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This study investigated the effects of modeling, behavior rehearsal, and information feedback on the behaviors and self-concepts of institutionalized male juvenile delinquents. Fifty subjects, ages 12-18, were given pretreatment assessments with a number of self-report and behavior rating scales. Ten subjects were assigned to each of four treatment groups. In ten sessions, one group viewed videotapes of acceptable ways of dealing with problem situations; a second group rehearsed these same situations using scripts printed on large cue cards; a third group viewed the videotapes and then rehearsed the situations; a fourth group, while rehearsing the situations, was videotaped and the performance was immediately fed back to the group. A discussion of important points followed each session. The remaining subjects were assigned to a no-treatment comparison group. Forty-five subjects (nine in each group) were given a posttreatment assessment with the same measures used prior to treatment. Contrary to predictions, no significant changes were found in any groups on any of the dependent measures at the posttreatment assessment.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This study represents an experimental investigation into the effects of modeling, behavior rehearsal, and information feedback via self-observation on the behavior and self-concepts of institutionalized juvenile delinquents.

An assumption that delinquent behavior is asocial and is thus distinguished from antisocial behavior has been made by McDavid and Harari (1968). The term asocial refers to "the individual's inability to control or inhibit impulses toward socially unacceptable acts that stem from otherwise relatively normal motivational bases" (McDavid and Harari, 1968, p. 118). This unacceptable behavior is posited to derive from the delinquent's failure to learn or accept existing social standards. In other words, delinquents do not regulate their behavior, are impulsive, and they fail to inhibit socially undesirable responses because of this lack of control. The delinquent can be seen as having deficits in the areas of social skills and self-regulatory behaviors. Accepting this as a basic hypothesis, behaviors such as aggression and impulsiveness should be amenable to change through the use of social learning techniques.

Evidence showing that modeled behavior is an effective instructional technique has been provided by Bandura (1969) and Bandura and
In discussing the emphasis of behaviorally oriented therapies, Thoreson and Mahoney (1974, p. 5) write: "By increasing the number of responses available to an individual, he is 'freed' from the previous limitations imposed by such things as learning deficits and fears and anxieties that have led to avoidance responses." By providing an individual with opportunities to learn, the number of social skills that are needed to survive in any environment is increased.

Sarason (1968) indicates that providing adequate information concerning the appropriate modes of social behavior to the delinquent youth should aid in effecting positive changes in behavior and attitude. An investigation which gave validity to this general statement was accomplished by Sarason and Ganzer (1973). This study was a comparison of two methods of presenting information to male juvenile delinquents. The first method of presentation consisted of having institutionalized delinquents role play several situations immediately after observing them being performed by adult models. Each modeled situation dealt with a particular problem that was either social (e.g., resisting peer pressure to participate in inappropriate activity), educational (e.g., discussing a problem with a teacher), or vocational (e.g., applying for a job). The second method consisted of presenting the same information through group discussion with no modeling or role playing being involved. Half of the subjects in the two groups were given feedback via video and audiotape. Pilot studies reported by Sarason (1968) had suggested that videotaped feedback would increase the effectiveness of the modeled presentations by giving the subjects
repeated exposures to the situations as well as allowing them to observe their own performance. Repeated measures with several self-report indices (e.g., Wahler's Self-Description Inventory, Wahler, 1969, and Rotter's Internalization-Externalization Scale, Rotter, 1966) and behavioral rating scales (10 bipolar descriptions on a 7-point scale), along with interview and recidivism data were used to evaluate the effectiveness of treatment methods. Subjects in each group were comparable in age (the average was 16 years and 7 months) and IQ (the average was 95.3 as determined from the Lorge-Thorndike Nonverbal Intelligence Scale, Lorge, Thorndike, and Hagen, 1966). A comparison of the two experimental groups with a no-treatment control group gave evidence of significant increases in the participants' positive self-concepts and appropriate behaviors and a decrease in the recidivism rate. No significant differences between the two treatment groups were found. Furthermore, there was little difference between the subjects in the discussion group who received videotaped feedback and those who didn't. The modeling and role-playing group, however, showed this difference: the half that received videotaped feedback showed less overall positive change. This unexpected result was accounted for by the reports of most subjects that seeing their role-played performance and comparing it to the experienced performance of the adult models was quite upsetting (Sarason and Ganzer, 1973). This apparently increased their anxiety and decreased their positive self-concept.

The study being reported on here is a comparison of the effectiveness of modeling and other observational techniques for changing the self-concepts and behaviors of institutionalized juvenile
delinquent boys. The subjects were divided into five groups: televised modeling; behavior rehearsal; televised modeling and behavior rehearsal; behavior rehearsal and televised self-observation; and a no-treatment control.

In the televised modeling group, subjects were shown videotaped segments of adult and peer models role playing acceptable ways of approaching problem situations involving interpersonal interactions. This method of presenting modeled behaviors via symbolic modeling techniques, in the form of films, has been discussed by Bandura (1969). The effectiveness of these techniques in modifying behavior has been discussed by several investigators (Bandura, Ross, and Ross, 1963; Bandura and Menlove, 1968; Hill, Liebert, and Mott, 1968; Flanders, 1968; Bandura, 1971).

Subjects in the behavior rehearsal group role played the same situations that were presented to the televised modeling group. The videotaped segments were not shown to this group, but the same scripts used in the first conditions were presented here in the form of large cue cards.

The importance of using techniques that are powerful enough to teach behaviors which can be established in the repertoire of an individual through positive reinforcement has been discussed by Bandura (1969) and Braukmann and Fixsen (1975). The technique of behavior rehearsal, presenting social behaviors that will be effectively substituted for behaviors that are inappropriate or nonexistent through the enactment of various scenes that are relevant to an individual's
particular needs, has been evaluated by Lazarus (1966), Wolpe and Lazarus (1966), and Goldstein and Simonson (1971). Variations of these techniques have been used in several treatment programs (e.g., Gittelman, 1965; Friedman, 1968; Kaufman and Wagner, 1972; Sarason and Ganzer, 1973).

The televised modeling and behavior rehearsal group was shown the videotaped segments and then rehearsed (role played) the scenes.

The fourth group, behavior rehearsal and televised self-observation, rehearsed the scenes without having viewed the videotaped segments. The performance of each subject was taped and immediately played back to the group. Sarason and Ganzer (1973) provided feedback to their subjects via this method and, as previously mentioned, failed to show any significant differences in treatment effects between those who received videotaped feedback and those who did not. This treatment condition was an attempt to partially replicate their investigation and further determine whether increased exposure to both peer and self-modeled behavior is a more effective behavior modification technique than televised modeling and/or behavior rehearsal alone.

Finally, a control group of subjects drawn from the same population as the treatment groups was given pre- and posttreatment measures only to compare the effects of treatment provided in this investigation with the treatment that an individual normally gets at this institution.

It was hypothesized that subjects in the four treatment conditions would show a change in self-concepts toward a more internalized
locus of control. An assumption was made that delinquent youths tend to be more externalized in their beliefs and thus attribute any reinforcement received as being under the control of outside sources (luck, fate, or powerful authority figures). This feeling of "powerlessness" has been discussed by Battle and Rotter (1963) and Seeman (1959) as being a variant of the term "alienation." The social alienation that a person experiences is related to socioeconomic status and affects the degree of social learning that he or she acquires. Such an alienated (externally controlled) individual would not expect his or her own behavior to determine desired outcomes and presumably would not be concerned with learning socially acceptable behaviors (Battle and Rotter, 1963). In a study on the effects of alienation on prison inmates, Seeman (1963) found that alienated inmates learned significantly less information important to their future release from prison. In contrast to these results, Seeman and Evans (1962) found that hospitalized tuberculous patients who scored as "internals" on an internal-external scale were more informed about their condition and were seen as "better" patients by ward staff.

To test this notion of internal versus external locus of control, subjects in all five experimental conditions were given pre- and posttreatment tests using Bialer's Locus of Control questionnaire (Bialer, 1961). It was expected that as subjects became more skilled in solving socially relevant problem situations they would become less alienated and more internalized in their beliefs.

Another hypothesis was that there would be an increase in the amount of responsible behavior, self-control, and socialization in
subjects in the four treatment conditions as measured by both self-report and behavioral scales. Three scales taken from the California Psychological Inventory (Gough, 1957, 1960, 1969; Megargee, 1972), Responsibility (Re), Self-Control (Sc), and Socialization (So), were used as self-report measures of these dimensions. Behavioral rating scales, like those described by Fowler and Megargee (1977), were used to measure a subject's observed behavior on several dimensions. These scales were 9-point ordinal line scales developed especially for use in this study.

The overall prediction was that a ranking of the most powerful to least powerful treatment condition would look like this: (1) behavior rehearsal plus televised self-observation; (2) televised modeling plus behavior rehearsal; (3) behavior rehearsal; (4) televised modeling.
CHAPTER 2

METHOD

Setting

This research was conducted at the Arizona Youth Center (AYC), a rehabilitation center for delinquent boys, located in the desert about 15 miles north of Tucson, Arizona. AYC is part of the Arizona state correctional system. The boys are committed to the Center from various rural and inner-city areas in the state, although the majority are from the Phoenix metropolitan and adjacent areas in the northern part of the state. Ages of the youths range from 12 to 18 with the average age approximately 15. Length of stay at the facility is dependent on how quickly the individual advances through the program.

The environment at AYC is a structured one in which boys are given both individual and group counseling, academic and remedial skills training. Advancement is based on ratings of cottage counselors and caseworkers in charge of each cottage. When a boy is deemed ready for release from the Center (usually to the parents, although some are paroled to group or foster homes or another facility), he appears before a review board. There the recommendations of staff members are reviewed and a boy is sent to one of the above mentioned placements.

Physically, AYC consists of five cottages (one-story cement block buildings containing rooms and open dormitories), an
administration building, a classroom building, and a kitchen and staff
dining area; housing for the Superintendent and Assistant Superinten-
dent is also provided. Two of the five cottages are maximum security
structures, with chain link fences topped by barbed wire, surrounding
each one. The three remaining cottages, from which the subjects were
drawn, are open environments which places a youth on his honor not to
escape. There are 25 to 30 boys in each of the three cottages. Coun-
selors are permanently assigned to a cottage and work eight-hour shifts
around the clock, with at least one person on duty seven days a week.

Subjects
Fifty subjects were selected from the student population at the
Center. The boys attended classes from 8:30 a.m. to 3:15 p.m., five
days a week. The school day was divided into 50-minute periods and
each boy had at least one free period during the day. In order to min-
imize disruption of the existing school day, ten students were selected
and assigned to groups dependent upon when their free period occurred.
Thus, boys with the same free period were placed in the same group.

The ten selected from each free period were randomly assigned
to two smaller groups of five each. Each subgroup of subjects, with
the same free period, were then randomly assigned to one of four treat-
ment conditions (two subgroups per condition) or to a no-treatment
control.

Procedure
A treatment session consisted of two subgroup meetings, with
one group leader conducting one part of the session. Treatment groups
met twice a week for five weeks. Each session was 45 minutes long. Group leaders were two staff psychologists and two psychology graduate students (a male and a female psychologist; a male and a female graduate student).

In order to provide continuity and control for possible reactive effects of therapists, e.g., sex, personality, etc., each group leader ran all the sessions (10) for one subgroup in two of the four treatment groups. Thus, none of the group leaders had both subgroups in the same treatment condition. The therapy groups, however, gained continuity by having the same group leader throughout the treatment program.

Modeling and role-playing scenes were from the scripts (see Appendix A) of Sarason and Ganzer (1973). There was a total of ten problem situations presented to each treatment group (two a week for five weeks). Cue cards were used to present the scripts to both the models used in the televised modeling conditions and the experimental subjects.

During the initial treatment session, a general statement was read to each subgroup describing the group process as presented in Sarason (1968). At subsequent sessions, the only instructions given were those needed to set the scene for a particular situation. A discussion covering specific points presented in the situation concluded each session.
Treatment Conditions

A. Televised modeling: Videotapes of socially acceptable ways of approaching various problem situations (e.g., interviewing for a job, presenting a problem to a counselor or teacher, resisting peer pressure to do unacceptable acts, etc.), role played by adult and peer models, were shown to each subgroup. Each session dealt with one specific problem. The tape was shown two to four times during the session. A short discussion period followed.

B. Behavior rehearsal: Each boy in a subgroup was required to role play an appropriate response to the same problem situation that was presented in the televised modeling condition (A). Scripts used in A were presented on cue cards (27 inch by 33 inch sheets of paper). The tape was not shown to this group. Each boy's performance was observed by the other members present. A discussion of specific points followed.

C. Televised modeling plus behavior rehearsal: This group viewed the videotapes that were presented in condition A. Each subject was then required to role play the scene as in condition B. A discussion of specific points followed.

D. Behavior rehearsal plus televised self-observation: Each subject role played the same problem situations as was done in condition B. The performance of each was videotaped and immediately played back to the members present. As in the other conditions, a discussion of relevant points occurred prior to the end of a session.

E. No-treatment control: Nine boys drawn from the same population as the treatment subjects acted as controls. These subjects
were simply given the pre- and posttest dependent measures at the same time as the treatment groups.

**Dependent Variables**

Prior to being assigned to experimental conditions, the following self-report measures were given to all subjects.

1. **Bialer's Locus of Control Scale for Children** (Bialer, 1961): A 23-item questionnaire developed from the James-Phares adult scale of internal-external control (Battle and Rotter, 1963). A high score indicates an internal locus of control (see Appendix B).

2. **Responsibility Scale of the California Psychological Inventory (CPI)**: A 42-item scale that was derived by testing various criterion groups selected from a normal population. High scorers are seen as being able to accept responsibility for their behavior (Megargee, 1972).

3. **Self-control Scale of the CPI**: A 50-item scale which is a rationally derived group of items that seem to relate to impulsiveness and the control of aggression. High scorers are considered to exhibit self-control while low scorers are viewed as being impulsive (Megargee, 1972).

4. **Socialization Scale of the CPI**: A 54-item scale that was empirically derived by comparing the responses of delinquents and non-delinquents. It is a measure of the degree in which values have been internalized by the individual. High scorers are considered to be highly socialized individuals (Megargee, 1972).
Items on the three CPI scales are answered as either true or false. A discussion of the scales and their use as a predictor of delinquency is presented by Gough (1966).

The four self-report measures were presented to groups of subjects via audio cassette recorder in order to overcome any deficits in reading skills. Instructions (see Appendix C) on how to fill out the questionnaires were given at the beginning of the testing session.

Behavior Ratings

In addition to the self-report measures, a behavioral rating scale (see Appendix B) was used to determine a boy's observed (1) self-control; (2) interaction with other boys; (3) interaction with counselors or teachers; (4) responsibility for self; (5) responsibility for assigned tasks; (6) rapport with other boys; (7) rapport with rater. These 9-point horizontal line scales are anchored at five points by a descriptive statement. They were developed from standard 9-point ordinal scales by psychological services staff at AYC. These behaviors were rated by both teachers and counselors at the Center. Raters were unaware as to which group a particular boy had been assigned. In an attempt to minimize the effects of possible rater bias, six different raters (three counselors on different work shifts and three teachers in different classrooms) were asked to rate each boy. No data on rater reliability was collected.

Within a week following the completion of treatment sessions, the 45 subjects (nine in each group) remaining in the study were given the same self-report measures as reported above. They were again rated
by the same counselors and teachers using the 9-point behavior rating scales.
CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

Subjects

Of the 50 subjects who received the pretreatment assessment, 45 (nine in each experimental condition) completed the study. Three subjects were excluded because of nonattendance at group sessions (caused by illness, scheduling conflicts, or other problems beyond the experimenter's control); two others were paroled from AYC prior to the completion of the study.

Treatment Effects

The means and standard deviations for all groups on all dependent measures are presented in Tables 1, 2, and 3. Main treatment effects on all dependent measures were analyzed by one-way analysis of covariance (see Appendix D) using pretreatment scores as the covariate. Comparisons of preassessment and postassessment means generated insignificant overall F values. Only one of the comparisons approached significance; this was the Socialization (So) Scale of the CPI (f = 2.35 p < .10). Consequently, no posthoc measures were conducted.

Intercorrelations among Dependent Measures

To assess intercorrelations among the self-report dependent measures, Pearson product-moment correlations were computed for
Table 1. Self-report measures--mean pre- and posttreatment scores across treatment conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control Scale^a</td>
<td>Pre 16.89 3.02</td>
<td>17.11 2.42</td>
<td>13.78 2.22</td>
<td>16.11 3.33</td>
<td>17.22 2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post 18.11 2.98</td>
<td>17.44 2.74</td>
<td>15.22 2.05</td>
<td>16.56 2.83</td>
<td>17.33 3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility Scale of CPI^b</td>
<td>Pre 21.11 5.37</td>
<td>19.33 5.87</td>
<td>17.33 3.28</td>
<td>19.11 4.81</td>
<td>17.66 4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post 20.44 5.98</td>
<td>18.56 5.53</td>
<td>17.79 3.77</td>
<td>19.33 4.12</td>
<td>15.89 4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Control Scale of CPI^c</td>
<td>Pre 23.00 9.41</td>
<td>26.11 9.19</td>
<td>25.67 5.03</td>
<td>21.33 6.04</td>
<td>22.33 5.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post 27.00 8.69</td>
<td>26.56 8.43</td>
<td>25.33 7.83</td>
<td>22.56 6.52</td>
<td>20.56 8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialization Scale of CPI^d</td>
<td>Pre 27.44 4.88</td>
<td>27.44 4.19</td>
<td>26.33 4.44</td>
<td>26.22 4.68</td>
<td>27.00 6.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post 29.44 5.27</td>
<td>28.22 3.60</td>
<td>25.67 3.74</td>
<td>27.56 5.70</td>
<td>24.67 4.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aMaximum score 23. A high score indicates internal locus of control.

^bMaximum score 42. A high score indicates a person who accepts responsibility for own behavior.

^cMaximum score 50. A high score indicates a person who exhibits self-control.

^dMaximum score 54. A high score indicates a person who is highly socialized.
Table 2. Teacher's behavioral ratings--mean pre- and posttreatment ratings across treatment conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Televised Modeling</th>
<th>Behavior Modeling</th>
<th>Behavior Rehearsal</th>
<th>Behavior Rehearsal &amp; Observation</th>
<th>No Treatment Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>5.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>5.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with Other Boys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>6.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>5.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>6.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for Assigned Tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>6.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>5.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport with Other Boys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>6.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport with Rater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>6.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>5.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Counselor's behavioral ratings—mean pre- and posttreatment ratings across treatment conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self Control</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>6.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with Other Boys</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>5.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with Counselors</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>6.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for Self</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for Assigned Tasks</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>5.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport with Other Boys</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>5.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>6.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport with Rater</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>5.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>6.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
pretreatment scores on the four self-report measures. These inter-
correlations are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Correlation between pretreatment self-report measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Report Measures</th>
<th>Pearson Product-Moment Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control Scale (IE)</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility Scale of CPI (RE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Control Scale of CPI (SC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialization Scale of CPI (SO)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$  
** $p < .01$  
*** $p < .001$

The correlations between the pretreatment scores on the Locus of Control Scale and the three CPI Scales were not significant. The CPI Scales showed significant intercorrelations with the highest being that between the Socialization (So) and Self-Control (Sc) Scales, $r = .45$, $p < .001$, and the Responsibility (Re) and Self-Control (Sc) Scales, $r = .35$, $p < .01$. A moderate correlation ($r = .26$, $p < .05$) was found between the Sc and So Scales.
While similar to the investigation conducted by Sarason and Ganzer (1973), the present study utilized more varied types of modeling techniques. These included televised modeling followed by discussion, behavior rehearsal followed by discussion, televised modeling followed by behavior rehearsal followed by discussion, and finally, a somewhat different approach that was also used by Sarason (1968) and Sarason and Ganzer (1973) in which subjects rehearsed designated behaviors which were then videotaped for playback to the rest of the group. The effectiveness of such modeling techniques has been shown to be effective with both children and adults in countless studies. Thus, the insignificant results obtained in this study can in no way be construed as evidence against the proven effectiveness of modeling techniques. What then do they indicate?

Three reasons for the lack of significant positive changes occurring in this sample population as measured by the various self-report and rating scales may be: (1) basic problems with the experimental design; (2) the use of dependent measures that were either inappropriate for use with this sample population or simply not powerful enough to pick up any subtle changes that occurred; and (3) a good treatment program that was not effective with this subject population.
One of the basic problems with the design may have been the training conditions themselves. They may simply have not been set up in a manner that would maximize the benefits of modeling techniques. For example, the sessions may not have been long enough to allow for practice effects that are surely important in teaching socially appropriate behaviors to groups of asocial boys. Another factor could have been the paucity in the number of sessions. In their study, Sarason and Ganzer (1973) had the subjects meet for 16 sessions. This problem was realized prior to the present study but time constraints made it prohibitive to increase the number of sessions (e.g., the danger of subject attrition being much higher).

Another problem with the design that became really obvious after treatment sessions started was the use of scripts and cue cards in the training sessions. The majority of the boys were simply not able to read at a level necessary for using written scripts. The sessions for many of them, therefore, became very tedious and boring. A general description of the scene, with the boys providing their own dialogue, would have probably been more effective. This approach would involve more active participation by the group members.

Thus, it would appear that one of the major reasons for a lack of measurable and significant changes in the self-concepts and behaviors of the subjects used in this study was the lack of power in the treatment conditions. Even in the case where several techniques were combined (e.g., televised modeling plus behavior rehearsal plus discussion), the individual procedures making up the package may not be powerful enough to transfer appropriate social skills to the youths.
The second reason for a lack of positive changes in the subjects' self-concepts and behaviors of these young delinquent boys involves the use of the dependent measures. The rating scales are open to some criticisms. Among these were the use of multiple raters and the failure to obtain reliability measures of these raters. In the attempt to correct for rater bias, the author may have, in effect, insured the unreliability of the scales. A perusal of the raw data indicates some variance among individual raters. However, once these scores were averaged across three raters (in one group of ratings three teachers, in the other three counselors rated each subject), these differences disappear and there is a definite tendency for the scores to cluster about the middle of the scale. The lack of any rater reliability data compounds the error.

There is some evidence to support the use of the three scales of the CPI as a measure of change in this study. There seems to be less support for the use of the locus of control concept as a measure of sociability.

Megargee (1972) discusses all of the scales of the CPI in terms of their development and the original intent of the developer, H. G. Gough. The Responsibility (Re) Scale was originally developed "to identify people who were conscientious, responsible, dependable, articulate about rules and order and who believe that life should be governed by reason" (Megargee, 1972, p. 56). The Socialization (So) and Self-Control (Sc) Scales are related to the Re Scale in that they all appear to measure aspects of socialization, maturity, and responsibility.
(Megargee, 1972). Their use in this study would thus seem appropriate; this is especially true of the So Scale which was originally used to reflect delinquency. The problem of their not showing significant changes would thus seem to be one of experimental design as discussed above. Another possibility is that some of the subjects were so verbally immature that they did not understand the questions. Yet, the mean scores reported here are quite similar to those reported by Gough (1957) for comparable groups. In an attempt to eliminate the problem of the subjects not being able to read, the questions were presented by audiotape. This may have simply served as a further distraction to the boys and led to a haphazard selection of answers by some (especially the younger boys).

The Locus of Control Scale for Children (Bialer, 1961) presents an interesting contrast to the three CPI scales. Although it is believed to reflect the degree to which persons accept responsibility for their behavior (internals) or attribute events as being under the control of outside forces (externals) and would thus appear to bear some relationship to the personality attributes that are measured by the CPI (e.g., the more mature child would be more internalized in his/her beliefs), the results of this study do not appear to support this assumption. While many of the subjects scored in the internal direction on the Locus of Control Scale, they scored quite low on the three scales of the CPI. Correlations between the Locus of Control Scale and the Re, Sc, and So Scales were quite low and insignificant. There is one problem with this particular scale that may have contributed to this
finding: the scale is phrased in such a way that a yes response is scored as internal for the majority of the items, making the scores open to the establishment of a response set.

A third possible explanation for the lack of positive findings could be that a quite adequate treatment program simply did not work with this group of subjects. One factor that may have contributed to this was the ethnic composition of the subjects. The makeup of the five groups was 51% white, 24% black, and 24% Mexican-American. It would be interesting to compare these figures with the groups in Sarason and Ganzer's (1973) study. However, they do not report the ethnic background of their subjects. The setting was basically the same as in other studies and the ages of the subjects were comparable; in this study 16.08 years, in Sarason and Ganzer (1973) 16.58. Another factor may have been the intelligence level of the subjects. Sarason and Ganzer report an average IQ of 95.3 as determined from the Lorge-Thorndike Nonverbal Intelligence Scale. Unfortunately, there are no IQ data available on the subjects that participated in the present study. However, based on this author's experience, the 95.3 figure seems high for this population. This may indicate that the participants in Sarason and Ganzer's study were performing at a much higher intellectual level (albeit a nonverbal measure) than those in the present one. Thus, there may have been several factors related to the composition of the subject population that combined to negate any positive effects of the present treatment program.
In summary, this study points to the need for more strictly controlled investigations into the area of modeling and its influences on the behavior of delinquent youth. There is an obvious need for developing intervention techniques that will fully utilize proven and powerful behavioral approaches.
APPENDIX A

PEER/ADULT MODEL SCENES

The following scenes were extracted from a supplement to Sarason and Ganzer (1973); complete transcripts available from them.

Session

1  Planning ahead scene: Youth is seeing his caseworker concerning where he will be sent and the plans he must make. Caseworker seated at desk; Jim is seated at 90 degree angle to him at desk.

2  Showing off scene: Bill and George in George's father's car pull up to a stop signal. Bill tries to talk George into drag race with car next to them. George must resist temptation.

3  Skipping school scene: Joe tries to talk George into cutting class to go to the beach. George resists. Takes place at table in cafeteria during lunch time.

4  Convertible scene: Three youths are wandering around looking for something to do. They spot a new convertible with keys in it. Dave and Dick unsuccessfully try to talk Jim, a parolee, into taking it.

5  Parolee drinking scene: George knocks on Tom's door. He has beer in the car and wants to have a party. Tom is on parole and resists temptation to go (there is a cue card for each boy).

6  On the job problem scene: Part A. At the gas station, Joe's boss calls him into the office and tells him that he does not want his friends hanging around the station. Joe must hold his temper.

   On the job problem scene: Part B. Joe tells his friend Frank that he can't let him use the station equipment anymore.
Session

7 Tackling school problem scene: Bob is having trouble in his math class and goes in to see his teacher about it.

8 Job interview scene: Part A. George is on parole and is applying for a job. This is the interview scene.

Job interview scene: Part B. Boy goes back to check on whether he got the job. His perseverance pays off and he gets a job.

Job interview scene: Part C. Same as B except will not hire him because of his record. He must control his temper.

9 Asking for help scene: Rick is having trouble and goes to see his P.O. about it.

10 Joining the crowd scene: Scene B. Shows a boy on his first day at a forestry camp. He joins a group of other boys and they razz him about his being skinny.

Session 1: Planning Ahead Scene

Introduction. Most teenagers don't plan too far ahead, sometimes because they feel that the future is too uncertain or that they just aren't given any real responsibility for themselves or sometimes they just plain avoid thinking about the future. Planning ahead is particularly hard in an institution because you don't feel that you have any control over what happens to you--at least for the time being. A common attitude is, "I'll worry about that when the time comes." This is a poor way to think. Planning may be most important for boys in an institution--you'll all need realistic plans when you get out so you won't suddenly find yourself on the "outs" and having to make decisions without any organized thoughts or plans. You should be planning now while you have lots of time and have people around and available to help you.

Scene A. The first scene is a discussion between a boy, Jim, and his caseworker. They've been talking regarding Review Board and where Jim might be sent. Jim has decided that he should make plans for his future and is talking with his caseworker.

Jim: Do I have anything to say about where the Review Board sends me, Mr. ________?
Caseworker: Well, Jim, what you want is considered, of course, but there's a lot of other factors involved, you know.
Jim: Yes, I know. I want a parole but probably won't get it because of my home situation and all.
Caseworker: That's probably true. Where do you think the best place for you would be?

Jim: Well, I've been thinking that it's time I planned for my future. I'll have to finish high school because I'd like to study electronics afterwards. I guess Alpine is the only place I could go to school. I've got 1 1/2 years left to go.

Caseworker: It's the only full-time program. But let's be realistic. It's possible you'll be sent to a forestry camp.

Jim: I know, but I don't think that would help me as much as school.

Caseworker: Well, let's say you get sent to Alpine. Have you thought of how you would use this time?

Jim: Yeah. I guess I'll have to take enough English and History to keep up with high school requirements.

Caseworker: Yes, that's true. But what else?

Jim: Since I didn't plan this when I started high school, I'm behind in other credits. I know that math and algebra are important for electronics. If I still have time, I'll try to take some physics. If I don't, I can still pick it up when I get back to school at home.

Caseworker: Have you thought about training after high school?

Jim: Yes. I don't want to go to college. Besides, there's some good tech schools here where I could get all the basic electronics training. I'll have to work part time, too, so that will take extra time.

Caseworker: That's true. Sounds like you have some pretty realistic plans so far, Jim. There's a chance you can get Alpine, but we'll have to wait and see.

Discussion points. 1. Discuss with each boy where he wants to be sent and where he really thinks he will be. 2. Get each boy to discuss his plans for the future.

Session 2: Showing Off Scene

Introduction. One way people get attention and praise from others is by showing off. It seems to be real cool to do something daring or clever in front of some friends. Often others will egg a person on, daring him to do something dangerous or stupid and then laugh or compliment him for doing it. The reason we show off is because some buddy or even a girl friend seems to enjoy it and seems to like us more for doing it. Driving fast, making someone else look silly, stealing something because we are dared to, or breaking rules in front of someone who has to enforce them are examples of showing off. Of course, what's happening is that we're risking getting into trouble or even getting hurt in order to get approval from our friends. That is a pretty high price to pay to get someone to like you if there's a better way.
Scene A. In this scene two boys are on their way to get their dates to go to a show. George has borrowed his dad's new car for the evening. As they're talking, they pull up to a stop light where some friends are in a car next to them.

Bill: Man, this sure is a cool car. How long has your dad had it?
George: Three months.
Bill: Wow! How come he lets you use it?
George: Well, I look after it--wash it every week, keep the inside clean, you know.
Bill: Man, I bet she really moves out. How many horses has it got?
George: Oh, it puts out about 340.
Bill: He got wide oval tires, too, huh? Does that give you better traction?
George: Yeah, supposed to be about 20 percent, I think.
Bill: Hey, there's Pete and Jim. Hey, they want to drag—he's revving his engine. Let's take him.
George: NO... I'm not dragging him.
Bill: Waddya mean? He thinks he's such a big man with his hot Chev. Let's show him.
George: NO. I promised my dad I wouldn't drag.
Bill: Just once won't hurt. What's the matter, you chicken? Think you can't take him?
George: I can take him easy... but I'm not gonna.
Bill: Now look, let's show those guys. Get ready... the light's yellow... green... GO! Oh, what the hell's the matter with you? How are we going to face them at school?
George: That's my problem, not yours. I know damn well I could take them and I don't have to prove it. Come on, forget it. Where are we gonna take the girls after the show?
Bill: Aw hell, I don't care.
George: Well, how about that new pizza place on Eighth? It looked pretty sharp when I drove by the other day. I hear it's not too expensive either.
Bill: Yeah, I guess that sounds okay.

Discussion points. 1. Are guys who try to make you show off really acting like friends? 2. What are other ways of getting approval from friends? 3. Will you really be ostracized from a group? 4. Emphasize control of showing off. 5. Methods for avoiding showing off--sticking to your "no" and changing the subject. 6. Will friend in scene still be mad in five or ten minutes?
Session 3: Skipping School Scene

Introduction. Most guys seem to agree that finishing school is a good idea. Almost everyone figures he’ll get a high school diploma someday. However, some guys think that graduating is too far in the future to worry about now. They don’t study, cut school a lot, and end up out of school and in trouble. Going back to school after having been in trouble is also pretty hard. Most guys on parole want to finish high school but most of them also have problems doing it. The scene today is about one of these problems. After the scene we will talk about the problem presented and other problems that you guys may have with school.

Scene A. The scene takes place at school during lunch. Joe and George are sitting next to each other at a table.

Joe: Hey, George, it's a great day out. Let's take off this afternoon and go to the beach. It'll sure beat getting trapped in that crummy hot classroom all afternoon.

George: Going swimming would sure be great. I'd like to go, but, look man, the water will still be there at three. Let's go then.

Joe: At three? After the sun sets? What's the matter, have you got the hots for Miss Carlson? You used to cut school all the time.

George: No more . . . I'm on parole. I've got to stay in school if I don't want to get sent up again.

Joe: What's skipping one afternoon gonna hurt? Your parole counselor will never know the difference.

George: Yeah, but if I cut with you today, I'll bet I'll be the guy you'll look up the next time you want to cut out for the beach. If I get on that, pretty soon I'd hardly be going to school at all anymore.

Joe: So what? I skip a lot and it doesn't bother me.

George: That's your business. I got into trouble in the first place 'cuz I was skipping school a lot and fooling around. You guys go ahead. I don't want to run the risk of getting kicked out of school. Man, I want to graduate and the time to worry about doing it is right now.

Joe: Yeah. Look, I just want you to come along this once.

George: Yeah, and I want to go along but later, not now. How about getting together at three?

Joe: That's a lot of wasted sun. I'll see if Pete will cut with me. If he does, we'll head out now and we'll look for you at the beach at three. If he won't either, let's meet at the car at three. Okay?

George: Okay.

Discussion points. 1. Ability to resist temptation. 2. Special school problems of parolee. 3. Importance of finishing school. 4. Reasons for skipping school and their validity. 5. "Vicious circle" aspects—skipping increases chance of getting caught which leads to further avoidance of school (truancy) to avoid punishment.
Session 4: Convertible Scene

Introduction. Today we're considering the topic of peer pressure—the way your friends can put pressure on you to do things that maybe aren't in your best interests. You all probably have had the experience of "going along" with something your friends wanted to do even though maybe you didn't want to do it. This kind of situation is the topic for today.

Scene A. A parolee has gone out with three old friends of his who are pretty wild. They told him they wouldn't get into any trouble, so he agreed to go with them. They went to a dance and didn't get into any trouble there, but now the dance is over and they are wandering around looking for something to do. Outside a restaurant they see a new convertible with the top down, and the keys have been left in the ignition. One guy notices this, and suddenly suggests that they take it for a ride. All except Jim, the parolee, go for the idea. He's mad because they said they wouldn't get in any trouble. They're also making fun of him because he doesn't want to join them.

(The boys are all standing.)

Dave: Check that convertible, man.
Dick: Hey, driving that around would be really cool.
Dave: Hey look, the keys are still in the ignition. Let's take it for a ride.
Jim: Hey, you guys, we are not stealing that car.
Dave: Why not? We won't get caught. Anyway, any guy that leaves his keys in the car is just asking for it.
Dick: Yeah, and we'll ditch it pretty quick—we'll be long gone before they even know it's gone.
Jim: You know damn well our chances of getting caught in that car are real good. Any cop who saw us would stop us right away.
Dick: We'll see the cop first and cut out before they even get near.
Dave: If they do get after us, we can stop the car and split three ways. They won't catch more than one of us. If we're smart they won't catch any of us.
Jim: Listen, I went with you guys on the condition we didn't get in any trouble. So let's stick to the agreement.
Dave: Let's go—we're wasting time. Are you guys coming?
Dick: I am!
Jim: Ah, the hell with you guys—I'm not.
Dave: What's the matter—you chicken?
Dick: Yeah, it looks like you lost your nerve at that institution!
Jim: Leave me out, man. See how you guys like being sent up. I've had enough of it for a long time.

Discussion points. 1. Jim is tempted to go but controls himself. 2. Group is applying strong pressure on him to go. 3. Jim is angry at the bind his friends put him in, having to choose between them and playing it straight. 4. The reality of this is that everyone gets
in these binds. There are similar choices during life, especially for teenagers, and the consequences of the antisocial choice may be especially bad for parolees. 5. How to handle others' expectations of you when returning to the "old gang." 6. Talk about Parole Counselor. What is his function, when should a boy go to talk to him? What kinds of things would the boy in this scene have wanted to tell his Parole Counselor? What are some other things or situations where the Parole Counselor might be helpful?

Session 5: Parolee Drinking Scene

Introduction. This scene deals with a problem many parolees face—how to deal with friends who want you to do things that might get you in trouble. JPCs agree that this is one of the most significant problems parolees have. We've talked about this before—the pressures your friends can put on you to get you to do what they want, even when it might not be best for you.

Scene A. This scene involves a guy who has just been paroled and is at home. A friend comes by and tries to get him to go out drinking.

(George knocks on the door and Tom answers.)

Tom: Hi, George, how're you doing?
George: Hey, man, we're glad to see you back. Gotta celebrate your return. We got a couple cases of beer out in the car. Come on, we're gonna have a party.
Tom: Oh, you know I gotta stay clean.
George: What do you mean, you gotta stay clean? Come on, this party was planned just for you. We even got a date with Debbie lined up for you. It won't hurt just this once.
Tom: Well, you know I'm on parole. I can't go drinking . . . I might get caught and if I get caught now, I'll really get screwed.
George: Oh, man, we won't get caught. We never get caught doing anything like that.
Tom: Well, maybe you guys have never gotten caught, the the night I got in trouble I was out drinking and ended up stealing a car. (pause) You know, I just got back.
George: Look, man, you don't have to drink. Just come to the party and have a little fun. What are we gonna tell Debbie anyway?
Tom: You know being there is the same as drinking to the fuzz. And Debbie won't have any trouble finding someone else.
George: You mean you don't want to go out with Debbie?
Tom: Not to this party. Maybe to a show sometime or something like that.
George: Boy, I sure don't understand you. You have sure changed since you got back from that place. You trying to kiss us off?
Tom: No, that's not it, man. If you want to do something else where we wouldn't get in trouble, (pause), like to a show, the dance or something, that would be okay, but ... well ... I know some guys who were in there for the second or third time and they don't get the breaks anymore. You know what it is to be on parole.

George: Okay, look, let's just have one quick beer now out in the car, okay? For old times' sake.

Tom: No, man, I know where that leads. Then it would be just one more and then pretty soon we'll be drunk. I can't do it, man.

George: Jeez! What is the matter with you, man? Just one beer?

Tom: Maybe another night. My old man expects me to help him work on the boat tonight, anyway. I'll be in trouble with him if I take off. Look, I'm sorry, maybe some other time, okay?

George: Okay. Can't be helped, I guess. Look, we'll be at John's place. Come on over later if you can.

Tom: Sure. See you tomorrow, anyway.

Discussion points. 1. Resisting temptation. (Controls desire to do what is immediately satisfying.) 2. Resisting strong peer pressure. 3. Consequences of going drinking. Importance of training yourself to think of consequences before acting. Big problem for kids. 4. Note how friend tries to get him to take any little step he can, knowing that it can lead up to more stuff that way.

Session 6: On the Job Problem Scene

Introduction. The situation today is about two things that are real problems for many teenagers. One is how to deal with adults who are in a position of authority. Many kids really resent authority, especially when they see it as arbitrary or excessive. The second thing is how to deal with friends who are really just "using" you to get something for themselves.

Scene A. The scene takes place at a gas station. The boss calls Joe, his part-time worker, into his office to tell him a few things. Joe is 17 years old, and is out on parole. The boss is mad, and is going to chew Joe out for letting friends hang around the station. Being chewed out by the boss makes Joe mad but he controls his anger because he really needs the job. He acts polite to the boss and doesn't give him any back talk. The boss is justified in his anger. Joe, however, has been doing a good job, and this problem isn't all his fault. This is a two-part scene. In the second scene, Joe runs into Frank at school the next day and tells him he can't come down to the station anymore.

Boss: (calling to Joe) Joe, would you come in a minute?
Joe: (walks over to the office) Yes, sir?
I'll make this brief. I've already told you a couple of times that I don't like to have your friends hanging around the station like they do, but they're still showing up. I don't like it.

Well, I told them not to, but I guess they didn't take me seriously. Do they really hurt anything?

Hell, yes, they do! I've had several complaints, and we're also missing a couple wrenches. I realize it's not easy to tell your friends that, but you got to learn that business is business.

Yes, sir. I'll make it clear to them.

If I catch them around here again, you're fired! Understand?

Okay, I'll be sure they stay away.

They better. And I want to see you showing more life in helping customers. We've got a lot of competition, you know.

Okay. Go back to work.

Scene B. Frank has been saving himself money by using the station tools, and doesn't like the idea of not being able to do this anymore. He is mostly interested in what he wants and doesn't care much what happens to Joe. Frank keeps trying to put pressure on Joe to help him. Joe starts getting pretty angry, because this job is really important to him as he is on parole and has to make good. He is also mad at Frank because Frank doesn't seem to care if Joe gets in trouble with the boss. This scene takes place at school. Joe sees Frank in the hall and calls to him.

Hey, Frank, wait up. I got to talk to you.

(waiting for Joe to catch up to him) What's happening?

The boss chewed me out yesterday because you guys are coming down to the station so much.

What do you mean? I was just going to bring my car down to do a tune-up on it. I need to borrow some tools.

No, man, you can't do that anymore. I got to make good on this job, and if you guys show up at all, I get canned. So, you'll just have to stay away.

Well, the boss doesn't hang around all the time. Maybe I could come in one evening after he's gone home. You aren't chicken to that, are you?

(energetically) No! I mean it. Put yourself in my place. If you had my job, would you let me use the station?

Sure I would.

The hell you would! If I louse this job up, I don't know where I'll get another.

Well, maybe in a few weeks your boss will have calmed down so I could do it then. I'll even give you a couple of bucks to let me use the equipment.

(now angry) No deal! Get this straight, man, you've got to stay away. Is that clear? I'm not going to risk this job for a few lousy bucks. Don't push me, man.
Frank: Okay, okay. Don't lose your cool. We'll stay away from the station.

Joe: (calm now, smiles) Okay. Thanks, Frank.

**Discussion points.** 1. Joe really wants to do well at this job as it is a real chance for him to make good. 2. Look at consequences. 3. Frank puts a lot of peer pressure on Joe which is hard for Joe but he stands up to him. 4. Everyone involved wants different things. Have to sort this out. 5. Oftentimes others wouldn't do for you what they demand of you.

**Session 7: Tackling School Problems Scene**

**Introduction.** Almost everyone has run into some difficulties with at least a few courses in school. Either the teacher doesn't seem to explain things clearly enough, or the course just seems to be too hard, or the subject isn't interesting and seems unimportant to our later lives, or some other problem comes up and interferes with our getting much out of the course. While everyone has experienced these difficulties at one time or other, some people seem to be able to solve school problems better than others. Others just let these problems ride and continue to add up, until they are really behind in the course and have a bad attitude toward the course and toward school in general. It is hard for a person to remain interested in school and want to continue going to school when he is getting further and further behind and not trying to solve the various school problems as they arise.

One of the best ways of solving school problems is to tackle them as soon as they appear. This should be done by talking over course problems with the teacher. To insure that a talk with the teacher is helpful, the following rules are worthwhile to keep in mind: 1. Don't put off these discussions. Go in as soon as the problem arises. 2. Have a specific problem in mind. A teacher can only help you when you are able to talk clearly about the things that are giving you trouble. 3. Don't just dump the whole problem in the teacher's lap and expect it to be solved. Follow through on his suggestions.

Teacher: Come in, Bob. Did you want to see me?
Bob: Yeah, I'm having trouble with this section that you assigned yesterday, and I thought I'd better come in and see you before I got all messed up.

Teacher: Well, I'm glad you did. Have you read the section?
Bob: Yeah, I read it last night, but I didn't understand it too well. When I went to work these problems here at the end, I couldn't get anywhere with them. Could you work through this example problem here? This is where I really got fouled up.

Teacher: Yes, of course. How have you been doing up to now?
Bob: Okay. I thought everything was okay until I got to this stuff.
Teacher: I'm glad you came in early before you started to really get behind. This is an important section and the material in it is important for the things we'll be studying for the rest of the course. But this section must be a lot harder to understand than the rest. The author doesn't explain things as well as usual here. I've had about four people come in and ask me for help with this assignment.

Bob: Really? I thought I was the only one having trouble.
Teacher: Oh no. As a matter of fact, it's a good thing that you are all coming in and asking me about it. I had planned to give a quiz on this section tomorrow to see if you are all keeping up with the work. But if some of you are having trouble understanding this section, there's no use testing you on it.

Bob: Geez, I couldn't pass a test on this stuff.
Teacher: Well, I planned instead to just spend tomorrow going over the section step-by-step, since it's giving so many people trouble.

Bob: Yeah, that'd probably be better.
Teacher: Also, if you want, you could read these three pages in this other book by Walters. He has a better explanation of what's going on than our textbook.

Bob: Yeah, okay. I can do that in study hall and get the book back to you right away.
Teacher: That's fine. Now about this sample problem, let me explain it as I work it on the board.

Discussion points. 1. Is this brown nosing? What would make it like "buttering up" the teacher? 2. What other problems might be tackled by going in to talk them over with a teacher? 3. Does Bob feel like a "dummy" because he asks the teacher for help? How would you feel? Would your expectations of how your friends might see this prevent you from trying to get help from a teacher?

Session 8: Job Interview Scene

Introduction. Having a job can be very important. It is a way that we can get money for things we want to buy. It is a way we can feel important because we are able to earn something for ourselves through our own efforts. For this reason, a job can make us feel more independent. Getting a job may not always be easy. This is especially true of jobs that pay more money and of full-time jobs. A job may be important to guys like you who have been in an institution because it gives you a way of showing other people that you can be trusted, that you can do things on your own, that you are more than just a punk kid. However, because you've been in trouble you may have more trouble than most people getting a job and being interviewed by the man you want to work for. Being interviewed makes most people tense and anxious because interviewers often ask questions which are hard to answer. After
each of you has been interviewed, we'll talk about the way it felt and about what to do about the special problems that parolees may face in getting jobs.

Scene A. A boy who is on parole from an institution is applying for a job at a small factory in his home town. He is 17 and has not finished high school but hopes to get vocational training. Obviously, the boy has a record. This will come up during the interview. Pay careful attention to how he handles this problem. This is a two-part scene. First, we'll act out the job interview, then a part about another way of convincing an employer that you want a job.

(Mr. Howell is seated at his desk when George knocks on the door.)
Howell: Hello. I'm Mr. Howell, and your name? (Mr. Howell rises, shakes hands.)
George: George Smith.
Howell: Have a seat, George. (both sit down) Oh, yes, I have your application right here. There are a few questions I'd like to ask you. I see you have had some jobs before. Tell me about them.
George: I worked in the summer when I was going to school. I've worked on some small construction jobs and in a food processing plant. I also worked for eight months in the forest.
Howell: Did you ever have any trouble at work, or ever get fired?
George: No trouble, except getting used to the work the first couple of weeks. I did quit one job--I didn't like it.
Howell: I see that you have only finished two years of high school. You don't intend to graduate?
George: (showing some anxiety) Well, no, I'll try to go to vocational school while I'm working. It may take me two years or so, but I intend to get vocational training.
Howell: How did you get so far behind in school?
George: I've been out of school for a while because I've been in some trouble. Nothing really serious.
Howell: I'd like to know just what kind of trouble you've had, serious or not.
George: Well, I was in a forestry camp for eight months, but I'm out on parole now. One of the reasons I want to get a job is to help me keep out of trouble.
Howell: What kind of trouble were you involved in?
George: A friend and I stole some cars and car parts. I guess we were pretty wild. I'm not running around like that any more, though.
Howell: You sound like you think you can stay out of trouble now. Why do you think so?
George: In those eight months at camp I thought about myself and my future a whole lot, and realized it was time to get serious about life and stop goofing off. I know I haven't been out
very long yet, but my parole counselor is helping me with the problems that come up. I'm trying to stay away from the guys that I got into trouble with. I really think that if I could get a job and be more on my own it would help a lot, and I really want to work.

Howell: Yes, I think you're probably right. But, I'm afraid we don't have any openings right now. I'll put your application on file though and let you know if anything turns up. I have several other applications, too, so don't be too optimistic.

George: All right. Thank you. Can I call you back in a few days? (George stands and starts to leave as he says this line.)

Howell: Yes, that would be fine.

Scene B. It is now a week later. George has called back several times to see if an opening has occurred. He now stops by to check again.

(George knocks on Mr. Howell's door.)

Howell: Come in.

George: (enters room while speaking) I stopped by to see whether you had an opening yet.

Howell: You certainly don't want me to forget you, do you?

George: No, sir, I don't. I think it's the best thing for me to do now. I can't get into vocational school until I'm 18, so I really need the job.

Howell: You know, I believe you. I wasn't so sure at first. It's pretty easy for a guy who has been in trouble to say that he's going to change and then do nothing about it. But the way you've been coming here and checking with me so often, I think you're really serious about it.

George: Yes, sir, I am. If I had a job now, I'd be all set.

Howell: Well, I've got some good news for you, George. I have an opening for a man in the warehouse and I think you can handle the job if you want it.

George: Yes, very much. When do you want me to start?

Howell: How about tomorrow morning at 7:30?

George: Okay.

Howell: I'll take you out there now and introduce you to Mr. Jones, who will be your supervisor.

Scene C. Same as Scene B.

(George knocks on Mr. Howell's door.)

Howell: Come in.

George: (entering room) I stopped by to see whether you had an opening yet.

Howell: You sure are persistent. Have you tried other places?

George: Sure, I'm checking back on them, too. Getting a good job isn't easy.
Howell: (uncomfortably) Ah, well, look. We're not going to have a place for you here. I wouldn't want you to waste your time coming back again. We can't use you.

George: (rises to go) Well . . . (pause) . . . okay. Thanks for your trouble. Look, what's up? I know that your company is hiring other fellows like me right now.

Howell: Er . . . that's true. Uh, I'm afraid that we have a company policy not to hire anyone with a record.

George: How come? That doesn't sound fair to me.

Howell: Well, er, ahem . . . that's just the company's policy. I'm sorry, but my hands are tied. There's nothing I can do about it.

George: Well, I would have appreciated knowing that right away.

Howell: I'm really sorry. I can see you're trying . . . I hope you get a job.

George: Well, do you know of a place that could use me? Since you're in personnel, maybe you've heard something.

Howell: Well, I did hear that Rasmussen Tool & Dye is hiring and they don't have the policy we do.

George: Thanks. I'll go over there right now. Could I use your name as a reference—to say you sent me?

Howell: Well— I guess that would be all right.

Discussion points. 1. Importance of presenting oneself well. Getting a job is "selling yourself" too. In both scenes the boy takes the initiative instead of waiting around passively for things to happen. He emphasized the value of his camp work experience. 2. How to deal with the fact that you have a record. Here, the boy had to admit to having a record because of the time in school gap. If he had lied, the interviewer would have caught this and formed the impression of dishonesty. Discussing the possibility of cases when telling about a record is unnecessary. Situational factors are very important. 3. You will feel anxious when being interviewed because getting the job is important. That's all right, everyone does. If it is too obvious, admitting it is okay, too. 4. Persistence is a trait employers like. In this case, it is an important reason why the kid got the job. Also, act enthusiastic. Ask about possible overtime work, if there are any additional things you should learn about the job, etc.

Session 9: Asking for Help Scene

Introduction. Everyone has problems, but some people are better at solving them than other people are. It's true that there is no one sure way to solve every problem, but it's important to do something about problems. Too many people avoid doing anything about a problem and just hope it will go away. But things hardly ever just go away by themselves, and little problems often build up and build up to something big unless a guy takes some action.
People solve lots of problems themselves, but sometimes it helps to talk to another person. Another person sees a problem differently, and often can see a quick solution that the guy with the problem didn't see because he was too wrapped up in it to see it clearly.

Your parole counselor is a good person to talk to. He's had lots of experience talking to guys with similar problems, and he understands the special problems that boys on parole have. In the scene today, a boy on parole takes a problem to his JPC. He really is hesitant because he's a little afraid that he'll appear stupid, and that maybe the JPC will watch him closer if he figures the boy is having a bad time. Lots of guys are scared that maybe their parole will be revoked if they admit to having problems. Usually these fears are unrealistic and your counselor can help you with problems before they become serious.

Scene A. A boy who has been on parole for a period of about three months is having a problem with his job, and he's going in to his JPC to talk to him about it.

(knock on door)
Mr. R: Come in.
Rick: Hi, Mr. Rideout.
Mr. R: How are things going?
Rick: Well, they were going okay until yesterday.
Mr. R: What happened?
Rick: Well, you know I'm getting along pretty good with my Mom now. We took a trip, my Mom and my sister and I. We went down to the ocean. That was over the weekend, and we stayed kind of late on Sunday and didn't get back until pretty early Monday morning and, you know, I was supposed to be at the job at 6:30 in the morning. Well, I didn't make it. I guess my alarm didn't go off or I didn't hear it--anyway, it's probably just as much my fault as the alarm's fault, but . . .
Mr. R: Did you call your boss?
Rick: You're not going to recommit me, are you?
Mr. R: No! No!
Rick: Am I going to be on parole longer now?
Mr. R: No, Rick. You've done a real good job on this job that you've got since you first got out. In fact, I heard a report from your boss just a little while ago that he's satisfied, and the fact that you've come to me now instead of later I think we can go to work on this. So, I'm not, I mean, don't worry about me recommitting. I think it took a lot of guts for you to come in here when you've just goofed up.
Rick: Yeah, it did. It really did. I don't want you to think that I can't handle it, cause I really can. It's just something that happened, you know, and I don't want you to get all bent out of shape about it or anything or I wouldn't be in here.
Mr. R: Now, you say you haven't had any contact with your boss. When do you go back to work?
Rick: Okay, here's the problem. See, we got back and my Mom said, well, it's like quarter to nine by the time I woke up and my Mom said well, why don't you go to work late anyhow? And so I said, okay. But then I started to walk to work and I thought, you know, that boss of mine gets kind of bent out of shape pretty bad, and he's a tough guy to work for. So, I guess I kind of chickened out. Anyway, I didn't go to work.

Mr. R: Jobs are hard to come by. The fact is that you have come in and I can help you at this time. I think we can work this out because you do have a good record there. What I want you to do is go right on down there--level with him, tell him exactly what happened, and I'll get on the phone and talk to him before you can get down there. Okay?

Rick: Yeah, 'cause I really want the job.

Mr. R: Okay, well, I'll go to bat for you.

Rick: Okay, thanks a lot.

Mr. R: Real good. You're doing a good job. If you had waited longer, you would have lost a job.

**Discussion points.** 1. Contrast these two scenes. What is different? a. Rick begins work on the problem immediately. b. He explains it clearly so it can be easily understood by both persons. c. He didn't just dump the problem into the JPC's lap hoping to have it solved. 2. How realistic is Rick's fear of parole revocation? 3. How is this scene related to the job interview scene? (Having to admit to a problem and having to deal actively with it.) 4. Relate this to general concern of what other people think of you and the fear that if you have problems people think bad of you. (Example of feelings when on group outings, movies, etc.)

**Session 10: Joining the Crowd Scene**

**Introduction.** Today we'd like to consider some of the problems that can come up when guys are faced with getting into a new situation, and having to fit into and be accepted by a new group. Being accepted by the group is important for everyone but probably more so for teenagers. Most teenagers are very concerned with being "one of the guys." Let's take your first day right here on ______ cottage as an example. You were probably all concerned when you first got here, because you wanted to "fit in" but didn't know what to expect or what you had to do to be accepted. The older guys here tested you out to see what you were like. They probably "ranked" on you and kidded you to see what you'd do. The way a guy handles this determines whether or not he's accepted and respected. You all are going to have to face similar situations again--this will happen all through life--you'll be continually meeting new groups and wanting to be accepted by them. Some of you will go to another institution from here, and you'll be "tested" even more there than you were here. The same thing will happen on parole, only probably it won't be as obvious.
Scene B. In this scene, John handles the situation in a better way. He "takes" the ranking—which usually stops it after a while.

John: (walking over) Hi.
Doug: Well, here's the new guy. What's your name, man?
John: John.
Doug: (aside to Dave) Man. I thought his name would be "Scarecrow," he's so damn skinny.
Dave: Yeah—well, we'll call him Scarecrow anyway, huh, Doug?
Doug: Right. Hey, Scarecrow, I'm Doug and this is Dave.
John: (extends hand) Glad to meet you. Maybe if the chow's good here, I can put on some weight. Then you'll have to find a new nickname (laughs).
Dave: What are you in for, Scarecrow?
John: Car theft.
Doug: Is that all?
John: Yeah, that's all.
Dave: (aside to Doug) Jeez, I hope Scarecrow isn't gonna be on my work detail. He looks like he'd fall apart the first day.
John: How hard do they work the guys here?
Doug: It's pretty rough. I don't think ya can handle it, Scarecrow.
John: (laughs) Well, I'm not Mr. Muscle, but I guess I can handle it.
Dave: We'll see. You wanna meet the other guys?
John: Sure, could you guys introduce me around?
Doug: Okay, come on.

Discussion points. 1. Contrast these ways of dealing with ranking. 2. When peers know they can't "bug" you, they quit pretty soon. 3. Generalize to other situations. 4. Importance of getting involved with peers. If you "hide," they think you're scared or weak, and often exploit this.
APPENDIX B

DEPENDENT MEASURES
Children's Locus of Control Scale

Instructions

This is not a test. I am just trying to find out how kids your age think about certain things. I am going to ask you some questions to see how you feel about these things. There are no right or wrong answers to these questions. Some kids say "Yes" and some say "No." When I ask the question, if you think your answer should be yes, or mostly yes, say "Yes." If you think your answer should be no, or mostly no, say "No." Remember, different children give different answers, and there is no right or wrong answer. Just say "Yes" or "No," depending on how you think the question should be answered. If you want me to repeat a question, ask me. Do you understand? All right, listen carefully, and answer "Yes" or "No."

1p. When somebody gets mad at you, do you usually feel there is nothing you can do about it?
2f. Do you really believe a kid can be whatever he wants to be?
3f. When people are mean to you, could it be because you did something to make them be mean?
4f. Do you usually make up your mind about something without asking someone first?
5f. Can you do anything about what is going to happen tomorrow?
6f. When people are good to you, is it usually because you did something to make them be good.
7f. Can you ever make other people do things you want them to do?
8f. Do you ever think that kids your age can change things that are happening in the world?
9f. If another child was going to hit you, could you do anything about it?
10f. Can a child your age ever have his own way?
11p. Is it hard for you to know why some people do certain things?
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12f. When someone is nice to you, is it because you did the right things?

13f. Can you ever try to be friends with another kid even if he doesn't want to?

14f. Does it ever help any to think about what you will be when you grow up?

15f. When someone gets mad at you, can you usually do something to make him your friend again?

16f. Can kids your age ever have anything to say about where they are going to live?

17f. When you get in an argument, is it sometimes your fault?

18p. When nice things happen to you, is it only good luck?

19p. Do you often feel you get punished when you don't deserve it?

20f. Will people usually do things for you if you ask them?

21f. Do you believe a kid can usually be whatever he wants to be when he grows up?

22p. When bad things happen to you, is it usually someone else's fault?

23f. Can you ever know for sure why some people do certain things?

Note: The letter "f" following item number indicates that an answer of "Yes" is scored as internal control. The letter "p" signifies that an answer of "No" is scored as internal control.
General Behavior Rating Sheet

Name: _____________________  Rater: _____________________

PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER YOU THINK BEST DESCRIBES THE YOUTH'S BEHAVIOR.

A. SELF-CONTROL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>impulsive</td>
<td>minimal</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>often in</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>does not control</td>
<td>control</td>
<td>control</td>
<td>control</td>
<td>control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control his behavior</td>
<td>of his behavior</td>
<td>of his behavior</td>
<td>of his behavior</td>
<td>of his behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. INTERACTION WITH OTHER BOYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>withdrawn</td>
<td>minimal</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>often in</td>
<td>forms close</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distant from other boys</td>
<td>interaction with other boys</td>
<td>interaction with other boys</td>
<td>interaction with other boys</td>
<td>relationships with other boys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boys</td>
<td>boys</td>
<td>boys</td>
<td>boys</td>
<td>other boys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. INTERACTION WITH TEACHERS OR COUNSELORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>withdrawn</td>
<td>minimal</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>often in</td>
<td>forms close</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distant from teachers</td>
<td>interaction with teachers</td>
<td>interaction with teachers</td>
<td>interaction with teachers</td>
<td>relationships with teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers</td>
<td>teachers</td>
<td>teachers</td>
<td>teachers</td>
<td>teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. RESPONSIBILITY FOR SELF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>accepts no responsibility for what he does</td>
<td>occasionally accepts responsibility for what he does</td>
<td>reluctantly accepts responsibility for what he does</td>
<td>often accepts responsibility for what he does</td>
<td>accepts complete responsibility for what he does</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### E. RESPONSIBILITY FOR ASSIGNED TASKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fails to complete assigned tasks</td>
<td>fails to complete assigned tasks</td>
<td>occasionally completes assigned tasks</td>
<td>follows orders does what he is told only</td>
<td>often completes assigned tasks with- out being pressured</td>
<td>independently initiates and completes tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### F. RAPPORT WITH OTHER BOYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>withdrawn from other boys rapport with other boys</td>
<td>withdrawn from other boys rapport with other boys</td>
<td>minimal rapport with other boys</td>
<td>moderate rapport with other boys</td>
<td>much rapport with other boys</td>
<td>forms close relationships with other boys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### G. RAPPORT WITH YOU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>withdrawn from you rapport with you</td>
<td>withdrawn from you rapport with you</td>
<td>minimal rapport with you</td>
<td>moderate rapport with you</td>
<td>much rapport with you</td>
<td>forms close relationships with you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

INSTRUCTIONS TO SUBJECTS
Directions for Answering Questions

This is not a test such as the ones you are used to taking. There are no right or wrong answers, it is simply a way of asking you questions about yourselves. We would like to know how you feel about certain things. None of the caseworkers, counselors, or other students here at AYC will see or be told the answers that you mark down. These answers will not be placed in your file nor will they be shown to the Board, Parole Officers, or your parents or relatives. These results will have nothing to do with how long you stay at AYC nor with how you are treated while you are here.

Please answer either yes or no to questions 1 through 23 on the answer sheet by putting an X through the yes or no next to the question that is being read aloud. For statements 24 through 157, put an X through the T if it is true for you and an X through the F if it is false for you.

The statements will be read to you from this tape recorder. The number of the statement will be read, followed by the statement, and then there will be a short pause to allow you to put an X through the answer that is correct for you. Please do not skip over any of the questions or statements as you will not have a chance to go back and mark it later. Remember there are no right or wrong answers. There is only the answer that is real for you.

Thank you all for answering these questions for us. Please do not discuss the test questions or answers with anyone here at AYC.
At the Start of Session 1

For those of you who don't know me, my name is Mr/Mrs/Miss _________. We are doing something new to show you some different ways of handling common situations and problems that might happen in your lives. The situations we'll work with and emphasize are often particularly important to fellows like yourselves. I say this because just the fact that you're going through an institution will have important effects on your lives, and we want to work with you to teach you better ways of handling these effects. In other words, we need to work together on new ways to handle problem situations. These are situations which we feel will be important to you in the future. They are things that any of you might run into from time to time and we think that you can benefit from learning and practicing different ways to act in these situations.

The way I want to do this isn't by lecturing or advising you. Having people watch others doing things and then discussing what has been done is a very important way and a useful way to learn. It is easy to learn how to do something just by watching someone do it first. Oftentimes, just explaining something to someone isn't nearly as effective as actually doing it while the other person watches. For example, it is easier to learn to swim, or repair a car, if you have a chance to watch someone else doing it first.

We think that small groups, working together, can learn a lot of appropriate ways of doing things just by watching others play roles and/or by playing these roles themselves. By role, we mean the particular part a person plays or acts in a particular situation . . . kind of like the parts actors play in a movie scene, only this will be more real. These roles are based on actual situations that many people have trouble with, like how to control your anger, or how to resist being pressured by your friends into doing destructive or illegal things. Other roles are directly related to fellows like yourselves who have been in an institution. These are situations such as the best ways you can use the skills of your P.O. to help you after you leave here. These things are some that not everyone can do well. We want to emphasize better ways of doing these things and coping with similar problems which will be important in the future.

(Each treatment group was then given instructions appropriate to the task that was described by that particular condition. For example, in the behavior rehearsal condition, each group of subjects was told: each person in the group will get a chance to role play a part in various situations. After everyone has had a chance we will discuss important ideas presented in the scene. We will meet two times a week.)
Each meeting will deal with different situations. The behavior rehearsal plus televised self-observation group was also told that their performance would be videotaped and played back to the group. Instructions for the televised modeling and the televised modeling plus behavior rehearsal groups differed but slightly from the other two.)
APPENDIX D

SUMMARY TABLE OF ANALYSES OF COVARIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Measure</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Report Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control Scale</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility Scale of CPI</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Control Scale of CPI</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialization Scale of CPI</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher's Behavioral Ratings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Control</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with Other Boys</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with Teachers</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for Self</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for Assigned Tasks</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport with Other Boys</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport with Rater</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counselor's Behavioral Ratings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Control</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with Other Boys</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with Counselors</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for Self</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for Assigned Tasks</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport with Other Boys</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport with Rater</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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