 11.40. This was a positive relationship, as the highest possible score was 12 indicating a high percentage of the sample felt they had high scores in regards to their own learning ability. This was surprising as many of the respondents had not received a high school diploma and had academic difficulties, which they admitted in their interviews.

The domain of self confidence had a standard deviation of 1.10 from the mean of 8.10 indicating there was not a lot of variability. The highest possible score was 9.00, which indicates a positive relationship with the model. In addition, self-worth also had a positive relationship as it had a mean of 10.40 with a standard deviation of 1.26. The highest possible score in this domain was
12. There were some variances in this domain, however, the sample is so small to make inferences.

The domain of own social skills had a positive relationship with the model as it had a mean of 14.30 with a standard deviation of .919. The highest possible score for this domain was 15.00. As a result of this, there were not many variances as the scores were consistent with the average. Within this domain, the question of “love others” had no variations as the mean was 3.00 with no standard deviations. This indicated all of the respondents had a positive relationship with this domain.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADAPTIVE FUNCTIONING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calm and relaxed (4)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humor (8)</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy (9)</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful (11)</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good judgment (18)</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like school (25)</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust people (27)</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handle criticism (32)</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look at bright side of things (35)</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BODY IMAGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like my face (38)</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like my neck from the body down (39)</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with my hair (40)</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like my height (41)</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like my fingernails (42)</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERCEPTION OF HOW OTHERS VIEW HIM</strong> (OTHERS' PERCEPTION)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well liked (14)</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyable (15)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People tell problems to you (16)</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy (17)</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>Value 1</td>
<td>Value 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others are confident in me (19)</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True to your word (20)</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be counted on (21)</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others appreciate (22)</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liked at school (23)</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciated by family (24)</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People like me around (37)</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERCEPTION OF OWN LEARNING ABILITY (OWN LEARNING)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel intelligent (28)</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory reading ability (29)</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of current events (30)</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with school (31)</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SELF CONFIDENCE (SELF CONFIDENCE)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident (2)</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak up when right (3)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self control (7)</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERCEPTION OF OVERALL SELF-WORTH (SELF-WORTH)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthwhile (1)</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest (10)</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with Accomplishments (12)</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unselfish (13)</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERCEPTION OF OWN SOCIAL SKILLS (SOCIAL SKILLS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nice (5)</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>p-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behave (6)</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love others (33)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good friend (34)</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act in social situations (36)</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 depicts the Pearson Product Moment correlations ($r$) and $p$-values ($p$) that were computed between the seven domains in the Self Evaluation Scale. All relationships were statistically positive. Correlations ranged from .11 to .93. Significant relationships were found between adaptive functioning and others' perception ($r = .74; p < .05$), own learning ($r = .84; p < .01$), and social skills ($r = .78; p < .01$). Significant correlations were found between others' perception and own learning ($r = .81; p < .01$) and self-worth ($r = .67; p < .05$). Significant relationships were also found between own learning and self-worth ($r = .67; p < .05$) and social skills ($r = .72; p < .01$). The strongest relationship among domains in this study was between self-confidence and self-worth ($r = .93; p < .001$). These significant finds strongly support the Family Teaching Model. The body image component of the Self Evaluation was the only domain which did not demonstrate any relationships.

These findings are to be expected and are indicative of the findings of the literature review. There is an argument that the inability to build and maintain satisfactory relationships with peers defines an emotional or behavioral disorder in children and youth. As a result of this, a social skill is very important as a class of behavior for this population. Another important class of behavior is that of adaptive functioning and social competence which is related to social skills (Gresham, 1997).
In addition, these findings support the research as it has shown a correlation between social skills and self-esteem (Bijstra, Bosma, & Jackson, 1994; Bockoven & Morse, 1986; Rihggion, Throckmorton, & DePaola, 1990; Thompson, Bundy, & Broncheau, 1995; Verduyen, Lord, & Forrest, 1990; Wright, 1995), and self-esteem and locus of control (Enger, Howerton, & Cobbs, 1994; Hillman, Wood, & Sawilowsky, 1992; Long & Sherer, 1985; Wood, Hillman, & Sawilwowsky et al., 1996) which links social skills and locus of control. Youth that are in residential care who receive structured social skills training would show an increase in their internal locus of control (Newberry & Lindsay, 2000). In addition, this training of social skills could increase their independence during their adolescent years (Mallon, 1992) as well as being effective in their adult life (Weissbourd, 1996).

However, the domain of body image did not have any effect on the model; this was very surprising as there was no correlation of body image to the Teaching Family Model, even though this was a component of the model.

These findings support the model, as mentioned in the best practices; two of the components of the model include social skill teaching and self-government. These two best practices are well supported by the domains of the survey instrument and have a positive relationship with the model. In other words, the more that social skill teaching and self-government have a positive relationship with self-esteem.
### Table 2

**Pearson Correlations and P-values Between the Seven Domains of the Self-Evaluation Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adaptive Functioning</th>
<th>Body Image</th>
<th>Others’ perception</th>
<th>Own Learning</th>
<th>Self Confidence</th>
<th>Self Worth</th>
<th>Social Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive Functioning</td>
<td>r = .23</td>
<td>p = .513</td>
<td>r = .74*</td>
<td>r = .84**</td>
<td>r = .56</td>
<td>r = .63</td>
<td>r = .78**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Image</td>
<td>r = .23</td>
<td>p = .015</td>
<td>r = .16</td>
<td>r = .39</td>
<td>r = .25</td>
<td>r = -.11</td>
<td>r = .56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others’ perception</td>
<td>r = .74*</td>
<td>p = .015</td>
<td>r = .81**</td>
<td>r = .51</td>
<td>r = .67*</td>
<td>r = .61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own Learning</td>
<td>r = .84**</td>
<td>p = .002</td>
<td>r = .39</td>
<td>r = .81**</td>
<td>r = .55</td>
<td>r = .67*</td>
<td>r = .72*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Confidence</td>
<td>r = .56</td>
<td>p = .091</td>
<td>r = -.25</td>
<td>r = .51</td>
<td>r = .67*</td>
<td>r = .93***</td>
<td>r = .54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Worth</td>
<td>r = .63</td>
<td>p = .06</td>
<td>r = -.11</td>
<td>r = .67*</td>
<td>r = .93***</td>
<td>r = .56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Skills</td>
<td>r = .78**</td>
<td>p = .008</td>
<td>r = .56</td>
<td>r = .61</td>
<td>r = .72*</td>
<td>r = .54</td>
<td>r = .54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
Qualitative Analysis

Table 3 depicts the demographic information of the respondents. Out of this sample group, sixty percent (six) of the respondents were African American, while thirty percent (3) were Caucasian, and ten percent (1) were biracial. This is indicative of the research, as males make up the majority of residents in residential care as well as of those in care, “47% were African American, 32% were Caucasian, 14% were Hispanic, 6% from unknown racial or ethnic backgrounds, ….” (U.S Department of Health and Human Services, 1996). This is, however, a small population, and it is very difficult to generalize to the entire residential population.

Eighty percent of the residents are from Florida, while twenty percent are from the surrounding areas of Georgia. This is very important as this indicates that these residents were not relocated far from their original homes. The farther that the respondents are from their original homes, the more likely that they exhausted the resources in their community.

In addition, forty percent of the youth returned to their family homes. Mark returned to his mother's home; George returned to his father's home; and Andrew and Wilson returned to relative's home. Out of these respondents that returned back home: Mark is currently in eighth grade; George is in technical school; Andrew attends community college; and Wilson is not in school.

Out of the sixty percent that did not return home, Berry and Lionel had a rented apartment with roommates; Daniel had an apartment by himself; and Chris, JT, and Donald lived in a school dormitory. Out of this sample, Berry was
in eleventh grade, while JT and Donald were enrolled in Job Corp. in order to obtain their GED and vocational certificate, and Chris was enrolled in community college. Only two of the respondents did not have a job, Mark who was in eighth grade and George who was in technical school.

The educational level and work history of this sample was very important which revealed that half of the sample received a General Equivalency Degree (GED), while 3 received a high school diploma, and 2 are still in high school. This is significant as in a study encompassing youth discharged from the foster care system, 66% of 18 year olds did not complete high school and 39% do not have job experience. These factors are very important since this correlates with the adaptive functioning domain of the survey question which had a mean of 24.60. This addresses the research question of sustainable relationships, getting their needs met and changes in behavior. Research and studies show our youth today are behind educationally with less youth graduating and higher literacy rates (State of the Child, 2002). In addition since there is limited research in outcomes of residential care it is important to look at these factors in determining success (Whittaker, 2000).

In addition, five of the ten adolescent males also receive financial assistance from the state. This is very important because they are getting their needs met through assistance from the State or relatives. Out of the five males that do not receive support, they were living with relatives or with roommates. There was one male, Mark who was involved in criminal activity. Mark went back into his mother’s house with whom he did not have a relationship for many years.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>D.O.B</th>
<th>RACE</th>
<th>PLACE OF BIRTH</th>
<th>WORK HISTORY</th>
<th>CURRENT HOUSING</th>
<th>CURRENT SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARK</td>
<td>8.10.84</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Tallahassee, Florida</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Lives with mother</td>
<td>8th grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERRY</td>
<td>5.19.84</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Pensacola, Florida</td>
<td>Full time customer service</td>
<td>Rented apartment</td>
<td>11th grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL</td>
<td>5.22.84</td>
<td>Biracial</td>
<td>Destin, Florida</td>
<td>Full time fast food</td>
<td>Rented apartment</td>
<td>Community college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE</td>
<td>1.3.84</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Athens, Georgia</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Lives with father</td>
<td>Technical school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRIS</td>
<td>2.11.84</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Quincy, Florida</td>
<td>Full time basketball team mgr</td>
<td>School dormitory</td>
<td>Community college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT</td>
<td>2.10.84</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Tallahassee, Florida</td>
<td>Full time electronics</td>
<td>School dormitory</td>
<td>Job Corp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONALD</td>
<td>2.1.85</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Thomasville, Georgia</td>
<td>Full time mechanics</td>
<td>School dormitory</td>
<td>Job Corp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIONEL</td>
<td>4.11.84</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Ft. Lauderdale, Florida</td>
<td>Full time sales</td>
<td>Rented apartment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW</td>
<td>11.1.84</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Jacksonville, Florida</td>
<td>Full time stocking</td>
<td>Lives with aunt and son</td>
<td>Community college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILSON</td>
<td>12.3.84</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Wakulla Springs, Florida</td>
<td>Full time lawn repair</td>
<td>Lives with brother</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WITHIN CASE ANALYSIS

MARK

The interview for respondent #1 (Mark) was conducted at a secluded park in Tallahassee, Florida. Mark was born on 8/10/84 in Tallahassee, Florida to African American parents, but was raised by a single mother. Mark was living in the residential facility for 1 year and 1 month. He started out with his mother in Tallahassee and moved to the facility because he was arguing a great deal with his mother and getting suspended in school for talking back to teachers.

Mark currently lives with his mother. He does not receive any assistance. He has been living at home since he left the facility a year ago. Mark does not currently work. Mark attends school on a regular basis. He is in middle school in 8th grade. He repeated 7th grade twice, but is getting ready to take his GED because of his age.

While in the facility, Mark worked on respecting authority, role modeling, peer relations, following Instructions, getting along with others and anger control:

I got in trouble once in the home for fighting. Since I came back home I have been suspended for a total of seven weeks for cursing out teachers, and violating dress codes. I was suspended and also did not tell my mother and went to my grandfathers’ house. The police saw me and picked me up as they said I looked suspicious walking in the street. Also, four months after I came out of the residential facility, I
was in a shelter for three days as my mother and I got into an argument, and she threatened to hit me, so I told her if she would I would hit her back. She kept comparing me to my father, and I got mad. I also almost got in a fight with my sister because my sister pushed me into some boxes, and I got up and jumped at her and she was scared and she called the police, so that is also why I went to the shelter. There were no charges because I did not physically touch my sister.

**Mark** said that he believed not allowing them their privileges helped him realize that he had to earn things, but when he earned them he felt like he deserved it. **Mark** also said that he liked that they did things like a family as that helped him feel good.

**Mark** stated that when he first entered the program he was angry and mad that his mother sent him there. **Mark** also admits that he is still angry with his mother for sending him away. **Mark** said that he did not feel good about himself as he thought he did something wrong, now he knows that he did not do anything wrong. **Mark** stated that when he entered the facility his goals were to get home by working on his behavior. Now his goals are to get his GED and get a job and move out on his own.

Concerning the residential facility, **Mark** stated, “You got a lot of free stuff, like designer clothes, and CD’s. I liked the FT”s as they were very nice and
got us a lot of things. I also liked summer recreation when we went to different places every week during the summer.” Mark also said regarding the facility,

I would change the point cards as it really does not do anything. I still got my privileges, I just had to do stupid stuff to get it, like volunteering and doing extra chores. Also with the school notes we could forget them and they would not know. I would make it more realistic. Like if they got suspended, I would try and get their school work and have them do their work at home instead of volunteering or doing chores. I also do not like when they ask questions they know the answer to, like if we got our report cards when they know report cards have not come out yet. I also hated the vans as they were so big and everybody knew who you were. I would change the other adolescents who came there. Sometimes adolescents come there who should not be there and they do things for attention and they disrupt the whole house before they finally leave.

Mark said that the facility should change the rules about having relationships with the opposite sex. “They try to keep us separated but they can’t. When I was there, there were so many relationships, they just did not know about it. They should teach us how to work on having relationships so there would not be any problems later on. They also do not let us have contact with
other people. No one came on campus. If I wanted to visit a friend I could not because I would have to get special permission, and they would have to make a big deal out of it. Also, it would be even harder to have my friends visit me on campus; they could not because of confidentiality reasons.

In his interview Mark revealed that his behaviors of controlling his anger and his temper improved. “I can walk away now instead of arguing.” Mark felt that none of his behaviors worsened. “The way my mother sees it is that I have not changed, but I just do it to get on her nerves. We do not get along with each other as she likes to baby my brother and sister. She does not think the older adolescents (two) know what they are saying, and she puts us down that is why no one wants to stay with her.”

Mark was on the weekly motivational system when he left for 2 months. Mark was on daily motivation system for a long time as he was having point added to his system standing due to his behavior in the facility. Even though he left on weekly and had difficulties in the home, Mark felt that he had graduated the program successfully.

Mark rated his level of self-esteem at being high, 4. Mark stated that he believes that he can control his anger more and he is getting along with his peers more. Mark also said that he could walk away more instead of arguing. Mark also had little contact with the Family Teachers. “I call or see them once in a while but not too much.”

Mark said now he and his mother are having a hard time with their relationship. During the interview the mother took the other adolescents to the
park to play while we were talking nearby. **Mark** also said that many people knew he was in the facility because they remember the bus he was on. He did not mind being in the facility. He still sees the adolescents at school that are now in the facility, but he does not talk to them much as they are in different classes.
BERRY

The interview for Respondent #2 (Berry) took place in his apartment in Tallahassee, Florida. Berry was born in Pensacola, Florida on 5/19/84 to a single African American mother. Berry stated that he lived with his mother in Tallahassee, but that he came to the facility at 11 years of age because he would not do his chores or would not follow instructions from his mother. Berry has been living in this residential facility for 7 years as his mother died three years ago, and he had nowhere else to go at that time.

Berry lives in a rented apartment with two college roommates paid for by himself. He does not receive any assistance. He has been living there for three months; this is his second apartment as he had problems with his former roommate playing loud music and partying.

Berry works at Winn Dixie every day, full time in dairy and frozen foods, for about a year now. He also attends high school on a regular basis. He will graduate next year. He has been in high school for three years and is in the 11th grade. Berry worked on being independent. Previously he worked on following instructions and on getting along with others.

Berry stated that he believes that teaching the skills in the facility helped him as a will as being able to talk to the Family Teacher about his problems. In addition, Berry mentioned that the family meetings helped as they were allowed to talk about things that bother them. Berry said that the facility reminded him of being at home, as he had to do his chores, and they acted like a family as they ate together and went to church together.
Upon entering the facility Berry does not remember how he felt. Berry, however, remembers he felt very sad and depressed when his mother died and his Family teacher really helped him through this tough time by talking to him and allowing him to deal with it in his own way. Berry's goals entering the program was to learn as much as he could, so he could go home; that changed when his mother died to learning to become independent. His future goals now are to finish high school.

In regards to the facility, Berry stated that “It’s a nice place to be at and they help you with your behavior as I changed my behavior; like at home I did not like to clean up and now I like to. I also liked the family teachers as they were good to me and nice to live with. I liked how we ate dinner together and did a lot of things together.” Berry also wanted to change some things about the home. “I would change the home using the van (big blue or white ten passenger van) as everybody knows who you are when you go out and it’s huge, it’s embarrassing. I did not like the point card because I got negatives. I don’t see how it helped us now or then. I don’t think it is realistic it is just something they had to do at the facility.”

Berry felt that his social skills increased, “I was able to do my chores (daily chores consisting of bedroom and another assigned part of the home). Getting along with others improved as I would talk more with the guys in the house, and we would get along with each other (6 guys in the house).”

Berry did not feel like any of his behaviors worsened. “Once I was on a sub system for a fight in elementary school, about 4 or 5 years ago. I did not
like it because I had to go everywhere with the Family Teachers, but it really wasn't a big consequence."

Berry was on the Natural and logical motivational system. That is after you work yourself through all the systems. “I was the only one in 6 years to get to Natural and Logical. This system is more realistic as it relates to society. For example, if I was home and did something my mother may have taken away the television.” He was on this motivational system for 2-3 years.

Berry felt that he graduated the program successfully. Berry rated his level of self-esteem at 3, being moderate. Berry stated that he felt that his behaviors have improved drastically as well as his attitude. He said that he is now more positive and he can live on his own.

Berry also has a lot of contact with the Family Teachers. “I either call almost every day or I see them at least once a week.” Berry stated that he has learned to pay his bills, i.e. electricity. Berry also said that he really likes having his own apartment and being able to pay his bills, as it is something new to him. He has no girlfriend or have any relationships. He also does not let his friends come by his apartment nor does he hang out at night according to him. He said that he may get a girlfriend when he gets out of high school. But right now, he has to finish high school, and later on he wants to get married.

Berry lived in a three bedroom apartment with two other roommates. Berry stated that he interacts with his roommate, but they do not hang out as they are in college. Berry also had his room very clean and items were all put away. His room was decorated with posters and trophies related to sports. He
said that he likes to play football and basketball. *Berry* also had a cell phone that he said his Family Teachers gave him. He now pays the bill. He also had a picture of his mother on the wall.
DANIEL

The interview for Respondent #3 (Daniel) took place in his apartment in Tallahassee, Florida. Daniel was born in Destin, Florida on 5/22/84 to a Puerto Rican mother and Jamaican father. Daniel stated that his parents abandoned him as a child and he was sent to the state mental hospital in Jacksonville, Florida, around 5 years of age, as he was fighting a lot. He then went into foster care in Jacksonville, then to Maine into Foster care, and was adopted by family but the adoption did not go through even though the family took me to Europe for about a year. The social service agency came for him; he was about 11 at this time. He then went back into foster care with a family temporarily for a few months, and then went into North Florida Baptist Home (group home), Tallahassee Memorial Psychiatric Hospital, then another foster home and finally the residential facility.

Daniel currently lives in a rented apartment paid for by a social service agency, for the last six months. Daniel’s apartment was neatly decorated and he had a computer and electronic equipment. Immediately after leaving the residential facility, Daniel stayed with his old foster parents until his apartment was ready. CHS also pays for school. He receives no other assistance, besides his income.

Daniel has a full time job at a fast food restaurant, for about 3 weeks now doing customer service. Before, Daniel worked at another fast food service place for 3 months, and at another one before that for about 4 1/2 months. He changed jobs often when he did not like it anymore. Daniel attends school on a
regular basis. He attends Tallahassee Community College, for about 3 semesters studying film. He is averaging a C and is taking courses full time.

While in the home, Daniel worked on: following Instructions and Anger Control. He stated that, "I am unsure of why these were my target behaviors but maybe because I was aggressive when he was younger." Daniel had one incident of anger control while in the residential facility. "Once I got into trouble for quitting my job when confronted by the manager on someone else stealing. I told the manager that he knew who was stealing so why ask me. I walked off the job and had to find another one."

Daniel stated that he felt that the Family Teachers themselves made the program and helped him change the way he felt about himself. "They were really great people who would do anything for us." When I entered the program I felt good about myself but I was tired of moving and just wanted to turn 18 to be on my own. My goals now are to finish community college and start making real money. I also want to get my drivers license so I can start driving."

Daniel stated that "the Family Teachers were nice and supportive, they went all out for the adolescents and the adolescents appreciated this; the FT’s did all they could to get me my apartment paid for and to get me into community college. Without them I would not be where I am now. That’s all I have for (residential facility). The FT’s made the home. They talked to us and were down to earth. They held high expectations, but they weren’t too hard on you."
Daniel stated that in regards to the personnel, "Everybody are tight-wads. The whole program doesn't make sense to me. For example, the point card, what is that. No one cares about a point card as if you lose your privileges you still get three meals a day and a bed. That didn't stop you from being defiant. You can just tear up the cards; no one cared about the points. The facility's environment was secluded (facility is isolated from the rest of the community in a private area that is in a cul de sac.). They should have homes in neighborhoods. Also in the home, some youth with more severe issues sometimes influence the other ones who end up displaying the same behaviors and get worse. The boys and girls are separated and have little contact and that can be a major problem when they get out in the real world, like bad interaction skills with the opposite sex or with the same sex. There are few activities, every one sits down and watches television. It is like institutionalization. My FT's used their own time to take us to different places but the facility restricted where we could go. I remember one kid saying when they get out they are going to buy as many sweet snacks as possible. That's no encouragement; they need to get their own encouragement. They should treat us like normal adolescents, for instance I could not get a license until I left. But there are a lot of things they need to change."

Daniel stated that he did not believe he improved any of his behaviors. "I came in with self control, I just had no where to go. I also worked on being independent so that improved. But it was not because they did anything, it was just me. The FT's helped with my Independent living skills though, but
nothing with my behaviors specifically. I got my self control through realization about society and life pretty much.” Daniel also did not feel that any of his behaviors worsened.

Daniel was on the weekly motivational system when he left the facility. “I did the same on weekly as people did on Achievement and got the same things. So I did not see any point in reaching for Achievement. I don’t see any difference between any of them except that you get to go different places.” I was on weekly for 6 weeks and I left program on weekly.

Daniel felt that his behavior and attitude have matured and that he is a more responsible adult who can make good decisions. In regards to graduating the program successfully, Daniel stated, “I feel that I graduated the program successfully in some peoples’ eyes and in others no. But I feel that I graduated the program successfully.”

Daniel rated his level of self-esteem as 5 being very high. He also stated that he has a lot of contact with the family Teachers. “I either call or see them at least once a week. I also see or call my old foster parents at least once a week. My foster father gave me a car but I have to learn how to drive. I catch the bus or get rides from my foster parents who live nearby, to get to work and school.”

Daniel stated that the facility should be like real life hidden from society, we are not criminals, and we are there for treatment. Daniel also said that because the girls and boys are separated this does not help with relationship building as they can get in trouble with the opposite sex when they get out.
Daniel lived in a one-bedroom apartment in a complex close to his work that was well decorated. Daniel had a computer and electronic equipment. Daniel also stated that he has a car from his old foster parents who he has always been in contact with as they live near by. He also said that he is studying for his license now. Daniel is also in a relationship with a female for about 4 months and he said it was difficult at first but he is getting better at talking.
GEORGE

The interview with respondent #4 (George) took place in his apartment. George was born on 1/3/84 in Athens, Georgia to Caucasian parents. George lived in the residential facility for 1.5 years. He started out with his father in Athens and then went to the facility. He went there after stealing a car. "The probation officer from the court after my hearing sent me there after I was found guilty of theft and vandalism."

George currently lives with his father for about a year in Ocala, Florida. George does not work currently. During the summer he works at the grocery store. George attends a technical school locally. "I am studying how to repair engines. I have been in this program for 7 months."

While in the facility, George worked on following instructions, respecting authority, and on being honest. In the home he got in trouble for stealing things that did not belong to him. There have been no incidents since leaving the facility.

George said that he believed that doing things together, like having dinner, going out and going to church together reminded him of being home which helped him to feel comfortable. He also believed that the social skills made him more confident as he knew how to react in different situations.

Upon entering the program, George said that he felt angry and lost and as if the whole world was against him. He also felt invincible as he was fighting and stealing until he was caught. His goals before entering the program were to complete his probationary requirements, which were to stay in this facility for a
year, pay restitution, complete community service hours, and to undergo therapy. His goals now are to graduate from technical school and get a full-time job and move out on his own.

Concerning the facility, George stated that, “I liked that I was working on making myself better so I can go home. I also liked the fact that this was not a locked-down facility, and I had freedom to do a lot of things. I also like that I spoke to my father every day when I had my privileges, so I was still in contact with my family.” “I would want to change how we are not allowed to interact with the girls or even have our own friends come to the house. It made me realize a lot of times that I was different and other people knew that to.” George stated that in the home he learned to refrain from stealing as he would have to pay back the person he stole from. “It also did not feel good when one of the other adolescents began stealing from me.” George said that his behaviors did not get worse. “If I got in trouble at this facility I would go to the detention center.” He has had no incidents of criminal activity since leaving the facility.

George was on the weekly motivational system for nine months when he left the facility. George felt that he had graduated the program successfully, “I am not in trouble any more and I am learning a trade. My father and I are also getting along better.”

George rated his level of self-esteem at 4, being high. George said that he was very proud that he turned his life around. George said he and his father have a much better relationship since he came back. George said before that
they argued often and he would steal many things or break into people's property for fun.

George also has no contact with the Family Teachers. George and his father live in a three-bedroom home on a farm. George helps his father with the farm duties and also attends school. George's mother died at childbirth.
The interview with respondent #5 (Chris) occurred in his school dormitory in Tallahassee, Florida. Chris was born on 2/11/84 in Quincy, Florida to African-American parents. Chris lived in this residential facility for 1 year. He began at a group home where he was placed when he was 13 because his mother had a nervous breakdown. No other family member could take care of him. He has one sister who is currently in a residential facility in Gainesville, Florida, and who is younger.

Chris lives in the dorms at a community college for about a year. He receives governmental assistance for tuition. Chris also works as the basketball team manager at the school. "I have been doing this for 6 months. I help with uniforms and items that they need for their games." Chris attends community college locally. "I am studying English and Public Policy."

While in the facility, Chris worked on reporting whereabouts, independent living, and following instructions. "I had a lot of incidents of not reporting my whereabouts because I skipped school a lot to go to the Senate as I was interested in politics. It was very hard for me to go to school as I was bored and I thought I would miss something."

Chris stated that he was unsure of what methods really helped him besides the Family Teachers themselves who had made time to help them get what they need, such as his enrollment in college. "When I entered the program I felt that I could achieve anything that I wanted and this was my time to get ahead in life." My future goals were to finish school and enroll in college, as well as
participate in the student government of that college. I am now the student
government president for the community college. My future goals are to finish
college and start law school and become a Senator or Congressman.”

Regarding the facility, Chris also liked that the Family teachers were able
to understand his dilemma and allow him to get a GED as high school was not
motivating for him. “I also liked that we were attending church every Sunday
even though it was not my own church. I also liked that I could visit my family a
lot as they were close by.” Chris said that he would want to change how the
facility encourages everyone to be on medication. “Every person that comes in
there they want to put on medication. My caseworker and I disagreed with their
recommendations with medication since I had never been on any medication
and there were no prior concerns with this.”

Chris reported that in the home he learned to report his whereabouts and
let people know where I am going. If I did not do this then I would not be allowed
to go anywhere. Chris reported that none of his behaviors worsened while he
was in the facility.

Chris was on the Achievement level of the motivational system for 3
months. Chris felt that he had successfully graduated the program, “I am
accomplishing a lot and seeing my hard work come to life.”

Chris rated his level of self-esteem at 5 being very high. Chris stated that
his attitude has become more positive since he is achieving more and
accomplishing more. Chris stated that he now has the social skills necessary to
participate in intellectual conversations. He attributes this in part to having “adult conversation” with the Family Teachers.

Chris has little contact with his Family Teachers. Chris’s dorm room was a single that was very neat and clean. Chris had much memorabilia and books in his room. Chris is also a member of the Student government of this school and is part of the young democrats. Chris is in contact with his family locally, however he prefers to be by himself. The whereabouts of Chris’s mother is unknown as she is homeless and has schizophrenia.
The interview with respondent # 6(JT) took place in his apartment in Miami, Florida. JT was born on 2/10/84 in Tallahassee, Florida to African-American parents. JT was living in the facility, for 4 years. He lived with his mother in Gainesville, Florida; he does not know his father. He and his mother argued and fought a great deal, so he came to the residential facility to work on his behaviors.

JT currently lives in a Job Corp. dormitory in Miami, Florida for the past eight months; he lived at another Job Corp. facility for six months in Miami. He receives SSI benefits since his mother died. He works at the vocational school facility doing electronics for about eight months.

JT stated that he worked on anger control while he was in the home. He said that he did not have any incidents that were his fault. He did say that he got into a fight once with two other adolescents and had to do community service hours and was on probation. JT refused to elaborate. He also worked on independent living when he was getting ready to leave the facility.

JT said that when he first came to the facility he was always angry and getting into arguments. He believed that the Family Teachers helped him by teaching him how to calm down and solve problems instead of "blowing up."

Upon entering the facility, JT responded that his goals were to learn to control his anger and work on his academics. Now his goals are to finish his education and get a job, so he can live on his own.
JT said that he liked the fact that he received free stuff from the home, like clothes and specials (CD’s and posters). “I also liked the campus with the pool and basketball courts, so we could play outside, and the times we went to recreation parks or the bowling alley or fun zone. They were fun.”

In regards to the residential facility, JT said that he would change how they separate the girls from the boys during activities, “they make us sit apart and we were constantly monitored. I would also change how we had to go to their church on Sundays. When we came in they said we could go to our church for six months, I had not seen that yet.” “And the point cards make no sense. All it was, was for them to check t see if the Family Teachers were doing their jobs. It did not help me that much. I did what I wanted to do and made up the points I had to.”

Regarding his behavior, JT said that he did not get into fights as much in the residential facility. He said that if he got into a fight he would be sent to a more restrictive facility. However, he did mention that when he first came. “I got into a fight with two other adolescents and had to serve community service hours and was on probation for a year.”

JT was on the weekly motivational system for two years and left the facility on this system. JT did not feel that he graduated, from the program successfully, “because I still am working on my GED.” JT rated his level of self-esteem at moderate, 3. JT felt that since leaving the facility he has matured and learned to make decisions on his own and can control his temper. JT also has no contact with the Family Teachers.
DONALD

The interview with respondent #7 (Donald) took place at his school dormitory. Donald was born on 2/1/85 in Thomasville, Georgia to African American parents. Donald resided in the residential facility for three years. He previously lived with his mother before coming to the facility. "The DCF worker brought me after they removed me from my home because my mother was hitting me. I saw her a few times after that but I can't see her anymore."

Donald currently lives in the dormitory at Job Corp in Jacksonville, Florida; he has been there for about a year. He receives assistance from the state. He is learning a trade and working in a mechanics shop for the last five months. He earned his GED there and is in the process of getting a vocational certificate in mechanics and plumbing.

While in the facility, Donald worked on anger control, getting along with others, resisting peer pressure, and independent living. In the home "I got in a lot of trouble by letting the other guys influence me. I would be the one to get in trouble and not them. I have never been on a subsystem though. I also got in an argument with another kid and they made us work on peer relations. I rarely got into another big trouble. I have not gotten into any trouble since leaving except getting docked at work because I was late."

In regards to methods used in the home that helped changed the way the respondent felt about himself included family meals and outings and teaching interactions because "it helped me to know how to react in a lot of situations."
Upon entering the facility, Donald’s goals were to become a leader and not a follower, and to learn how to take care of him. Donald’s goals now are to finish Job Corp and get an apartment of his own. Donald also wants to get a job as a manager when he has graduated from Job Corp.

Regarding the facility, Donald liked that there were many other guys on campus that he can play sports with. He also liked the summer recreation when they went to different parks or fun places. “I also liked my Family Teachers as they would do special things for us on our birthdays or when we did good in school or any special events. I really liked the awards banquet that they had every year, as we would get to dress up and receive special awards. I liked how they made a big deal out of us.”

In regards to changing anything about the facility, Donald wanted to change how many times he had to meet with the staff. “It seemed like every week they came in the home and we had to stage everything for them. We had to eat dinner and act on our best behavior as the Family Teachers were being judged. I also never liked the vans as they were so big and everybody knew who we were. It was embarrassing.”

While in the home, Donald learned to get along better with others. “I actually made a lot of friends while I was here.” Donald reported that no behaviors worsened while in the residential facility. Donald was on the weekly motivational system for two years when he left.

Donald felt that he graduated the program successfully. Donald rated his level of self-esteem 4, being high. Donald has little contact with the Family
Teachers. Donald also felt that he has learned to become more independent since leaving the home, and he is not scared to be by himself, he is more confident.

Donald has minimal phone contact with the Family Teachers. However he is maintaining contact with his brother who lives in Tallahassee. Donald has almost graduated the Job Corp program and will be staying in Jacksonville as they are getting him a job.

Donald's dorm was not very clean. He had clothes thrown on the floor. Donald reports that he has to get up at 6:30 every morning as they do drills and they have breakfast before they go to classes. Donald also reported that he liked the home he was in right before he left as he had been in other homes where he did not get along with the Family Teacher.
LIONEL

The interview with respondent # 8 (Lionel) took place at his apartment in Tallahassee, Florida. Lionel was born on 4/11/84 in Ft Lauderdale, Florida to African American parents. Lionel lived in this residential facility for one year. Lionel started out with his mother in Tallahassee, who abandoned him, so he was removed and went to a shelter. He then lived with his grandmother for a few months and came to the facility, because “my grandmother could not take care of me, she was too old.” Lionel currently lives in an apartment with a roommate for the past year with no assistance. Lionel works at the kiosk in the mall selling phones for four months. Lionel is working into getting into a community college.

While in the facility, Lionel worked on anger control, following instructions, and respecting authority. “I had a lot of incidents of not following instructions in the home. I also went on a sub system once for breaking a CD.” In regards to what methods helped Lionel change the way he felt about himself, Lionel responded, “I believe that they taught me that I could get what I need by acting a certain way and not screaming. I also believed that they taught me how to deal with a lot of situations by having us work on our social skills.”

Lionel’s goals upon entering the home included learning to live on his own. His goals now are to find his mother, and complete college. Referring to the home, Lionel stated that, “I liked that I was in a safe place that people cared. I also liked that we got a lot of free stuff that I never would have gotten at home. Also I liked that I could visit my grandmother when I wanted depending on my behavior.” Lionel also stated that he would change “how they put aggressive
adolescents in the same home with other adolescents who are not aggressive. Even though the place is safe, it is still scary when you have all these other adolescents with major problems in the same home as you."

"In the home I learned to control my anger better. Now I can hold back my anger instead of fighting and getting into trouble. **Lionel** reported that none of his behaviors worsened while in the home." **Lionel** was on the weekly motivational system for 7 months when he left the facility. **Lionel** felt that he had graduated the program successfully. "Yes I am working and making money by myself and I am also helping my grandmother out too."

**Lionel** rated his level of self-esteem at very high. **Lionel** thinks all of his behaviors have improved, including following instructions, respecting authority, and anger control. **Lionel** stated that he knows he is independent and knows how to get what he needs. **Lionel** also believes that he thinks more positively and he is more productive. **Lionel** has no contact with the Family Teachers. **Lionel's** apartment was a two-bedroom apartment that he shared with another roommate. **Lionel** claims that he gets along with his roommate. **Lionel** said that he likes the fact that he can pay all of his bills, and he also knows where to go to get what he needs. **Lionel** is also very proud of the fact that he can cook by himself. **Lionel** catches the bus to work even though he does own a driver's license.
ANDREW

The interview with respondent # 9 (Andrew) took place at his aunt’s house in Tallahassee, Florida. Andrew was born on 11/1/84 in Jacksonville, Florida to Caucasian parents. Andrew resided in the residential facility for two years. Andrew began at a foster home when he was younger in Jacksonville, then he moved to a group home in Atlanta, Georgia for a few years then to Tallahassee to this facility. Andrew was removed from his home due to abuse.

Andrew currently lives with his aunt and her son for the past year and a half. He also receives assistance for school from the government. Andrew is also working at Kmart doing stocking and supplying for the last two years. He attends community college since last semester.

While he was in the facility, Andrew worked on respecting authority, anger control, resisting peer pressure, following instructions, and independent living. “I did not like people telling me what to do so I used to argue a lot and refused to follow instructions. I also got in a fight once when one of the other boys spoke badly about my aunt. I got on a subsystem that time.”

In regards to what methods were used that helped in changing the way that Andrew felt about himself included: having teaching interactions, family meetings, one on one conversation with the Family Teachers.

Upon entering the program, Andrew stated that he was always angry and never wanted to talk to anyone. He also stated that he did not like himself at the time. His future goals were to be independent; now they are to graduate.
community college and attend a four-year college, so he can get an degree in social work.

Regarding the residential facility, Andrew liked that he had cable and video games and could play them when he had his privileges. "I also liked that we did a lot of things together as a family, like eating together and having meetings, I never did these things at home, and it felt good and made me feel welcome an part of the family. I also liked that I could talk to my FT's about what was bothering me, and they would listen. They actually came to us and asked us how our day went and wanted to know things that happened with us. It made it much easier to talk when people were not screaming at you or did not get upset because you had a bad day at school. They helped you work through your problems so you can know what to do next time."

In terms of the facility, Andrew did not like the amount of times that he had to be on his best behavior when he had guests and was supposed to use all of his skills. He said that it was not natural. "Everyone was nervous when someone from the office showed up. If this was family style you do not make a big production when you have guests. We have to stop everything we are doing and introduce our selves and sit and talk with our guests. This took time away from our chores and homework which we still had to do anyway."

In the home Andrew worked on being a friend and not an enemy. "Before I did not get along with people or did not want to listen to what they have to say. Now I learned that when you listen to others you learn more and they will also listen to you." None of his behaviors worsened in the facility.
When he left the facility, **Andrew** was on the Weekly motivational system for one year. **Andrew** reported that he felt that he had graduated the program successfully. **Andrew** rated his level of self-esteem at being high. **Andrew** stated that he feels that his behaviors are more positive as he is calmer and is more focused. **Andrew** has no contact with the Family Teachers.

**Andrew** lived with his aunt and her son in a two-bedroom apartment; he shares a room with his cousin. **Andrew** reports that he and his cousin get along very well, and they can talk through their problems. Before **Andrew** said he would fight his cousin over any little thing. **Andrew**'s room was very clean and he had pictures of him being in the residential facility.
The interview with Respondent # 10 (Wilson) took place at a secluded park in his neighborhood. Wilson was born on 12/3/84 in Wakulla Springs, Florida, to Caucasian parents. He is one of ten children, the oldest is 23. Wilson lived in the residential facility for two years. Wilson lived with his mother and then he was removed and placed in a group home due to abuse. He went to live with his brother for a few months, but that did not work out, and then he moved into this facility.

Currently, Wilson lives with his brother and his wife and adolescents in a three-bedroom home for about a year. He does not receive any assistance. Wilson works with his cousin at a lawn repair company for one year. He does not attend school.

While in the facility, Wilson worked on respecting authority, following instructions, and independent living. “I did not like to listen to what people had to say and I would argue back a lot. I had an answer for everything. I never got in any major trouble in the home, except for negatives for arguing back and not accepting my consequence.” There have been no incidents since leaving the facility.

Wilson felt that having two Family Teachers really helped him feel better about himself since he had a father figure to talk to. Wilson also commented on the family style environment, such as eating dinner together, the house set up, and all the other adolescents in the home made him more comfortable as it
reminded him of his family, and he did not feel like he was in a facility all the time.

Regarding the home, Wilson liked that he was close to his brother and he could see them when he wanted to if he had his privileges. "I also liked the food that they had, there was so much, and we had good holiday dinners. I also liked having some of the other adolescents there because we could play together and have fun." Wilson stated that he would want to change the point card system. "We had to carry them everywhere with us, and it was embarrassing. It made no sense. Who stops what they are doing in real life to give points. Sometimes, I did not even remember what the points were for. It was also easy to make up the points you need. I did not like the fact that we had so many appointments to go to. We had to see this psychiatrist or that clinical person almost every week. I felt like a test rat some times."

Wilson stated that when he first entered the program, he was very angry as he had to be there. Wilson's goals upon entering the program were to learn to be independent and to graduate high school. "Now I want to graduate from college and get a good paying job."

In terms of his behaviors in the home, Wilson learned to walk away and not argue all the time. "I learned that when I kept my mouth shut and stopped arguing I got more in return." Wilson stated that none of his behaviors worsened, "except that I hide my entire valuables still, this is the only thing that got worse because there was so much stealing going on."
Wilson was on the weekly motivational system when he left the facility and was on it for one year. Wilson was not sure if he graduated from the program successfully or not. "I guess I am alive and back home."

Wilson rated his level of self-esteem at 3 being moderate. Wilson commented that he has learned to get what he need by working hard, and he did not do that before. "I am still working on the confidence though, but it is hard when you have to work to hard to get s little."

Wilson lives with his family in a crowded home. Wilson is also one of the sole providers for the home as his brother has four adolescents. Wilson said that he did not like the residential facility because he was away from his family. However, he said that you can either get better or worse as there are many adolescents there that can influence you.
The following within case analysis analyzes the domains of the survey instrument. The domains are adaptive functioning, body image, other perception, own learning ability, self-confidence, social skills, and self-worth.

**MARK**

With respondent #1, Mark in regards to adaptive functioning, Mark felt very calm and relaxed, had a good sense of humor, trusted people, and looked at the bright side of things. “I can walk away instead of arguing.” Mark also liked school a little and liked to help people a little. In this domain of adaptive functioning in the self-evaluation scale, Mark scored a possible 21 out of 27 points, averaging a 77.77 percentage in this domain. According to the research previously mentioned, this should give an indication of his independence in the community and of academic success.

In regards to his body image, Mark scored possible 13 out of 15 points and was very happy with his body image. Mark averaged 86.6% in this domain.

Regarding of how people view him, Mark scored a possible 26 out of 33 on this domain. Mark also indicated that he does not feel that his family appreciates him. “The way my mother sees it is that I have not changed, but I just do it to get on her nerves. We do not get along with each other as she likes to baby my brother and sister. She does not think the older adolescents know what they are saying and she puts us down that is why no one wants to stay with her.”
In regards to his perception of his own learning ability, Mark scored a possible 12 of 12 points, indicating that he is extremely happy with his own learning ability. This is an interesting finding as Mark is in the eighth grade at school due to his struggles with academics and behavior.

In the domain of self-confidence, Mark scored a possible 8 of 9 points, with a percentage of 88.8% in this area. In the domain of overall self-worth, Mark scored a possible 9 of 12 points with a percentage of 75. This is an interesting finding as Mark has a high level of self-worth even though he is in the eighth grade and does not feel appreciated by his family with whom he lives with.

In the domain of perception of own social skills, Mark worked on respecting authority, role modeling, peer relations, following instructions, getting along with others, and anger control. He scored 12 of 15 points and had a percentage of 80% in this domain. This was surprising as Mark was in trouble with the law after he left the program. "I have been suspended for a total of seven weeks for cursing out teachers, and violating dress codes. I was suspended and also did not tell my mother and went to my grandfather's house. The police came and picked me up because they said I looked suspicious walking in the street. Also four months later, I was in a shelter for three days as my mother and I got into an argument, and she threatened to hit me, so I told her if she would I would hit her back. She kept comparing me to my father and I got mad. I also almost got into a fight with my sister because she pushed me into some boxes, and I got up and jumped at her and she was scared and she called the police, so that it is why
I went to the shelter. There were no charges because I did not physically touch my sister."
In the domain of adaptive functioning, Berry scored 25 out of 27 possible points with a 92.59% in this domain. This indicates Berry has a high level of adaptive functioning which research has shown to be correlated with social skills and social competence (Gresham, 1997).

In the domain of body image, Berry scored a possible 15 of 15 points in this domain, indicating that he felt very content with his body image.

In the domain of how others view him, Berry scored a possible 30 of 33 points, 90.9%, indicating that he felt others view him positively. This is very important, as this is Berry's perception of how others view him. In the domain of perception of own learning ability, Berry scored 100% of the points, indicating he was very pleased with his own learning ability. This result is surprising, however since Berry is behind academically because he is in the eleventh grade.

In regards to self-confidence and overall self-worth, Berry scored 100% of the points indicating he was very confident about himself. This is a very important finding as Berry has a high level of self-confidence, which has a positive correlation with social skills.

In the domain of perception of own social skills, Berry also scored 100% of the points indicating that he feels comfortable that he has acquired the necessary social skills. This is very important finding as research has shown correlations between social skills and self-esteem.
DANIEL

In the domain of adaptive functioning, Daniel scored a possible 26 of 27 points with 96.2% in this domain, indicating he had a high level of adaptive functioning in the community. In regards to the domain of body image, Daniel scored 100% of the points, indicating that he felt very comfortable with his body image. This score will give an indication of his level of self-esteem.

With the domain of how others view him, Daniel scored a possible 29 of 32 points, with a 87.8% on this domain. This score also reflects that Daniel only feels a little that he is trustworthy, and he is true to his word. These findings are significant and need further investigating.

In the domain of own learning, Daniel scored 100% of the points indicating that he had a high level of perception in his own learning ability. Daniel also scored 100% of the points in regards to the domain of self-confidence, indicating that Daniel is very confident with himself.

In the domain of self-worth, Daniel scored a possible 11 of 12 points, a 91.6% indicating that he felt that he had a high level of self-worth. Interestingly enough, Daniel felt that he was only a little honest as indicated by his scores.

In regards to social skills, Daniel scored 100% of the points in this domain, indicating he felt that he had high level of social skills. This is not surprising as Daniel also had a high level of self-esteem and self-worth.
In the domain of adaptive functioning, George scored a possible 23 of 27 points, with a 85.1%. This indicates that George felt that he had some level of adaptive functioning. In terms of the individual questions, George responded with “a little” in regards to trusting people, being clam and relaxed, looking at the bright side of things, and liking school. These results are very important as they give an indication of the degree of adaptive functioning that George has.

With the domain of body image George scored 100% of the points as he felt very comfortable with his body image.

In the domain of others’ perception, George scored a possible 21 of 33 points. In the individual questions, George did not feel that he could be counted on, and responded to “a little” in regards to being appreciated by is family, being appreciated by others, well liked, enjoyable, and trustworthy. These results are very surprising as this is in direct conflict with how George views himself.

In the domain of own learning ability, George scored 100% of the points indicating that he had a high perception of his own learning abilities. However, this contradicts the scores of domain of self-confidence since he has scored a possible 6 of 9 points, a 66.6% indicating that he is not as confident about himself. This is not surprising because George’s perception of how others view him is low. George also had a 66.6% in the domain of perception of overall self-worth, which was not surprising as he had a low score on self-confidence and a low perception of what others think of him.
In the domain of social skills, George scored a possible 8 of 12 points, with 66.6% of the domain. This is not surprising as social skills and self-esteem have a positive correlation.
In the domain of adaptive functioning Chris scored a possible 25 of 27 points, with a percentage of 92.59% of the domain. This indicated that Chris had a high level of adaptive functioning. In the individual questions, Chris indicated that he had a difficult time trusting people and handling criticism well.

In regards to body image, Chris indicated a score of 14 of 15 points, a percentage of 93.33% of the domain. Chris indicated that he did not like his face as much due to his acne.

In the domain of how others view him, Chris indicated a score of 32 of 33, a percentage of 91.4% of this domain. Chris, however, indicated that he felt that others appreciated him a little.

In regards to own learning ability, Chris scored 100% of the points of the domain indicating he felt very comfortable in his own learning ability. This is not surprising as the other domains were relatively high indicating a high level of self-esteem. Also, Chris is the only respondent in a community college.

Not surprisingly, the domains of self-confidence, self-worth, and social skills are also very high. Chris scored 100% of the points in these domains indicating he has a high level of self-confidence and self-worth. In addition, in the domain of self-worth, Chris indicated that he was not happy with his accomplishments thus far. This is interesting, indicating that Chris has high expectations for himself. Chris indicated that he wants to go to law school and be a Senator or Congressman. These results were not surprising as previously
mentioned, since there is a high correlation between social skills and self-esteem.
In the domain of adaptive functioning, JT scored a possible 25 of 27 points, 92.5% of the domain. In this domain, however JT answered “a little” in regards to being calm and relaxed and having good judgment.

In the domain of body image, JT scored 100% of the points, which indicated, he was satisfied with his body image. JT also scored 100% of the points in the domain of how other people view him. These results correlate with social skills and self-esteem.

In the domain of perception of own learning ability, JT had a score of 11 out of a possible 12; which is 91.6% on the domain. This result is surprising however, as JT indicated that he did not feel that he graduated the program successfully due to not getting his GED. These results conflict with each other as JT, indicated that he was not pleased with himself academically, but he has a high perception of his overall learning ability. In addition, the question of being knowledgeable in current events resulted in a response of “a little.”

In the domain of being self-confident JT scored a possible 7 of 9 points, 77.7% success of the domain. This result was very interesting as JT was confident even though he was behind academically. In the domain of self-worth, JT scored 11 out of a possible 12 points. This was interesting, as JT felt that he was worthwhile, honest and unselfish. However, JT was not satisfied with his accomplishments.
The last domain of social skills, JT scored 14 of 15 possible points, 93.3% of the domain. This result was interesting; even though JT is behind academically, he still indicated a high score on his perception of his own social skills.
DONALD

In the domain of adaptive functioning, Donald scored 27 out of 27 points, indicating he had a high level of adaptive functioning. In the domain of body image, Donald scored a possible 14 of 15 points. This also indicated a high level of perception of his own body image.

In the domain of others' perception, Donald scored 27 of 33 points, 81.8% of the domain. These results were varied as Donald had varied scores in this area.

In the domain of own learning ability, Donald scored 8 of 12 points, 66.6% success rate of the domain. This result was not surprising as Donald had difficulties academically since he is still working on his GED.

In the domain of self-confidence, he scored 8 of 9 points, 88.8% of the domain. In the domain of self-worth Donald scored 10 of 12 points; 83.3% of the domain. The domain of social skills indicated a score of 14 of 15 points; 93.3% of the domain. These results were very interesting, as it showed a positive correlation between social skills, self-esteem and self-worth.
LIONEL

In the domain of adaptive functioning, Lionel scored 100% of the points, indicating he had a high level of adaptive functioning. In the domain of body image, Lionel received 14 of 15 points, 93.3% indicating he felt good about the way he looked. Lionel indicated "a little" on the question regarding his height, as he is short for his age. In the domain of others' perception of him, Lionel scored a possible 32 of 33, 96.9% of the domain, indicating that he felt many people had a positive perspective of him. The individual question of not being appreciated by family was responded with "a little."

In the domain of perception of own learning ability, Lionel obtained 100% of the score, indicating he perceived that he had a high learning ability.

In the domain of self-confidence, self-worth, and social skills, Lionel reported 100% of the scores indicating that he felt that he was very confident and worthwhile. These scores are not surprising as Lionel also had a high level of adaptive functioning, which supports the research.
ANDREW

In the domain of adaptive functioning, Andrew scored 100% of the points indicating he had a very high level on the adaptive functioning. This was to be expected as Andrew is succeeding in academics and in being independent, even though he is living with his aunt. In the domain of body image, Andrew also scored 100% of the points indicating he liked the way that he looked.

In the domain of how others view him, Andrew scored a possible 29 of 33 points, resulting in 87.87% of the domain. This indicated Andrew had a high level of perception of how he thought others view him.

In the domain of own learning, Andrew scored 9 of 12 possible points, 75% of the domain. This indicted Andrew felt comfortable with his perception of his own learning ability. This was expected as Andrew is attending community college.

In the domain of self confidence, Andrew scored a possible 7 of 9 points, 77.7% success of the domain This was surprising as Andrew indicated a response of “a little” in regards to “speak up when right” and “confident” but indicated he felt he had a lot of self control.

In the domain of “self-worth” Andrew scored a possible 12 of 14 points, 85.7% of the domain. This result was not surprising, since Andrew’s scores are fairly consistent on the scale.
In the domain of "social skills" Andrew scored 100% of the points, which was not surprising as there is a correlation with adaptive functioning, in which he scored high.
In the domain of adaptive functioning, Wilson scored 25 of 27 possible points, 92.5% of the domain. This indicated that he had a high level of adaptive functioning in the community in the areas of academics and social.

In the domain of body image, Wilson scored a possible 14 of 15 points, 93.3% of the domain. This is to be expected as the other domains have scored relatively consistent and high.

In the domain of others' perception, Wilson scored a possible 27 of 33, 81.8% of the domain. This result was not surprising; however, the scores were not as high as the other domains.

In the domain of own learning ability, Wilson scored a possible 11 of 12 points, 91.6% of the domain. This score was not surprising, since this is consistent with his academic achievements.

In the domain of self-confidence, Wilson scored 100% of the points. These results were not surprising, because the scores in the other domains were also high.

In the domain of self-worth, Wilson scored a possible 11 of 12 points, 91.6% of the domain. This score was not surprising as this is consistent with self-esteem, which is also high.

In the domain of social skills, Wilson scored 100% of the points indicating he had a high level of perception of his own social skills. This result was not
surprising as the domains of adaptive functioning and self-esteem was high, which had a positive correlation with social skills.
Across case analysis

Table 4 represents the respondent’s level on the motivation system, level of self-esteem, graduation success rate, and level of Family Teachers support. The following data was gathered concerning the respondents and some of the findings not including the domains.

Eight of the ten males were on the weekly motivational system, while Chris was on achievement, and Berry was on the natural and logical motivational system for six years. Out of the respondents who were on the weekly motivational system, the average length of time in the facility was 1.467 years, with a range of .07 to 4 years. This is very important to note as the purpose of the point system and the motivation system is for the youth to move up from the daily motivational system with 350,000 points and move on through natural and logical.

These findings are not indicative of the model, as JT was on weekly for four years, and Donald was on weekly for 3 years. However, it is interesting to note as well that JT and Donald were also behind academically and were obtaining their GED from Job Corp. and living in the dormitory. Berry was on the natural and logical motivational system, which allows the youth to no longer be on the point card, and "this is the time for the youth to "learn to deal with greater ambiguity, achieve greater independence, "and prepare for his return to the real world" (Coughlin & Shanahan, 1991). Each youth should ultimately be at achievement or natural and logical motivational system to successfully complete the program and achieve their goals. (Coughlin & Shanahan, 1991).
Eight of the ten reported that they felt they graduated the residential program successfully, while JT reported no success, and Wilson did not know. JT stated that he did not feel that he graduated the program successfully as he was still working on his GED at Job Corp. and he did not feel like he was helped academically. Wilson was not sure and said, “I am not sure. I guess I am alive and back home.” This is very important, as the perception of the respondents gives a good indication if they feel they graduated successfully and what is success for them. JT equated success with academics, while Wilson was unsure and equated success with being alive and home.

In regards to JT, he was on the weekly motivational system for 4 years and had felt that he had a moderate level of self-esteem. This was not surprising as according to the model he was not successful in the program; as he did not move through the system in four years. Wilson also indicated his level of self-esteem was at moderate, and he was also on the weekly motivation system for two years. Interestingly enough, both of these respondents had no contact with the Family Teachers after they left the program.

Out of the eight males that reported that felt they graduated from the program successfully; Lionel, Andrew, and George had no contact with their Family Teachers after discharge. Andrew also lives with relatives and has a high level of self-esteem. Andrew has also been on the weekly motivation system for two years. Lionel reported a very high level of self-esteem and had no contact with the Family Teaches since he left the facility. Lionel also has been on weekly
for one year. JT also had no contact with the Family Teachers, but did not feel that he graduated the program successfully, due to academic concerns.

Both Berry and Daniel reported that they had a lot of contact with the Family teachers after discharge. Daniel reported, "I either call or see them once a week; I also call or see my old foster parents at least once a week." Berry stated the he calls or sees his old Family Teachers almost every day. Daniel also reported a very high level of self-esteem and was on the weekly motivational system at discharge, while Berry had a moderate level of self-esteem and was on the natural and logical motivational system for seven years.

It is interesting to note that all the respondents who had no contact with the Family teachers were all on the weekly motivational system for 1-2 years. The literature surrounding the Teaching Family Model, two important variables surface: consistent guidance and developing and maintaining a mutually reinforcing relationship (Braukmann et al, 1980). The correlation data has suggested that where such teaching and relationship variables are present at some strength, adolescents are more likely to achieve autonomy and self-confidence, in addition to avoiding delinquent behavior (Conger, 1977). Effective, positive teaching can increase the likelihood and strength of a mutually reinforcing relationship, in that this relationship can increase the opportunities for and effectiveness of teaching (Braukmann et al, 1984).
### Table #4

**TABLE ON MOTIVATIONAL SYSTEM, LEVEL OF FAMILY TEACHER SUPPORT, LEVEL ON SELF-ESTEEM, LENGTH OF STAY AT THE FACILITY, AND GRADUATION SUCCESS RATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Level of Family Teacher Support</th>
<th>Level on Motivation System</th>
<th>Level of Self-esteem</th>
<th>Time at facility</th>
<th>Graduated successfully</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARK</td>
<td>Little contact</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>1.1 years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERRY</td>
<td>A lot of contact</td>
<td>Natural and Logical</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL</td>
<td>A lot of contact</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>7 months</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE</td>
<td>No contact</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>1.5 years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRIS</td>
<td>Little contact</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT</td>
<td>No contact</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONALD</td>
<td>Little contact</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIONEL</td>
<td>No contact</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW</td>
<td>No contact</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILSON</td>
<td>No contact</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 represents the target areas that the respondents worked on.

The residents worked on the following target areas or behaviors: anger control, following instructions, getting along with others, independent living, peer relations, respecting authority, role modeling, resisting peer pressure, reporting whereabouts, honesty and stealing. The respondents indicated that all of these behaviors improved. However, Mark had an increase in aggressiveness which was not an initial behavior that was worked on. In addition, George felt that his level of trust worsened as a result of various people in and out of his life.

According to the research, identifying target behaviors usually consist of three different categories: behaviors that need to be decreased, behaviors that need to be increased, and behaviors that need to be maintained. (Myles et al, 1992).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>TARGET BEHAVIORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARK</td>
<td>&quot;Respecting authority, Role modeling, Peer relations, Following Instructions, Getting along with others and Anger control. I got in trouble once in the home for fighting.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERRY</td>
<td>&quot;Being Independent. But before I was working on Following Instructions and on getting along with others. I had no incidents in the home or when left.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL</td>
<td>&quot;Following Instructions and Anger Control.&quot; Unsure of why these were target behaviors but said that he was aggressive when he was younger. &quot;Once I got into trouble for quitting my job when confronted by the manager on someone else stealing. I told the manager that he knew who was stealing so why ask me. I walked off the job and had to find another one.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE</td>
<td>&quot;I worked on Following instructions, Respecting Authority, and on Being Honest. In the home I got in trouble for stealing things that did not belong to me. No incidents since leaving home.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CHRIS       | "I worked on Reporting Whereabouts, Independent Living, and Following Instructions. I had a lot of incidents of not reporting my whereabouts because I skipped school a lot to go to the Senate, as I was interested in politics. It was very hard for me to go to school as I was bored and I thought I would miss something."
| JT          | "I worked on Anger Control. I got into a fight with two other adolescents and had to serve community hours and get on probation." |
| DONALD      | "I worked on Anger control, Getting Along with others, Resisting peer pressure, and Independent Living. In the home I got in a lot of trouble by letting the other guys influence me. I would be the one to get in trouble and not them. I have never been on a subsystem though. I also got in an argument with another kid and they made us work on peer relations. I rarely got into another big trouble. I have not gotten into any trouble except getting docked at work because I was late." |
| LIONEL      | "I worked on Anger control, Following Instructions, and Respecting Authority. I had a lot of incidents of not following instructions in the home. I also went on a subsystem once for breaking a CD." |
| ANDREW      | "I worked on Respecting Authority, Anger Control, Resisting Peer Pressure, Following Instructions, and Independent Living. I did not like people telling me what to do so I used to argue a lot and refused to follow instructions. I also got in a fight once when one of the other boys spoke badly about my aunt. I got on a subsystem that time." |
| WILSON      | "I worked on Respecting Authority, Following Instructions, and Independent Living. I did not like to listen to what people had to say and I would argue back a lot. I had an answer for everything. I never got in any major trouble in the home, except for negatives for arguing back and not accepting my consequence. There have been no incidents since leaving the home." |
The respondents also indicated what they liked about the home. This included the following: the Family Teachers in their homes, the specials given as rewards and reinforcers, the outings and activities, safe environment, other adolescents there at facility, attending church, and contact with their biological families. These findings support the model as it is a family style model.

Table 6 represents the items that the respondents liked about the home. This is important to note as many of the respondents reported that they liked their Family Teachers. As previously mentioned there is a correlation between sustainable relationships and the effectiveness of the teaming interactions. The components of the model are also clearly seen in the responses of the prior residents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENT</th>
<th>WHAT THEY LIKED ABOUT FACILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARK</td>
<td>&quot;You got a lot of free stuff, like designer clothes, and CD’s. I liked the FT’s as they were very nice and got us a lot of things. I also liked summer recreation when we went to different places every week during the summer.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERRY</td>
<td>&quot;It's a nice place to be at and they help you with your behavior as I changed my behavior, like at home I did not like to clean up and now I like to. I also liked the family teachers are they are good to me and nice to live with. I liked how we ate dinner together and did a lot of things together.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL</td>
<td>&quot;The Family Teachers (FT’s) as they were nice and supportive, they went all out for the adolescents and the adolescents appreciated this. For example, the FT’s did all they kid to get me my apartment paid for and to get me into community college. Without them I would not be where I am now. That's all I have for (residential facility). The FT’s made the home. They talked to us and were down to earth. They held high expectations, but they weren't too hard on you.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE</td>
<td>&quot;I liked that I was working on making myself better so I can go home. I also liked the fact that this was not a locked down facility and I had freedom to do a lot of things. I also like that I spoke to my father every day when I had my privileges, so I was still in contact with my family.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRIS</td>
<td>&quot;I liked that they were able to understand my dilemma and allow me to get a GED as school was not motivating for me. I also liked that we were attending church every Sunday even though it was not my own church. I also liked that I could visit my family a lot as they were close by.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT</td>
<td>&quot;I liked that we got a lot of free stuff like clothes and specials (CD’s, posters, etc.). I also liked the campus with the pool and basketball courts so we can play outside, and the times we went to recreation parks or the bowling alley or fun zone. They were fun.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONALD</td>
<td>&quot;I liked that there were a lot of other guys on campus that we can play sports with. I also liked summer recreation when we went to different parks or fun places. I also liked my Family Teachers as they would do special things for us on our birthdays or when we did well in school or any special events. I really liked the awards banquet that they had every year as we would get to dress up and receive special awards. I liked how they made a big deal out of us.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIONEL</td>
<td>&quot;I liked that I was in a safe place that people cared. I also liked that we got a lot of free stuff that I never would have gotten at home. Also, I liked that I could visit my grandmother when I wanted depending on my behavior.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW</td>
<td>&quot;I liked that we had cable and video games and could play them when we had our privileges. I also liked that we did a lot of things together as a family, like eating together and having meetings, I never did these things at home and it felt good and made me feel welcome and part of the family. I also liked that I could talk to my FT’s about what was bothering me and they would listen. They actually came to us and asked us how our day went and wanted to know things that happened with us. It made it much easier to talk when people were not screaming at you or do not get upset because you had a bad day at school. They help you work through your problems, so you can know what to do next time.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILSON</td>
<td>&quot;I liked that I was close to my brother and he could see me when he wanted to if I had my privileges. I also liked the food that they had, there was so much, and we had good holiday dinners. I also liked having some of the other adolescents there as we could play together and have fun.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some of the items that the respondents wanted to change about the home are as follows: point card, easily recognizable vans, the isolated environment, restrictiveness, separation and unrealistic expectations of males and females, forced medications, numerous appointments, other aggressive youth, and normalcy. These findings are varied in support of the literature on the Teaching Family model and family style. Also these findings support the statements made by the respondents that they do not know how to interact with the opposite sex after they leave the facility, as they were so isolated in the program. The respondents also indicated a dislike with the point cards as they are not realistic in society, and you can easily make up points that were lost by volunteering or doing simple tasks unrelated to your goals. Table 7 represents these responses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENT</th>
<th>WHAT THEY WANTED TO CHANGE ABOUT FACILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MARK       | "I would change the point cards as it really does not do anything. I still got my privileges; I just had to do stupid stuff to get it, like volunteering and doing extra chores. Also with the school notes we could forge them, and they would not know. I would make it more realistic. Like if they got suspended, I would try and get their school work and have them do their work at home instead of volunteering or doing chores. I also do not like when they ask questions they know the answer to, like if we got our report card when they know report cards have not come out yet. I also hated the vans as they were so big and everybody knew who you were. I would change the other adolescents who came there. Sometimes adolescents come there who should not be there and they do things for attention, and they disrupt the whole house before they finally leave. Mark said that they should change the rules about having relationships with the opposite sex. They try to keep them separated but they can't. When I was there, there were so many relationships, they just did not know about it. They should teach us how to work on having relationships, so there would not be any problems later on. They also do not let us have contact with other people. No one can come on campus. If I wanted to visit a friend, I could not because I would have to get special permission, and they would have to make a big deal out of it. Also, it would be even harder to have my friends visit me on campus; they could not because of confidentiality reasons."

"I would want to change how we are not allowed to interact with the girls or even have our own friends come to the house. It made me realize a lot of times that I was different, and other people knew that to."

| BERRY      | "I would change the home using the van (big blue or white ten passenger van) as everybody knows who you are when you go out and its huge, it’s embarrassing. I did not like the point card because I got negatives. I don’t see how it helped us now or then. I don’t think it is realistic it is just something they had to do at the facility."

"Everybody are tight-wads. The whole program doesn’t make sense to me. For example, the point cards, what is that? No one cares about a point card as if you lose your privileges you still get three meals a day and a bed. That didn’t stop you from being defiant. You can just tear up the cards, no one cared about the points. The facility’s environment was secluded (facility is isolated from the rest of the community in a private area that is in a cul de sac.). They should have homes in neighborhoods. Also, in the home some youth with more severe issues sometimes influence the other ones who end up displaying the same behaviors and get worse. The boys and girls are separated and have little contact and that can be major problems when they get out in the real world, like bad interaction skills with the opposite sex or with the same sex. There are few activities, every one sits down and watches television. It is like institutionalization. My FT’s used their own time to take us to different places but the facility restricted where we could go. I remember one kid saying when they get out they are going to buy as many sweet snacks as possible. That’s no reinforcement; they need to get their own reinforcement. They should treat us like normal adolescents, for instance I could not get a license until I left. But there are a lot of things they need to change."

"I would want to change how they want everyone to be on medication. Every person that comes in there they want to put on medication. My caseworker and I disagreed with their recommendations with medication since I had never been on any medication and there were no prior concerns with this."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JT</td>
<td>&quot;I would want to change how they separate the girls from the boys with activities; they make us sit apart and we are constantly monitored. I also would want to change how we have to go to their church on Sundays. When we came in they said we could go to our church for six months; I have not seen that yet. And the point cards, as it makes no sense. All it was, was for them to check to see if the Family Teachers were doing their jobs. It did not help me that much. I did want I wanted to do and made up the points if I had to.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONALD</td>
<td>&quot;I would want to change how much time we had to meet with the staff. It seemed like every week they came in the home, and we had to stage everything for them. We had to eat dinner and act on our best behavior as the FT’s were being judged. I also never liked the vans as they were so big and everybody knew who we were. It was embarrassing.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIONEL</td>
<td>&quot;I would want to change how they put aggressive adolescents in the same home with other adolescents who are not aggressive. Even though the place is safe it is still scary, when you have all these other adolescents with major problems in the same home as you.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW</td>
<td>&quot;I would want to change the amount of times that we had to be on our best behavior when we had guests and we were supposed to use all of our skills. It was not natural. Everyone was nervous when someone from the office showed up. If this was family style you do not make a big production when you have guests. We have to stop everything we are doing and introduce ourselves and sit and talk with our guests. This took time away from our chores and homework that we still had to do anyway.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILSON</td>
<td>&quot;I would want to change the Point cards. We had to carry them everywhere with us, and it was embarrassing. It made no sense. Who stops what they are coding in real life to give points. Sometimes I did not even remember what the points were for. It was also easy to make up the points you need. I did not like the fact that we had so many appointments to go to. We had to see this psychiatrist or that clinical person almost every week. I felt like a test rat some times.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The components of the model are very important when looking at the responses of the respondents. The components of the Teaching Family Model (TFM) consists of: a token economy motivation system wherein youth earn points and exchange them for privileges; a self government system that allows youth to participate in development of the rules and structure of their daily life; a focus on teaching social skills from a standardized social skills curriculum; an emphasis on normalization; and a continuous evaluation system, part of which involves the youth evaluating the teaching family couple. (Friman, 1999).

In addition, as mentioned previously, the development of a mutually rewarding relationship between the teaching parents and the youth is another essential component of this model. “The effectiveness of a teaching parent is related to the reinforcing value that she or he has for that youth” (Wolf et al, 1995). In Solnick, Braukmann, Bedlington, Kirigin, & Wolf (1981), positive staff-youth relationships were shown to be important in producing desired treatment outcomes. Tables 8.1-8.10 represent the ex-residents responses as compared to the components of the model.

In looking at the components of the model, many of the respondents did not like the points system, as it was “unrealistic” or “made no sense.” The point system is a component of the token economy system. In regards to the self government system, there were mixed views on the manager system as some thought it “unfair.” In addition, Mark, George, Lionel, Andrew and Donald liked the manager system, while Chris, Berry and JT did not.
With teaching social skills, all of the respondents reported that they worked on their behaviors. There were many varied reports on normalization. Many of the youth thought the program was “unrealistic” in regards to the point cards, restrictiveness and secludedness of the facility; isolation from the opposite sex, and institution style vans. However, many of the youth reported they liked the family style environment with the Family Teachers and going on outings.

Many of the youth did not have a report on the evaluation system as this is not as evident. JT, Donald, Andrew and Wilson reported that the evaluation system was inconvenient and took away from their time to do activities and homework. In addition, many of the respondents disliked the consistent meetings and appointments they had to attend. JT commented that the point cards were for the staff to see if the Family Teachers were doing their jobs.
### Table 8.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARK</th>
<th>POSITIVES</th>
<th>NEGATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>token economy motivation system</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>&quot;I would change the point cards as it really does not do anything. I still got my privileges, I just had to do stupid stuff to get it, like volunteering and doing extra chores.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self government system</td>
<td>&quot;I liked being the manager.&quot;</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching social skills</td>
<td>Worked on behaviors</td>
<td>&quot;Also with the school notes we could forge them and they would not know. I would make it more realistic. Like if they got suspended I would try and get their school work and have them do their work at home instead of volunteering or doing chores.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>normalization</td>
<td>&quot;I also liked summer recreation when we went to different places every week during the summer.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I also hated the vans as they were so big and everybody knew who you were. I would change the other adolescents who came there.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuous evaluation system</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Mark said that they should change the rules about having relationships with the opposite sex. &quot;They try to keep them separated but they can't. When I was there, there were so many relationships, they just did not know about it. They should teach us how to work on having relationships so there would not be any problems alter on. They also do not let us have contact with other people. No one can come on campus. If I wanted to visit a friend I could not because I would have to get special permission and they would have to make a big deal out of it. Also it would be even harder to have my friends visit me on campus, they could not because of confidentiality reasons.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BERRY</th>
<th>POSITIVES</th>
<th>NEGATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>token economy motivation system</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>&quot;I did not like the point card because I got negatives. I don't think it is realistic it is just something they had to do at the facility.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self government system</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>&quot;I did not like it when the other boys gave me negatives.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching social skills</td>
<td>&quot;Its a nice place to be at and they help you with your behavior as I changed my behavior, like at home I did not like to clean up and now I like to.&quot;</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>normalization</td>
<td>&quot;I also liked the family teachers are they are good to me and nice to live with. I liked how we ate dinner together and did a lot of things together.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I would change the home using the van (big blue or white ten passenger van) as everybody knows who you are when you go out and its huge, its embarrassing. I don't see how it helped us now or then.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuous evaluation system</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DANIEL</th>
<th>POSITIVES</th>
<th>NEGATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>token economy motivation system</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>&quot;I remember one kid saying when they get out they are going to buy as many sweet snacks as possible. That's no reinforcement, they need to get their own reinforcement. But there are a lot of things they need to change. I did the same on weekly as people did on Achievement and got the same things. So I didn't see any point in reaching for Achievement. I don't see any difference between any of them except that you get to go different places.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self government system</td>
<td>&quot;I liked that we were in charge at times.&quot;</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching social skills</td>
<td>&quot;The FT's helped with my independent living skills though but nothing with my behaviors specifically.&quot;</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>normalization</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>&quot;The facility's environment was secluded (facility is isolated from the rest of the community in a private area that is in a cul de sac.). They should have homes in neighborhoods. The boys and girls are separated and have little contact and that can be a major problems when they get out in the real world, like bad interaction skills with the opposite sex or with the same sex. There are few activities, every one sits down and watches television. It is like institutionalization. They should treat us like normal adolescents, for instance I could not get a license until I left.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuous evaluation system</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Daniel stated that the facility should be like real life hidden from society, we are not criminals, we are there for treatment. Daniel also said that because the girls and boys are separated this does not help with relationship building as they can get in trouble with the opposite sex when they get out.

Table 8.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEORGE</th>
<th>POSITIVES</th>
<th>NEGATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>token economy motivation system</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Did not like point card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self government system</td>
<td>Liked manager system</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching social skills</td>
<td>&quot;I liked that I was working on making myself better so I can go home. In the home I learned to not steal as I would have to pay back the person I stole from.&quot;</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>normalization</td>
<td>&quot;I also liked the fact that this was not a locked down facility and I had freedom to do a lot of things. I also like that I spoke to my father every day when I had my privileges, so I was still in contact with my family.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I would want to change how we are not allowed to interact with the girls or even have our own friends come to the house. It made me realize a lot of times that I was different and other people knew that to.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuous evaluation system</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>POSITIVES</th>
<th>NEGATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>token economy motivation system</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Did not like point card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self government system</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Did not like manager system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching social skills</td>
<td>&quot;In the home I learned to report my whereabouts and let people know where I am going. If I did not do this then I would not be allowed to go anywhere.&quot;</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>normalization</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>&quot;I would want to change how they want everyone to be on medication. Every person that comes in there they want to put on medication. My caseworker and I disagreed with their recommendations with medication since I had never been on any medication and there were no prior concerns with this. I also liked that we were attending church every Sunday even though it was not my own church. I also liked that I could visit my family a lot as they were close by.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuous evaluation system</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>POSITIVES</th>
<th>NEGATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>token economy motivation system</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>JT stated that the point cards make no sense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;All it was, was for them to check to see if the Family Teachers were doing their jobs. It did not help me that much. I did want I wanted to do and made up the points if I had to.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self government system</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Did not like the manager system, as the boys would pick the same manager.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching social skills</td>
<td>Worked on behaviors</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>normalization</td>
<td>&quot;I also liked the campus with the pool and basketball courts so we can play outside. And the times we went to recreation parks or the bowling alley or fun zone. They were fun.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I would want to change how they separate the girls from the boys with activities, they make us sit apart and we are constantly monitored. I also would want to change how we have to go to their church on Sundays. When we came in they said we could go to our church for six months, I have not seen that yet.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuous evaluation system</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>&quot;And the point cards as it makes no sense. All it was, was for them to check to see if the Family Teachers were ding their jobs. It did not help me that much. I did want I wanted to do and made up the points if I had to.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 8.7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIONEL</th>
<th>POSITIVES</th>
<th>NEGATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>token economy motivation system</td>
<td>Also I liked that I could visit my grandmother when I wanted depending on my behavior</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self government system</td>
<td>&quot;I really liked being manager.&quot;</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching social skills</td>
<td>&quot;I worked on anger control, following instructions, and respecting authority. I had a lot of incidents of not following instructions in the home. In the home I learned to control my anger better. Now I can hold back my anger instead of fighting and getting into trouble.&quot;</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>normalization</td>
<td>I liked that I was in a safe place that people cared. I also liked that we got a lot of free stuff that I never would have gotten at home.</td>
<td>I would want to change how they put aggressive adolescents in the same home with other adolescents who are not aggressive. Even though the place is safe it is still scary, when you have all these other adolescents with major problems in the same home as you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuous evaluation system</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8.8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DONALD</th>
<th>POSITIVES</th>
<th>NEGATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>token economy motivation system</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>&quot;I did not like the point card as it made no sense to me. I always received my privileges even if I have negatives, as I can volunteer to make them up.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self government system</td>
<td>&quot;I liked having the family meeting and we get to decide who is manager that week.&quot;</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching social skills</td>
<td>&quot;I worked on anger control, getting along with others, resisting peer pressure, and independent living. In the home I learned to get along better with others.&quot;</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>normalization</td>
<td>&quot;I liked that there were a lot of other guys on campus that we can play sports with. I also liked summer recreation when we went to different parks or fun places. I also liked my Family Teachers as they would do special things for us on our birthdays or when we did good in school or any special events. I really liked the awards banquet that they had every year as we would get to dress up and receive special awards. I liked how they made a big deal out of us. I actually made a lot of friends while I was here.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I also never liked the vans as they were so big and everybody know who we were. It was embarrassing.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuous evaluation system</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>&quot;I would want to change how much times we had to meet with the staff. It seemed like every week they came in the home and we had to stage everything for them. We had to eat dinner and act on our best behavior as the Ft’s were being judged.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 8.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>ANDREW</strong></td>
<td><strong>POSITIVES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>token economy motivation system</td>
<td>&quot;I liked that we had cable and video games and could play them when we had our privileges.&quot;</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self government system</td>
<td>&quot;I liked that we could be the manager and have some control over the other youth.&quot;</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching social skills</td>
<td>&quot;In the home I learned to be a friend and not an enemy. Before I did not get along with people or did not want to listen to what they have to say. Now I learned that when you listen to others you learn more and they will also listen to you.&quot;</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>normalization</td>
<td>&quot;I also liked that we did a lot of things together as a family, like eating together and having meetings, I never did these things at home and it felt good and made me feel welcome an part of the family. I also liked at I could talk to my FT's about what was bothering me and they would listen. They actually came to use and asked us how our day went and wanted to know things that happened with us. It made it much easier to talk when people were not screaming at you or do not get upset because you had a bad day at school. They help you work through your problems so you can know what to do next time.&quot;</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuous evaluation system</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;I would want to change the amount of times that we had to be on our best behavior when we had guests and we were supposed to use all of our skills. It was not natural. Everyone was nervous when someone from the office showed up. If this was family style you do not make a big production when you have guests. We have to stop everything we are doing and introduce our self and sit and talk with our guests. This took time away from our chores and homework which we still had to do.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Table 8.10</strong></th>
<th><strong>WILSON</strong></th>
<th><strong>POSITIVES</strong></th>
<th><strong>NEGATIVES</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>token economy motivation system</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self government system</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching social skills</td>
<td>&quot;I worked on respecting authority, following instructions, and independent living. I did not like to listen to what people had to say and I would argue back a lot. I had an answer for everything. In the home I learned to walk away and not argue all the time. I learned when I kept my mouth shut and stopped arguing I got more in return.&quot;</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>normalization</td>
<td>&quot;I liked that I was close to my brother and he could see my when he wanted to if I had my privileges. I also liked the food that they had, there was so much and we had good holiday dinners. I also liked having some of the other adolescents there as we could play together and have fun.&quot;</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuous evaluation system</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Results of Data Analysis

Research Question 1

This research question asked how effective is the Teaching Family Model on reducing the negative behaviors of residents coming out of residential care. The answer to this research question is that the male residents were all acclimated in the community. Mark was the only sample in this sample to have any criminal activities. The researcher did find an association between the model and criminal activity. Out of the ten males, they all reported that their behavior improved in their target areas.

Some of the target behaviors included: following instructions, independent living, role modeling, peer relationships, social skills, anger control, and respecting authority. All of the respondents reported an increase in appropriate behavior, in particular in their target behaviors. However, Mark and George reported that aggression or trust issues increased negatively.

In addition, nine of the ten who left the residential facility were on the weekly motivational system, while Berry was on natural and logical system for six years. Eight of the ten reported that they felt they graduated the residential program successfully, while JT reported no success, and Wilson did not know. This is very important as the residents move through the system depending on their behavior. Their level on the motivation stem does
not correlate with the findings of the interviews, in which the respondents report that they have improved behaviors.

These findings do not, however, support the model in totality in regards to the success of the program. The model's success depends to a large part on the level of the motivation system of the resident. In this sample, only one male made it to achievement and was on that system for six years.

Research Question 1 a

This research question asks how their behavior has changed since exiting the program. The answer to this research question is that Mark and George reported that their behavior has worsened in regards to anger control and trust issues. However, Mark was involved in criminal activity and was placed in a shelter after leaving the facility due to incidents with his mother and sister. Mark also resided with his mother and siblings at home. Seven males reported positive behavior changes in independent living skills; six reported positive changes in anger control, eight reported improved behavior in following instructions, three in getting along with others, four in respecting authority, one in role modeling, two in resisting peer pressure, one in reporting whereabouts, and one male in honesty and stealing.

In addition, eight of the ten males reported that they feel they have graduated the residential program successfully.
Research Question 2

This research question asks the effect of the Teaching Family model on self-esteem and social skills. In the seven domains identified were social skills and self-esteem. These are adaptive functioning, body image, perception of how others view him, perception of own learning ability, self-confidence, perception of overall self-worth, and perception of own social skills. All relationships were positive. There were significant relationships found between adaptive functioning and others' perception; others' perception and own learning; own learning, self-worth, and social skills. The strongest relationships occurred between self-confidence and self-worth. These findings support the Teaching Family Model. Body image was the only domain that did not have any relationships.

In addition, these findings support the research as it has shown a correlation between social skills and self-esteem (Bijstra, Bosma, & Jackson, 1994; Bockoven & Morse, 1986; Rihggon, Throckmorton, & DePaola, 1990; Thompson, Bundy, & Broncheau, 1995; Verduyen, Lord, & Forrest, 1990; Wright, 1995), and self-esteem and locus of control (Enger, Howerton, & Cobbs, 1994; Hillman, Wood, & Sawilowsky, 1992; Long & Sherer, 1985; Wood, Hillman, & Sawilowsky et al., 1996) which links social skills and locus of control. Youth that are in residential care who receive structured social skills training would show an increase in their internal locus of control.
(Newberry & Lindsay, 2000). In addition, this training of social skills could increase their independence during their adolescent years (Mallon, 1992) as well as be effective in their adult life (Weissbourd, 1996).

In addition Daniel, Lionel, and Chris reported their level of self-esteem at very high; Mark, George, Donald, and Andrew reported their level of self-esteem at high; Berv, Wilson, and JT reported their level of self-esteem at moderate. In regards to the domains of self-worth and self-confidence, there were varied scores with all having a high significance. The respondents overall had a moderate to high level of self-esteem.

In regards to social skills, all of the respondents reported an increase in positive behavior in their target behaviors. Only one respondent, Mark, who went back into his original family’s home continue with negative behaviors, as reported earlier.

**Research Question 2a**

This research question asked if there were any sustainable relationships with the sample. The answer is that out of this group Daniel is in an amorous relationship with a female. Out of the ten males, two maintained consistent contact with their family teachers, three maintained a little contact; and five had no contact. Eight of the ten reported that they do not have difficulty making friends. Berry and Lionel reported that they do have difficulty and are focusing on school right now.
Research Question 2 b

This research question asked how the needs of the individuals are met in their community. Out of this population, four males live with family or friends, three live in a school dormitory, two live in an apartment with roommates, one lives alone. In addition, seven males work full time, one part time, and two did not work at all. The relationships in the quantitative analysis of functional adaptability were positive. Regarding post-secondary education, six out of the ten males are in community college or vocational school. Half of the sample received financial assistance from the state.

In the literature surrounding the Teaching Family Model, two important variables surface: consistent guidance and developing and maintaining a mutually reinforcing relationship (Braukmann et al, 1980). “The correlation data has suggested that where such teaching and relationship variables are present at some strength, adolescents are more likely to achieve autonomy and self confidence and to avoid delinquent behavior.” (Conger, 1977) The development of a mutually rewarding relationship between the teaching parents and the youths is another essential component of this model. “The effectiveness of a teaching parent is related to the reinforcing value that she or he has for that youth” (Wolf et al, 1995). In Solnick, Braukmann, Bedlington, Kirigin, & Wolf (1981), positive staff-youth relationships were shown to be important in producing desired treatment outcomes.
Research Question 2 c

This question asks what the residents’ level of self-esteem is. Out of the ten males, three reported very high levels of self-esteem, three reported high levels of self-esteem, and three reported average levels of self-esteem. None of the males reported a decrease in self-esteem. Levels of self-esteem coming into and leaving the program are reported in Table 9. In addition, the quantitative data revealed significant findings to support the model, in regards to self-esteem.

These findings support the research as it has shown a correlation between social skills and self-esteem (Bijstra, Bosma, & Jackson, 1994; Bockoven & Morse, 1986; Rihggion, Throckmorton, & DePaola, 1990; Thompson, Bundy, & Broncheau, 1995; Verduyen, Lord, & Forrest, 1990; Wright, 1995), and self-esteem and locus of control (Enger, Howerton, & Cobbs, 1994; Hillman, Wood, & Sawilowsky, 1992; Long & Sherer, 1985; Wood, Hillman, & Sawilwowsky et al., 1996) which links social skills and locus of control.
Table 9

Area Graph of Pre and Post Esteem Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post Esteem Level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Esteem Level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of the Teaching Family Model (TFM), which is a modified token economy system, on the success of residents coming out of a residential facility. Student’s level of self-esteem, level on motivation system, and perceptions about graduating successfully from the program were looked at. Ten male adolescents’ ages 18-19 who previously resided in a residential facility in Florida, employing the Teaching Family Model were utilized for this investigation. All of the residents live in North Florida.

The researcher met with the respondents at a mutually agreed upon location of their choice, twice within a one-week interval. At the initial meeting the respondents were given the instructions and the purpose of this study, as well as the testing procedures. The respondents completed a 44 question, self evaluation scale form A (Cautela et al, 1983) the first week and completed a 17 question interview the second week.

An analysis of variance was used to interpret the results of the Self Evaluation scale Form A. The Likert scale scores were reported by mean and standard deviation.

The following research questions were answered:
1. How effective is the Teaching Family Model on reducing the negative behaviors of residential adolescents coming out of care?

2. What is the effect of the Teacher Family Model on self-esteem and social skills?

2a. What sustainable relationships have been formed?

2b. How are the needs of the individuals met in their community?

2c. What is their level of self-esteem?

In this chapter, the researcher will summarize the findings, discuss the limitations of this study, indicate what the implications of this study are, and describe recommendations for future research.

In this section, the results of each research question will be summarized along with the conclusions. In answering the research questions, discrete variables, being categorical in nature consisted of demographic information, with all the other variables being continuous. The discrete variables consisted of age, housing, school, employment, and criminal activity.

The continuous variables, showing gradual progress consisted of the domains of the questionnaire instrument, Self Evaluation scale Form A. These consisted of: adaptive functioning, body image, self-esteem, self-worth, social skills, others' perception, and perception of own learning ability; as well as the level and the time on the motivation system, length of time at facility, level of Family Teacher support, and their perception of whether they graduated the program successfully.
Implications

Because of the results of the research the investigator feels that the Teaching Family Model is an effective tool for negative behaviors but also on the behaviors of adolescents leaving residential care. Not only does the Teaching Family Model (TFM) improve negative behaviors, but it also provides residents a higher level of self-esteem. This is not to say that the TFM is the only effective method of behavior modification, but rather that it is effective as a model; no comparisons were made. Some suggestions for future research, which might offer more effective and far reaching results are the following:

Studies might be broadened to include a comparison treatment group to test the effectiveness of both models on behavior.

The effectiveness of the model on male versus female residents is another area worthy of investigation.

In addition, looking at academic levels before coming into the program and after leaving.

A longer period of treatment time should be considered when conducting further studies. In addition, a longitudinal study should be conducted to test for the longevity of the success of the model.

Further studies based on the problems of this investigation are summarized in the following recommendations:
1. There is a need for replication this study using different samples and different ages including a wide range of residents’ abilities to determine how well residents of varying ability levels react to this model.

2. The length of time that the researcher allowed for investigating the effectiveness of the model.

3. Future studies should look at the training aspects of the model for staff and the components of the model.

4. Administration of a pre and post test with a delayed post test to measure retention over a longer period of time.

5. A reevaluation should be made of the instruments used to ensure that the desired information is obtained.
Conclusions

Several conclusions were reached through interpretation of the statistical analysis. In answering the first question “How effective is the Teaching Family Model on reducing the negative behaviors of residential adolescents coming out of care?” it was found through the analysis of the qualitative and quantitative data that the Teaching Family Model is effective on reducing the negative behaviors of residential adolescents coming out of care.

In answering this question, the continuous variables were looked at, specifically social skills. The domains of “social skills”, “others’ perception” and “own learning” were looked at in answering this research question. A Pearson Product moment correlation was computed with the seven domains of the self-evaluation scale and all relationships proved statistically positive. There were positive statistical relationships with the other domains and significant relationships between others’ perception and own learning, and own learning and self-worth, as well as own learning and self-worth and social skills. In addition the respondents reported on their use of their target behaviors.

Out of this research sample, all of the respondents reported a positive increase in their target behaviors. One of the respondents, Mark reported an increase in aggression, due to moving back in with his mother who had originally referred him to the facility. George reported an increase in trust issues since leaving the home. All of the respondents, however, reported that there was a deficiency in skills centered on relationships.
These findings support the research by Mann Feder (1996) who studied two groups of conduct disordered adolescents in two "theoretically distinct residential programs" and found the modified Token economy had positive effects on the group outcomes over a long period of time, however the Therapeutic community setting also produced positive effects.

In addition, Braukmann et al (1984) and Conger (1977) suggest in their correlational studies that "where such teaching and relationships variables are present at some strength, adolescent are more likely to achieve autonomy and self confidence and to avoid delinquent behavior."

These results are further replicated in studies by Solnick, Braukmann, Belden, Kirigin, Ramp, & Wolf (1981) who studied eight residential homes, and found that the reinforcing relationships play a significant role in programs directed at reducing and preventing delinquency. This is important to note, as the research surrounding the Teaching Family Model identifies two important variables: consistent guidance and mutually reinforcing relationships (Braukmann et al, 1984).

These two variables are very important in extinguishing delinquent behavior. Bedlington et al (1981) conducted research on training emphasizing relationship development in two sets of homes, one being the Family Teaching homes and the other "matched comparison groups." Out of this study it was shown that the Family Teaching homes were more consistent in their teaching, talking and proximity, and the differences were significant in all but proximity. This study was again repeated in 1981 with the same results. These two rounds
of data suggest that training emphasizing teaching and relationship development make a difference; and if raining produces higher levels of these variables, we would expect there to be less delinquency in the Teaching Family Homes (Braukmann et al, 1984).

In answering the second question, "How has their behavior changed since exiting the program?", an analysis of the qualitative and quantitative data revealed that their behaviors improved positively. All of the adolescents reported a positive increase in their target behaviors. However, the adolescents did report that there were social skills deficits in relationships with the opposite sex as this was not taught.

In answering the third question, "What is the effect of the Teacher Family Model on self-esteem and social skills? A significant relationship was found with the model. Both qualitative and quantitative data was analyzed and the model was shown to have a positive effect on self-esteem and social skills.

This corresponds with the research that there is a positive correlation between self-esteem and social skills (reference).

In answering the fourth research question "What sustainable relationships have been formed?", the qualitative data was analyzed. Out of the ten respondents five were still in contact with their Family Teachers. In addition Daniel formed an amorous relationship with a female after his discharge. All of the respondents reported that they do not have a difficult time making friends, except Mark and George who have difficulties making friends. Many of the respondents have formed relationships with friends and family remembers. Mark
was the only youth who reported that he had a difficult time at home with his family.

In answering the fourth research question, "How are the needs of the individuals met in their community?", the qualitative and quantitative data was analyzed. The respondents were able to get their needs met in the community by working at a job or receiving financial assistance from the state or from their families. In looking at this, the individual's housing, work and school history were looked at in determining if there needs were being met. Out of the ten respondents, five received financial assistance either from the state to help with their monthly bills. In addition, forty percent of the youth returned to their family homes. Mark returned to his mother's home; George returned to his father's home; and Andrew and Wilson returned to relative's home. Out of these respondents that returned back home: Mark is currently in eighth grade; George is in technical school; Andrew attends community college; and Wilson is not in school.

Out of the sixty percent, that did not return home, Berry and Lionel had a rented apartment with roommates; Daniel had an apartment by himself; and Chris, JT, and Donald lived in a school dormitory. Out of this sample, Berry was in 11th grade, while JT and Donald were enrolled in Job Corporation Services to obtain their GED and vocational certificate, and Chris was enrolled in community college. Only two of the respondents did not have a job: Mark who was in eighth grade and George who was in technical school.
In answering the final research question, "What is their level of self-esteem?", the qualitative data was analyzed. All of the respondents reported an increase in their level of self-esteem.

An overall view of the statistical data indicates that the Teaching Family Model was effective on reducing negative behaviors of adolescents leaving a residential facility employing this model. However it is important to note that many of the respondents reported a lack of social skill teaching focusing on relationships. All of the respondents supported the model, however they reported deficits in the point card and the normalcy of the model.

Due to the small size of the population these findings cannot be generalized to the population. However, this study provided baseline data that can be utilized to conduct further research studies of the success of the Teaching Family Model on residents coming out of its care.
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APPENDIX

Appendix A

BEST PRACTICES OF THE TEACHING FAMILY MODEL

- A token economy motivation system wherein youth earn points and exchange them for privileges
- A self-government system that allows youth to participate in development of the rules and structure of their daily life
- A focus on teaching social skills from a standardized social skills curriculum
- An emphasis on normalization
- A continuous evaluation system, part of which involves the youth evaluating the teaching family couple. (Friman, 1999).
### SUMMARY OF FACTS OF VARIOUS POINT SYSTEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUB-POINT SYSTEM</th>
<th>DAILY POINT SYSTEM</th>
<th>WEEKLY POINT SYSTEM</th>
<th>ACHIEVEMENT SYSTEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRITERIA FOR SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION</strong></td>
<td>1) Earns back the number of points that were assigned to the sub-system 2) Family-Teacher agreement concerning behavior improvement.</td>
<td>1) Net 600,000 pts. 2) 3 consecutive days earning all privileges. 3) Family-Teacher agreement concerning behavior improvement.</td>
<td>1) 100 bonds purchased 2) Family-Teacher agreement concerning behavior improvement.</td>
<td>1) Family-Teacher agreement that behavior improvement dictates that no artificial reinforcement is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF SUCCESSFUL, NEXT SYSTEM</td>
<td>Daily, Weekly or Achievement, typically back to the same system standing they were on.</td>
<td>Weekly System</td>
<td>Achievement System</td>
<td>No system, or logical consequence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREQUENCY OF POINT EXCHANGE</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Weekly but with a daily contingency.</td>
<td>Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIVILEGE AVAILABLE AND COST</td>
<td>Credit Sub 1,000-10,000 Basics Basics Basics Snacks Snacks Snacks TV TV TV Tele- One 5 Phone min. On Campus phone call Time Based 20,000 20,000-30,000 30,000</td>
<td>Purchase as a group: Basic Snacks, T.V., Telephone, 10,000 Free time on grounds.</td>
<td>First five purchased in order: Basics 5,000 Snacks 3,000 T.V. 3,000 Telephone 3,000 Free time on grounds 6,000 Allowance 1 3,000 Free time on grounds 6,000 Allowance 11 Neg. Special Neg. (5,000 ea.)</td>
<td>All the privileges allowable on the weekly point system are granted free, but additional privileges cost points determined by Family-Teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS A MAKE-UP SYSTEM AVAILABLE AND WHAT IS THE DAILY REQUIREMENTS?</td>
<td>Yes. Double the subsystem daily difference.</td>
<td>Yes 20,000 at any time during the day following failure to earn privileges.</td>
<td>Couldn't buy privileges for the week</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS A DAILY DIFFERENCE REQUIRED TO KEEP PRIVILEGES?</td>
<td>Yes Credit 1000-10,000 Straight Fine 20,000 Time Based 20,000-30,000</td>
<td>Yes 10,000</td>
<td>Sometimes when a youth needs a &quot;bridge&quot; (0 to 6,000)</td>
<td>No, not typically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMOUNT OF POINTS USED TOWARD SYSTEM REDUCTION</td>
<td>All except 50% of the make-up daily differences.</td>
<td>All except 50% of 20,000 make-up.</td>
<td>All except 50% of make-up</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Permission of Community Director needed before placement on Sub-System or

Adreaceoents from tate:
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**Privileges that can be earned with points on the daily and weekly point systems**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Privileges</th>
<th>Daily system</th>
<th>Weekly system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basics (hobbies and games)</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snacks</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance (per $1.00)</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permission to leave (home, sports events)</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonds (savings for gifts, special clothing, etc)</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special privileges</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Registry of Agencies

February 2002

The Founding Site
Achievement Place Research Project
Life Span Institute
University of Kansas, 1052 Dole
Lawrence, KS 66045

Agency E-Mail: 
Phone: 
Fax: 
Agency Liaisons: Mont Wolf & Kathi Kirigin

Sponsor Agencies

Adriel School
P.O. Box 188, 414 N. Detroit St.
West Liberty, OH 43357-0188
Phone: 
Fax: 
Agency E-Mail: 
Agency Liaison: Robert S. "Bud" Milner
Operating Group Home & Treatment Foster Care Programs.

Boys & Girls Home of North Carolina, Inc.
P. O. Box 127
Lake Waccamaw, NC 28450-0127
Phone: 
Fax: 
Agency E-Mail: 
Agency Liaison: Stuart H. Sherman, Jr.
Operating a Group Home program.

Bringing It All Back Home Study Center of ASU
204 Avery Avenue
Morganton, NC 28655-3197
Phone: 
Fax: 
Agency E-Mail: 
Agency Liaison: Gary Timbers
Operating Group Home & Home-Based Service programs.
Catholic Charities Family Services
200 N. Vineyard Blvd., Suite 200
Honolulu, HI 96817-3938
Phone: [redacted]
Fax: [redacted]
Agency E-Mail: [redacted]
Agency Liaison: Janice Churma
Operating a Group Home program.

Center for Innovative Family Achievements (CIFA)
380 Scotch Road
West Trenton, NJ 08628-1301
Phone: [redacted]
Fax: [redacted]
Agency E-Mail: [redacted]
Agency Liaison: James Gill
Operating Group Home, Home-Based Service, & Treatment Foster Care Programs.

Child Guidance Center, Inc.
1100 Silver Dr., Suite C
Traverse City, MI 49684-5622
Phone: [redacted]
Fax: [redacted]
Agency E-Mail: [redacted]
Agency Liaison: Michael R. Smith
Operating a Group Home Program.

Closer to Home Community Services
3507A 17th Avenue, SW
Calgary, Alberta, Canada T3E0B6
Phone: [redacted]
Fax: [redacted]
Agency E-Mail: [redacted]
Agency Liaisons: Dianne Jaeger & Karen Oliver

Developmental Services of Northwest Kansas
P.O. Box 1016
Hays, KS 67601-1016
Phone: [redacted]
Fax: [redacted]
Agency E-Mail: [redacted]
Agency Liaison: [redacted]
Operating a Group Home Program.

Devereux Teaching-Family Program
225 Demott Lane, Suite 6, 2nd floor
Somerset, NJ 08873-4875
Family Resources, Inc.
P.O. Box 787
Beaufort, SC 29901-0787
Agency Liaison: Fran Tanner
Operating Group Home & Treatment Foster Care Programs.

High Sky Children’s Ranch
8701 West County Road 60
Midland, TX 79707-1307
Agency Liaison: Linda Knabe
Operating a Group Home Program.

Houston Achievement Place
245 West 17th Street
Houston, TX 77008-4001
Agency Liaison: Janie Estrada
Operating a Group Home Program.

Kenosha Human Development Services, Inc.
5407 Eight Avenue
Kenosha, WI 53140-3715
Agency Liaison: Richard Kauffman

Methodist Children’s Home
P.O. Box 2589
Madison, MS 39130-2589
Operating a Group Home Program.

Northern Family Intervention Services, Inc.
405 West Main, P. O. Box 398
Gaylord, MI 49734
Phone:  
Fax:  
Agency E-Mail:  
Agency Liaison: Ed Theiss

Operating a Home-Based Service Program.

Presbyterian Children's Homes & Services
300 Brookside Road
Waxahachie, TX 75167-2208
Phone:  
Fax:  
Agency E-Mail:  
Agency Liaison: Edward Watson

Operating a Group Home Program.

Teaching-Family Homes of Upper MI
1009 West Ridge Street
Marquette, MI 49855-3963
Phone:  
Fax:  
Agency E-Mail:  
Agency Liaison: Christine Staffeld

Operating Group Home & Home-Based Service Programs, Foster Care, Education and Counseling.

Utah Youth Village
5800 Highland Dr.
Salt Lake City, UT 84121-1346
Phone:  
Fax:  
Agency E-Mail:  
Agency Liaison: Michael R. Pearson

Operating Group Home, Home-Based Service, & Treatment Foster Care Programs.

Vera Lloyd Presbyterian Home & Family Services
745 Old Warren Rd.
Monticello, AR 71655-9713
Phone:  
Fax:  

Agency E-Mail: [redacted]
Agency Liaison: Donald Teater
Operating a Group Home Program.

Volunteers of America of Greater New York, Inc.
Community Youth Services
155 Washington St., Rm. 209
Newark, NJ 07102-3016
Phone: [redacted]
Fax: [redacted]
Agency E-Mail: none
Agency Liaison: David Taylor
Operating a Group Home Program.

Developing Agencies

Barium Springs Home for Children
P. O. Box 1
Barium Springs, NC 28010-0001
Phone: [redacted]
Agency Liaison: Matt Gaunt
Sponsored by Presbyterian Children's Services.

Berea Children's Home & Family Services
285 East Bagley Road
Berea, OH 44017
Phone: [redacted]
Fax: 440/234-7452
Agency E-Mail: [redacted]
Agency Liaison: Diane Matthews
Sponsored by Adriel School.

Brookside Children's Home
P. O. Box 112
Charleston, WV 25321
Phone: [redacted]
Fax: [redacted]
Agency E-Mail: [redacted]
Agency Liaison: Kenneth Powell
Sponsored by Adriel School.

Thornwell Home & School for Children
P.O. Box 60
Clinton, SC 29325
Fax: [redacted]
Agency E-Mail: [redacted]
Agency Liaison: John Carenen
Sponsored by BIABH

Virginia Home For Boys
8716 W. Broad Street
Richmond, VA 23294
Phone: [redacted]
Fax: [redacted]
Agency E-mail: ?
Agency Liaison: Molly Bynum
Sponsored by Adriel School

Wild Rose Community Connections
P.O. Box 1409
Okotoks, Alberta, Canada T0L 1T0
Phone: [redacted]
Fax: [redacted]
Agency E-Mail: [redacted]
Agency Liaison: Marianne Dickson
Sponsored by Closer to Home Community Services

Supportive Agencies

Allen County Children’s Services
330 North Elizabeth Street
Lima, OH 45801
Phone: [redacted]
Agency E-mail: [redacted]
Agency Liaison: Michael Mullins

Baptist Children’s Ministries
7404 Highway 90 West
San Antonio, TX 78227
Phone: [redacted]
Fax: 210/?
Agency E-mail: ?
Agency Liaison: Bruce Thompson

Children’s Village
P. O. Box 6564
Tyler, TX 75711-6564
Phone: [redacted]
Fax: 903/581-1998
Agency E-Mail: 
Agency Liaison: Kristen Anderson
Sponsored by Presbyterian Children’s Services.

Christ’s Home
800 North York Road
Warminster, PA 18974-2073
Phone: 
Fax: 
Agency E-Mail: 
Agency Liaison: Cheryl Cirilo

Father Flanagan’s Girls” and Boys” Home
13603 Flanagan Blvd.
Boys Town, NB 68010-7501
Phone: 
Fax: 
Agency E-Mail: 
Agency Liaisons: Dan Daly

Georgia Children’s Home, Inc.
4690 N. Mumford Road
Macon, GA 31210-4035
Phone: 
Fax: 
Agency E-Mail: 
Agency Liaison: Denise Brown

Marsh Foundation, The
1229 Lincoln Highway
Van Wert, OH 45891
Phone: 
Fax: 
Agency E-Mail: 
Agency Liaison: Dave Giesen

Methodist Home For Children
P. O. Box 10917
Raleigh, NC 27605
Phone: 
Fax: 
Agency E-Mail: 
Agency Liaison: Kenneth Perry
United Methodist Children's Home, Inc.
2002 S. Filmore Street
Little Rock, AR 72214
Phone: [blank]
Fax: [blank]
Agency E-Mail: [blank]
Agency Liaison: Craig Gammon
Operating a Group Home Program.
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INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. What is your date of birth?

2. What is your race? (African American, Caucasian, Hispanic, European).

3. How long were you living in this residential facility?


5. Who referred you to the residential facility? (Caseworker, Parent, Relative)


7. Do you work? What do you do for your job? How long have you worked there?

8. Do you attend school on a regular basis? Where? How long have you been in school?

9. What target behaviors did you work on while you were in this residential facility?

10. What methods were used with you in the program that you believe changed the ways you feel about yourself?

11. How did you feel about yourself when you entered the program?

12. What were your future goals prior to entering the program?

13. What are your future goals now?

14. What motivational system were you on when you left? (Daily, Weekly, Achievement, Natural and Logical)? How long were you on this motivational system?

15. Rate your level of self-esteem (1 being a very high self-esteem, 2 being high self-esteem, 3 being average self-esteem, 4 being low self-esteem, and 5 being a very low self-esteem).

16. How have your behavior and attitude changed since participating in this program?

17. How much contact do you have with the Family Teachers? (1- no contact, 2-little contact, 3-a lot of contact)
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SELF-EVALUATION SCALE (A)

Name ____________________________ Date _________________
Age ______ Sex ______
School (if in school) ____________________________ Grade ________
Occupation (if employed) ____________________________

Read each item. You will probably feel different about each one. Here are some of the ways you may feel after reading an item:

That is not at all true.
That is true a little.
That is very much true.

Put a check mark in the column that best describes how you feel about that item. At the end there are two questions for you to answer on your own. Write as much as you want.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am a worthwhile person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel confident.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I speak up when I'm right.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am calm and relaxed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am nice to other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I like the way I behave with people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I feel I have control of my actions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I have a good sense of humor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am a happy person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I am an honest person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I like to help people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I am satisfied with my accomplishments up to the present time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I am an unselfish person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Generally I am liked.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. People find me enjoyable to be with.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. People tell me their problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. People trust me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I am usually right in my judgment of people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. People have confidence in me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. People think I am true to my word.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. People think they can count on me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. My friends appreciate me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. People at school like me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. My family appreciates me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I like school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I like the way I look.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I trust people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
28. I feel that I am intelligent.
29. My reading ability is satisfactory.
30. My knowledge of current events is adequate.
31. I am satisfied with what I've learned in school so far.
32. I can handle criticism well.
33. I am able to love others.
34. I am a good friend to others.
35. I usually look at the bright side of things.
36. I like the way I act in social situations.
37. People like to have me around.
38. I like the way my face looks.
39. I like my body build from the neck down.
40. I am satisfied with the general appearance of my hair.
41. I like my height.
42. I like the way my fingernails look.

43. What I like best about myself is

44. What I like least about myself is
Appendix G

**Informed Consent – Program Participant**

You have been asked to participate in a research study conducted by Ms. Tiffany North, a doctoral student in the Ross College of Education, Health, and Human Services at Lynn University in Boca Raton, Florida. This research involves answering a questionnaire about your background and experiences. In addition, a self-evaluation scale will be administered by me, with no time constraints, and the results will be discussed with you. You may also be asked to participate in an audio taped one-to-one interview asking open-ended questions about your experience at your facility. The interviews will be transcribed. You will be contacted in person or by telephone for a follow up interview to review the analysis of the initial interview for accuracy.

The goal of the study is to discover the effects of the Teaching Family Model on youth leaving residential care. You have been selected because you meet the criteria for selection of volunteers. It is hoped that this research study will benefit other youths leaving residential programs in Florida.

You will be administered a questionnaire at a location of your convenience. No discomfort is anticipated, and there is no risk involved. Your participation is completely voluntary, and you may withdraw from the study at any time without absolutely any negative consequences. Should you withdraw from the study; the data collected will be eliminated and will be destroyed. All information provided will be kept in strict confidentiality. The transcription of the