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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was:

1) To describe the similarities and differences in aims of detached work approaches between Vancouver and other major North American centres.
2) To analyze the attempted fulfillment of the goals of the detached work program of the Boys Clubs of Vancouver.
3) To suggest the formulation of data gathering tools that would provide the Boys Clubs of Vancouver with more accurate and researchable information for future inquiries.

Questionnaires were formulated for:

1) The organization administrators in the areas where detached work was initiated.
2) The youths with whom the detached worker made contact.
3) Data was provided by the Boys Club describing the pre- and post-orientation program which they offered to their line detached workers. A third set of data regarding line worker perceptions of their training and role was obtained by us in February 1967 using the same tool as the Boys Club for their documentation.

We used the above data tools to attempt to determine the following:

1) The influence of the detached worker on delinquency rates, family situations, educational factors, peer group and authority relationships and leisure time activities.
2) The amount of neighbourhood organization involvement in the detached work program.
3) The workers perception of their role and any discrepancies from the prescribed role formulated by the sponsoring agency.

Provisional findings are as follows:

1) More youths increased their delinquent activities than decreased their delinquent activities while associating with the detached worker.
2) No work was done with the families of the involved teens.
3) Patterns of leisure-time activities were significantly influenced by the detached worker's presence.
4) The number of referrals that agencies stated they wanted from the detached work program was significantly higher (50% yes 25% no) than actually handled (6% yes 75% no). There was a similar trend in the number of referrals wanted and handled by the detached work program (36% wanted referrals 19% actual referrals).
5) 50% of the organizations contacted stated they could take a more active role in the detached work program largely in the area of use of facilities.
6) Observations and conclusions in the area of the workers' perception of his role (#3 page 2) were totally subjective and largely without statistical reliability.
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CHAPTER I

Today, the word "delinquency" is so casually tossed about that one would tend to think that either the whole youth population is delinquent; or, so much is known about delinquency that someone will stumble upon THE answer any day and end all the headaches and heartaches of authorities and parents alike.

At best, it is a very tenuous and vague term. Any discussion of delinquency is usually emotion-filled and emotion-provoking. Further, these discussions often emanate from fondly remembered personal experiences, and "perceived delinquent acts" of today's youths (mostly on hearsay evidence) - that is, acts morally judged by the individual to be of a delinquent (whatever that means!) nature.

In a report to the annual meeting of the Boys Clubs of Vancouver (1966), the Director of the Department of Detached Work Services for that organization stated: "Since the inception of the Boys Club movement, one of the primary aims has been to prevent the spread of juvenile delinquency. Boys' Clubs have operated "building centred" activities in districts and sections of the city where youth guidance services are a major necessity."¹

Unfortunately, this author assumes readers will know what he means when he states, "one of the primary aims has been to prevent the spread of juvenile delinquency". No definitions are forwarded to provide a frame of reference for this phrase.

On page 3 of the same report, he states, "The major problems identified and worked with were 'delinquent activities' which consisted of drinking,

theft, vandalism to private and public property, and the upsurge of glue-sniffing which was later to spread in other areas of Vancouver." There is yet no frame of reference, rather a listing of value-laden concepts of "delinquent activities". Further, is the student to assume that "juvenile delinquency" and "delinquent activities" are one and the same?

Also, the students must accept the assumption that Boys' Clubs programs and services and "youth guidance services" are in essence one and the same, without any frame of reference or evidence to support these assertions whatsoever.

Secondly, the students read that, "...the first major exploratory project "Mobilizing Unreached Youth" ... was documented and circulated widely in the service community. The purpose of this project was to ascertain the basic needs and interests of "unreached youth" (non-delinquent as well as delinquent) and to study through research methods of intervention and program." The students read this report and found this underlined statement to be verging on complete misrepresentation of facts.

Again, on page 5, it is stated, "A research committee was also established to collect data and document specific aspects of the project". The students were not provided the opportunity to meet with the "research committee", No mention was made of the existence of such a committee until the report was read.

In view of these difficulties, and in spite of them, the students have attempted to provide a tangible frame of reference for their considerations of detached work with "unreached" youths, some who have committed "delinquent acts". The students preferred, also, to consider the act rather than the youth as delinquent.

The most difficult task has been attempting to specifically pinpoint what the objectives of the Department of Detached Work have been. Also, to

\[2^{\text{Ibid, p. 4.}}\]
define what is inferred by the multitude of terms cast about in reports with such "reckless abandon". Some of these terms are: "juvenile delinquency", "services", "detached work", "youth guidance services", "research", "community development", "social adjustment forms", "social development forms", "social adjustment - prevention focus", "aggressive group work", "counselling services", "community organization", to name a few. These terms are applied in such fluid states that they could mean anything to anyone.

In the Introduction to the Summer Project - 1966 (To the student's knowledge, this is as much as has been completed of the report) several definitions were forwarded ie: 1) unreached groups, 2) Non-Pre-and Delinquent groups, 3) Group services, 4) Counselling services, 5) Community services.

Definitions one and two are adequate but three through five are vague and diffuse. (Note: See pages 11 - 14 Summer Report of Boys' Clubs on Detached Work, 1966).

The Director of the Department of Detached Work expressed concerns regarding the design, design of tools to measure effectiveness of the program, and the development of tools to evaluate the Orientation Program. The students perceived these concerns as directing their efforts to forming objective and hypotheses in areas such as the following:

A. To describe the similarities and differences in aims of the Detached Work Program approaches of Vancouver and other major centres.

B. To analyze the attempted fulfillment of goals of the Detached Work Program of the Boys Clubs of Vancouver.

To develop hypotheses and collect and analyze data that will test these hypotheses.

C. To make a beginning formulation of data gathering tools that will provide the Department of Detached Work with more accurate
and researchable information for future inquiries.

D. The Detached Worker as a significant variable in the outcomes of work with youths.

E. The influence factor of the Orientation Program in deflecting the new worker's perception of the "Detached Worker Role" to align with the "Detached Worker's Role Expectations" of the Boys Clubs of Vancouver.

F. In view of specific goals stated for the Summer Project - 1966, the similarity between agency role expectations and actual role performance of Detached Workers.

The report on the Summer Project - 1966 was not complete to the student's knowledge. This was a drawback to any valid and reliable investigation and research. Most of the 1966 material required was not available in a form usable to anyone but the Boys' Club staff members. Thus, it was necessary to "start from scratch" to analyze the detached work service in order to report data results and make recommendations for further analyses and research into detached work.

Problem Formulation

Firstly, problem formulation proved difficult in the beginning phases of exploration into the Detached Work Program of the Boys' Clubs of Vancouver. This situation arose because of several factors:

1. The expectations held by the Boys' Club as to what such a study "ought" to provide for them as an extension of their continuing pursuits with "unreached" youth in the community of Vancouver.

2. The academic expectations of the research consultant from the School of Social Work who wished to ensure that the students received an adequate research experience.
3. Problem explorations were considerably slowed because of the fact that the report of the 1966 Detached Work Program of the Boys' Clubs of Vancouver is incomplete even to this date. Little material was available that permitted the type of exploration required to develop reseachable material.

4. The descriptive material provided by the Department of Detached Work was limited. Above this, the terminology used was vaguely defined to the point of being ambiguous and totally misleading. Thus, the student's work was hampered in having to consistently define concepts, and programs referred to by the Boys Clubs in describing their method of approach.

The first question that confronted the students was: Why the need for Detached Work Programs? What conditions create the necessity for services such as detached work? There seem to be recurring specific conditions in any given environment that are consistently repeated:

(a) the lack of certain facilities available for use by a wide variety of youth populations and lack of workers with particular skills that lend themselves to the expressions of wants and interests of adolescents.

(b) the lack of creative, organized activities in the community that interest the diverse adolescent populations and draw them in to fulfilling participation.

(c) the lack of parental support for, or knowledge of limit-setting behaviour which will discourage illegitimate and morally un-sanctioned behaviour on the part of adolescents and encourage them to participate in sanctioned legitimate activities.

(d) the existence of gaps in the provision of services in the community on the part of public and voluntary organizations.
Certain populations are not being served. They may or may not be expressing themselves in illegitimate activities. It may simply be that their community does not possess the basic services considered fundamentally useful to their leisure-growth and development.

Typically, detached work services have been utilized as the development of influence relationships between detached workers and individuals or groups of youngsters in a target population. It is a process aimed at social control of "delinquent behaviour". There may even be claims to delinquency prevention. Such claims cannot be substantiated because adequate research methods have neither been developed to a point of validity and reliability nor adequately tried in a sufficient variety of circumstances and environments.

**ASSUMPTIONS**

Through the following assumptions we are attempting to establish a framework wherein hypotheses may be structured to test and analyze data gathered in particular areas of the Detached Work Program of the Boys' Clubs of Vancouver.

1. We first assume that there was a recognized gap in patterns of services of public and voluntary leisure-time organizations thus creating the need for an alternate strategy or approach that could be employed to reach specific target populations called "unreached" groups.

---

3 The closest description of "delinquent behaviour" comes in "Stop on any Street Corner" where the author writes "The major problems identified and worked with were 'delinquent activities' which consisted of drinking, theft, vandalism to private and public property, and the upsurge of glue-sniffing which was later spread in other areas of Vancouver". p 3.
DEFINITIONS

1:1 recognized - refers to the cognizance of police, leisure-time workers, parents, and school authorities who perceived groups of youths congregating in given areas with no formal organizational ties and were expressing themselves in delinquent, anti-social, or unacceptable behaviour.

1:2 public - refers to those organizations, in particular community centres, who derive their funds from tax dollars and/or other means and have a community sanction.

1:3 voluntary - refers to those organizations, in particular Y.M.C.A.'s, Y.W.C.A.'s, Neighbourhood Houses and Boys' Clubs who derive their funds from the United Appeal (i.e. voluntary gifts) and other means and have an assumed sanction through community participation.

1:4 "unreached" - the definition for "unreached" is derived from the writings of the Boys' Clubs in their reports on the Summer Project of the Detached Work Program and means that: a) the group was receiving no services, b) the group was receiving services but not being influenced.

There is no clear definition as to what is meant by the word "services". We are not sure whether "services" refers to particular programs offered by public and voluntary leisure-time organizations; or, whether it refers to the "workers" who are providing the programs, or both. Further, we are not clear, whether, by the word "services", the Boys' Clubs are referring to part-
icular types of activities that may include the "programs" of leisure time organizations as well as other activities such as individual counselling. 4

2. Secondly, we are assuming that those youths participating in leisure time public and voluntary organizational activities derived "social and recreational values" 1 from them and that this influences their behaviour in "morally and legally legitimate directions." 2

DEFINITIONS

2:1 "social and recreational values" - refers to standards of conduct expressed within the content of recreational activities and applying to the everyday aspects of ordinary personal inter-relationships with adults and peers.

2:2 "morally and legally legitimate directions" - refers to perceivable actions being within the confines of acceptable behaviour and not transgressing prescribed laws.

3. Thirdly, we are assuming that the strategy of "detached work" is the most effective alternative that may be employed to work with target populations about whom concerns have been expressed.

4NOTE: See "Worker responses to question #20: "What is an unreached youth?"", (page 52) also see figure #II (page 71) regarding % breakdown of professional and volunteer services offered when referrals were made either to or from the Detached Work Program. We are not aware of what this service consisted of, for how long it was given and what results were obtained.
DEFINITIONS

3:1 "detached work" - also known in reports from the Boys' Clubs of Vancouver as "aggressive group work in the community setting" - received little satisfactory discussion in the way of attempting an accurate analysis or definition of the term "detached work". Thus the following definition has been formulated: "Detached Work" refers to the activities of volunteers and paid personnel of the Boys' Clubs of Vancouver assigned to move outside the confines of that organization's buildings in order to contact a given group (or groups) of youths within a given area (or areas) for the purpose of establishing an influence relationship with individual(s) and Group(s) that will prevent or control their delinquency or pre-delinquent activities and encourage these youths to participate in existing or newly created programs and activities of established organizations.

DEFINITIONS

A:1 "influence relationship" - refers to the workers' activities in gaining the confidence and acceptance of youths in a target population and having them refer to him for guidance in their individual and group activities and behaviour.

A:2 "prevent" - refers to actions by the detached worker which would deter those youths who have had no prior police or court contacts from compiling such contacts.

A:3 "control" - refers to actions by the detached worker which would deter those youths who have had prior police and/or court contacts from compiling further contacts.

A:4 "delinquency" - refers to behaviour that transgresses prescribed laws of the Criminal Code of Canada.
A:5 "pre-delinquent activity" - is describing behaviour directly in line with A:4 but at a point where official community sanction has not been imposed.

**HYPOTHESES**

The following hypotheses have been formulated accordingly to analyze the activities and efforts of the Detached Workers of the Boys' Clubs of Vancouver.

I. Youths contacted by Detached Workers will be significantly deterred from police contacts.

**DEFINITIONS**

I:1 "deterred" - means "no further contact with police" and refers to those youths who have had previous contacts with police.

I:2 "police contacts" - refers to recorded contacts of the Youth Prevention Squad of the Vancouver Police Force and does not take into account contacts with the regular constables, etc.

I:3 "contacted" - refers to the relationship building activity of the Detached Worker who is working with a particular group of youths.

II. Youths contacted by the Detached Worker will be significantly deterred from court contacts.

**DEFINITIONS**

II:1 "contacted" - see Definition I:3

II:2 "deterred" - see Definition I:1

II:3 "court contacts" - refers to recorded court appearances as taken from the Youth Preventive Squad, etc, etc.

III. In the sample group, youths from broken homes will be involved in delinquent behaviour to a greater extent than youths from homes where both natural parents are present.
DEFINITIONS

III:1 "sample group" - refers to those youths who answered the questionnaire or those youths who were on the list supplied by the Boys' Club.

III:2 "broken homes" - as used in the questionnaire to youths, refers to those youths who are living in a home situation that does not include both natural parents.

III:3 "delinquent behaviour" - as used in the questionnaire, refers to two specific types of contacts with authorities:
   a) contacts with the Youth Preventive Squad
   b) contacts with the Family & Children's Court of the City of Vancouver.

IV. Those Detached Workers who have experienced the Orientation Program will perform more effectively than those who have not taken part in the program.

IV:1 "effectively"\(^5\) - refers to the influence relationships with target population youths aimed at preventing, deterring and controlling delinquent behaviour.

V. Youths with an incomplete educational experience will be more likely to have police and/or court contacts than those whose educational experience has been sequential.

DEFINITIONS

V:1 "incomplete educational experience" - refers to those youths who:
   a) have dropped out of school for any reason without having com-

\(^5\)NOTE: The definition implicitly includes such areas as:
   a) knowledge of adolescent behaviour in groups
   b) knowledge of community resources available to target populations
   c) knowledge of agency policy and functions regarding working with target populations
pleted the grade 10 sequence of the secondary school program.
b) do not have a trade or a completed vocational training pro-

V:2 "police contacts" - see I:2
V:3 "court contacts" - see II:3
V:4 "sequential" - refers to the youths' success in passing from one
course or grade to the next; it infers that the youth has not
experienced failure, or has not been discouraged from continuing education as the result of experienced failure.

As a result of concerns expressed regarding the content and impact of
the Orientation Program, an analysis was structured as follows:

1. A summary of the literature dealing specifically with the role,
   training, selection and the skills considered necessary for det-
   ached work.

2. An analysis of a questionnaire developed by the Boys Clubs.
   (See Appendix D)

3. A comparative analysis of the worker's performance indicated by
   an interview in relation to the statement of goals established by
   the Boys' Clubs from their 1966 report, specifically referring
   to sections II, III and IV. (See Appendix E) See Chapter IV.

A list of organizations was provided by the Boys' Clubs (See page 69).
Administrative representatives from these organizations were interviewed. No
hypotheses were formulated in the areas dealt with in the questionnaire. Rather
the questionnaire served as an information-gathering device that may reveal
areas meriting further research that may be substantiated by valid data.

Questions were asked in the following areas:

1. Different organizations knowledge of, interest in, and involve-
   ment with the Department of Detached Work.
2. Ideas and attitudes towards present and future administration and financing of the Detached Work Program.

3. "Delinquency perceptions" and perceived impact of detached work by the questionnaire respondents.

4. Ideas of Staffing a Detached Work Program.

5. Participation in, and attitudes towards referrals to and from the Detached Work Program.

Percentage breakdowns and question correlations were obtained on the information. Comments, evaluations and recommendations have been attempted on the basis of the information available despite its questionable accurateness. Responses have been used wherever possible to complement data from the "Questionnaire to Unreached Youths." Wherein, the material on this latter questionnaire is used in conjunction with the stated hypotheses.
CHAPTER II

OUTLINE OF THE THEORY OF DETACHED WORK PRACTICED IN NORTH AMERICA AND AN OUTLINE OF SOME OF THE PROGRAMS IN MAJOR NORTH AMERICAN URBAN CENTRES

Throughout the background readings we were confronted with numerous descriptive reports, articles, and studies which were mainly concerned with a specific area or program of detached work. To our knowledge, Irving Spergel is the only person to conceptualize a theoretical model, combined with a practical approach to the major aspects of detached work. Therefore, in this chapter, we will use his model as a guide, adding information from other sources where it is pertinent.

Historical Perspectives

The roots of detached work practice are to be found deep in the tradition of social agencies in North America, primarily the United States. As early as 1848, churchmen and charity workers sought, without much success, to contact "young roughs" and "vagabond boys of the metropolis" through religious or street work called "Boy's Meetings". They hoped that the sympathy of an audience might be used to influence wild and untutored boys when ordinary agencies were of no avail. The meetings were among the earliest efforts to combat delinquency through moral persuasion, outside the physical structure of a social agency.

Before the turn of the century, settlements, Boys Clubs, Y.M.C.A., Boy Scouts, police and other service agencies worked to win street boys over to programs in the agency, or failing this, to develop special facilities and activities for them in the vicinities of their own hangouts. Indeed, many agency programs which are now traditional or well established originated as efforts to serve street groups in their own districts. More than forty years ago, it was recommended that boy workers or "boy-men" be assigned to find con-
tact, and work with male gangs to "rehabilitate their memberships".¹

The Area Projects of the early and mid-thirties are still operating. They were the progenitors, and in part, the prototypes of the street work projects which have since been established in many large urban centres. The Area Projects attempted to use the resources of indigenous leadership in lower class neighbourhoods while working with delinquents. The emphasis was on the entire neighbourhood and not a specific gang.

The post World War II problem of delinquency shifted to a more aggressive character in lower class areas. Indigenous organizations simply could not cope with the enormous problems, and pressure was brought upon social agencies to do something. Attention was consequently directed to gang fighting. As a result, until very recently the agencies' response to pressures for control was to assign special youth workers to gangs in an attempt to redirect their energies into more constructive channels.

Increased recognition has been given to the notion that delinquency prevention, treatment, and control require the participation of those who form a significant part of the social world of the recipients. At the same time, most recent agency efforts continue to center on discovering more effective or more sophisticated worker techniques to reach delinquents.

Definition

A definition of detached work must answer the what, where, why, when and how of service to gangs. Irving Spergel offers an adequate definition: "The practice variously labeled detached work, street club, gang work, area work, extension youth work, corner work, etc., is the systematic effort of an agency worker, through social work or treatment techniques within the neighbourhood context, to help a group of young people who are described as delinquent

or partially delinquent to achieve a conventional adaption. This requires
the agent to work with or manipulate the people or other agency representa-
tives who interact critically with members of the delinquent group."²

Spergel and other writers in the field believe in order to gain an
understanding of detached work we must consider four basic sets of factors:
1. The delinquent subcultures and lower class neighbourhoods:

The delinquent subculture is the dominant system of beliefs, norms,
and values of delinquent groups. It may be regarded as a response to three
major sociocultural conditions operating within a neighbourhood context. The
lower class culture, the youth culture, and the opportunity system. The lower
class culture results from collective adaptation to such common life problems
as broken families, chronic unemployment, serious physical and mental illness,
slum housing, poor education, and some form of minority group status. The
youth culture is a response to the discontinuity of North American culture
which fails to provide adequate role patterns for adolescents. Probably the
most important assumption is that the development of delinquent subculture is
due to limitations in the available opportunities or insufficient access to
the symbols of status acknowledged by the larger culture.⁴

2. The delinquent group:

The group connects the neighbourhood social system and delinquent
subculture with the individual personality development. Interpersonal relations
within the small group develop personality, and also transmit cultural values.
During adolescence the peer group takes on superordinate importance for the low-
er class boy. The delinquent group is one way these boys can achieve status

²Irving Spergel, Street Gang Work: Theory and Practice, University of
³Ibid., pp. 1 - 20.
⁴Richard A. Cloward and Lloyd E. Ohlin, Delinquency and Opportunity, Glencoe,
even though it is seen as negative by the larger culture.

Delinquent groups tend to differ along a variety of dimensions which are influenced by the neighbourhood social structures, especially the delinquent subculture. Each group develops a distinctive set of characteristics within the limits of neighbourhood resources and the norms of the local delinquent subculture. Group characteristics such as origin, size, structure, behaviour, morale, controls, cohesion, and disintegration are influenced by these prevailing delinquent subcultural orientations.

The group may contain some nondelinquent members. While there may be variations, both as to type and severity, in individuals patterns of anti-social behaviour, dominant modes of delinquent behaviour tend to develop, which characterize the group as a whole.

3. The Individual Delinquent:

The delinquent, in addition to his social position as a gang member, is also a distinctive biopsychological entity. He experiences all the physical, social and psychological adjustment problems of adolescence. It is possible to describe the common quality of behaviour which adolescent delinquents share. First of all, there is a conscious flouting of adult authority in general, and conventional authority in particular. Secondly, there is a failure to meet the demands of middle class society and a rejection of school and social agency discipline. The underlying theme in all these patterns is distrust of adults and out-group peers.

Within each delinquent group it is possible to distinguish various basic pathological types of individuals, although the distribution of these types can be expected to vary by group and subculture. The delinquent is extremely difficult to diagnose and treat. Knowledge of his personality is usually derived through efforts at treatment. He makes clear that he does
not need the worker and often demonstrates a total lack of desire to change or even respond to the worker's efforts. He does not admit his symptoms are pain­ful, and has little motivation to reveal what is going on inside himself.

4. The Agency Worker:

The detached worker is an agency representative alone on the streets, who is striving to help the delinquent gang to change its pattern of behaviour. He is on the streets of the neighbourhood at odd hours of the day or night. He may have little immediate structure or support, such as office space, regular hours, guidance or supervision from colleagues or superiors. Furthermore, he belongs to two worlds; he is of the delinquent group and its subculture, but also of the world of respectable and conforming people. On the one hand, he tries to change the delinquent, and on the other, the people and institutions which have aided in producing the delinquent. His role may be divided into a series of distinctive, yet complimentary subroles: group worker, individual counsellor, family worker, and community worker. However, the major role is that of group worker, because his principal concern is the direct socialization of the group. Because of this focus, it is imperative that the worker have sufficient knowledge of group dynamics. Besides his professional and academic training, the agency itself must provide relevant training for the particular type of work to be done. However, this is the ideal and the fact is that the majority of detached workers are not social workers by training. Nevertheless, the value of the program will depend on the availability of at least minimally qualified staff. Unless qualified workers are available, the very basis for a detached work program comes under serious question.

Other criteria for a qualified worker gathered from various readings include: good health and physical strength, psychological and emotional maturity, an experimenting and somewhat radical personality rather than an extremely conservative one, some excellence in sports of some kind, willingness to devote time
and energy without serious personal hardships, and preferably single to pick up loose tail on the hoof.

The definition states that detached work is systematic effort. This means that there need be nothing intrinsically haphazard in the way the detached worker practices. The problem-solving approach he uses consists of a specific sequence of interactions with the group. He first initiates the relationship, establishes the expectation of supportive behaviour, then communicates conventional values, implements controls, facilitates positive intragroup transactions, develops constructive group activities, attempts to modify anti-social behaviour, and then terminates his relationship with the delinquent group. These actions may appear in various combinations and emphasis, but may also be regarded as sequential phases in the workers relationship with the group over an extended period of time.

In order to be effective, the agency must know the pattern of the group in general terms, and the probable meaning of the pattern before long-term service is initiated. The rationale for intervention and continuing relationship must be conscious and reasonably clear. Once clear about the nature of the delinquent problem, the agency sets appropriate program purposes. The purpose should be more clearly related to the group needs and the methodology selected accordingly. The neighbourhood conditions should provide the framework for determining the agency's purpose, structure, and methods. This includes social, economics, attitudes, size of group, sex, manifested behaviour, and cultural conditions.

Under the most trying circumstances at times, the detached worker must develop his program within the policies of the agency. By their interpretation and implementation of the agency's policies, the workers, themselves, collectively influence future goals and procedures established by the administrative.

---

staff, but this power as a rule tends to be limited, even for the highly independent and free-wheeling detached worker. In the final analysis, the kind of street work actually carried out will depend to a very large degree on factors which accrue over a period of time on the basis of official policy and day-to-day practice.

Spergel presents three current agency approaches to service; the treatment or rehabilitation approach, the area or sociological approach, and the balanced or intermediate approach. These are only used as approximations as there are many variations of each approach. Also, many different techniques are commonly employed by the worker regardless of his orientation. However, there are enough differences in practice to make it possible to classify agency programs within one of these three general categories.

1. The Treatment Approach

This type of organization tends to be private or voluntary and to have a long tradition of high-quality professional social service rendered to individuals, families, or groups. A settlement house with a multifunctional service program or a family service agency may be the base upon which the detached work project has developed. Increase of community and professional concern about the problem of delinquency may have originated the new service. The agency orients its program to a lower class segment of a relatively stable, well-organized working or middle class area. The program serves younger teenagers who are regarded as predelinquent. There are two treatment goals: (a) To assist the individual to develop more socially acceptable and emotionally satisfying relationships at home, in school, and in his peer groups. (b) To provide supportive and if necessary, long-term casework treatment to the parents or families of the youngsters.

6Ibid., pp. 49 - 66.
In this approach, the theory is that delinquency generally arises from the individual's personality problems which in turn stem from his relationship with his parents. Therefore the target for intervention is the personality malfunction or inability to develop effective interpersonal relationships. The major theoretical references are psychoanalytic psychology and especially ego psychology.\(^7\)

In general, eight or nine youths are selected to participate in a formed group in which the worker attempts to develop a sensitive relationship with each individual, in hopes to improve the individual's interpersonal relationships which in turn will reduce the need to engage in anti-social behaviour. Because the members are so sensitive to rejection, everything is done to provide a condition of maximum protection and support. The youngsters are picked up at school by the worker, transported to the meeting and then taken home. Also, special trips or programs are planned and carried out. This is the highest cost per unit approach.

Spergel believes only professionally trained social workers (M.S.W.) who have group or casework experience in dealing with emotionally disturbed children are competent in this approach. Finally, the worker must maintain close contacts with other related agencies and resources in the community.

2. The Area Approach

This is a neighbourhood-oriented program, usually arising out of community-wide concern and pressure for control of severely delinquent and aggressive youths. Natural groups which are engaged in the most aggressive delinquent behaviour in the neighbourhood are the focus of attention. Consequently, the crucial component of service is control and modification of the social conditions which precipitate this behaviour. Service is ordinarily extensive, emphasizing contacts with a large number of youngsters, agency workers, and

\(^7\)Ibid., p. 55.
neighbourhood residents, rather than intensive dealing with a small group of gang members. Area Service is used most frequently for highly deprived youths in poorly organized lower class neighbourhoods where the ethnic composition is of varying combinations. Through group activities, limited individual and group counselling and a variety of parent, community and agency contacts and projects, the agency attempts to de-isolate the delinquent and assist him to participate more fully in the conventional stream of stable lower class neighbourhood life. As the emphasis is on community involvement, the worker spends considerable time just "hanging around with the gang", interprets positive potential of the gang to the police, to civic groups and so on. He talks with significant adults regarding the needs of the gang, and also has agencies alter their program to reach the gang.

In the area approach, delinquency is regarded as one available adaptation which can be developed to gain status or acceptance which is inaccessible through conventional means. Delinquency is more the property of a particular kind of social environment than an aspect of individual character. The theory in this approach is oriented more toward sociology than social work. Spergel feels the minimum qualification for a worker is a bachelor's degree, preferably in the social sciences or education. Experience with youth groups is desirable but not essential. Recruits to this type of agency tend to come from the fields of recreation, physical education, probation, and correctional service.

3. The Balanced Approach:

This program incorporates elements of the other two approaches, attempting to improve interpersonal relations, and to a lesser extent to reduce delinquent behaviour. It is often developed on an experimental or demonstration

---

basis, often in response to, or anticipation of delinquency crisis. Such programs may be initiated as part of a metropolitan community council or other community planning unit. In time however, a separate detached work structure arises which is connected for administrative purposes with an existing voluntary service organization. The program which may have been control-oriented originally, shifts its emphasis toward treatment of individuals. The scope of service is broadened to include not only aggressive fighting groups but also less severely delinquent, although perhaps more disturbed youths. In general, youths served are less seriously delinquent than in the treatment approach. There is often a wide range of social class among members, some coming from extremely deprived social and economic conditions and others from fairly secure circumstances. Intensive work is carried on with individuals, both within and outside of the group, in an attempt to modify behaviour and attitudes. In addition, programs are established for family treatment or counselling and limited attempts are made to collaborate with other agencies. Usually, the actual control function is assigned to authoritative agencies so the focus can remain on treatment with the individual and his family.

In this approach, the assumed cause of delinquency arises from inadequate and frustrating family experiences where there is a lack of consistent love, acceptance and security on the part of the parents, consequently developing a sense of personal failure in the adolescent. In the lower class areas this is heightened and supported by the reality of status deprivations. This approach attempts to provide natural groups with a group work and individual counselling service.

In this approach, Spergel regards the master's degree in social work as the preferred minimum qualification for employment, but is willing to accept

---

people trained in a related field. Also, personality qualifications are of prime importance, particularly the person's case at working with the youths served. Workers are required to meet with their groups, make family contacts once or twice a week, and establish communications as needed with selected community agencies. The worker usually meets with three groups that are smaller than the area approach, but larger than the treatment approach. Contact is maintained for approximately two years.

Referral, Intake, and Grouping

Still another variation among different types of agencies is the process of recruiting, accepting, and organizing the delinquent youths to be served. For the organized group served by the treatment agency, the usual source is the school, mainly the junior high school, where the school social worker or counsellor, teachers and principal make the referrals. Public welfare agencies, police and probation officers are additional sources of referral. But the process is usually initiated by the agency administrator or worker who notifies the other organizations that such a group is to be formed, relating the criteria for admittance. The agency encourages more referrals than it can handle therefore allowing for a range of choices. As mentioned, the group is limited in size and once it has been formed new members are not taken unless there is a vacancy to fill. Great emphasis is placed on the group selection process since much of the success of the group depends on selecting the right members for the right group.

The area program is concerned with the referral of groups rather than individuals and the usual source are the police and the probation department. Neighbourhood residents and representatives of local social agencies also contribute information which the worker uses for investigation, intake, and service to certain natural delinquent groups. Sometimes the worker is assigned to an
area rather than a specific group, and is given freedom to form groups which may include non-delinquents as well as delinquents. The criteria for initiating service to this type of group includes: recognized delinquency, a substantial number of individuals are officially known to the police or probation department, the gang has durability and cohesiveness and there is evidence that group delinquency will continue unless the group is serviced. In essence, this agency approach services the most disadvantaged groups.

The agency which follows a balanced approach gets referrals from schools, police, probation officers and other social agencies. The request may be made in the name of a specific individual as well as a group, but the request is considered only when the individual is associated with others who are also in need of service. Most of the criteria listed in the area approach is applicable here, except that the group which offers the greatest potential for the agency to demonstrate its skill or develop new approaches may be selected, even though it is not the most seriously delinquent group in the area. The group does not exceed twelve members. Because an agency goal is to assist the group to dissolve group structure is often weak and membership patterns change frequently.

Although the differences in the various agency approaches have been emphasized, a great many practices and procedures are shared in common. In the selection of methodology, casework, group work, or community organization, the worker should not try to be all things to all delinquent groups and communities. The limits of agency purpose, type of lower class neighbourhood, and his own unique qualifications should influence his selection of methodology.

General Purposes and Objectives

As the definition states, detached work is a systematic effort. When

---

a detached worker seeks to help groups or individuals, he selects objectives from one of five major categories of purpose: control of delinquent behaviour, treatment of group members, provision of limited access to opportunities, value change, and prevention of delinquent activity. Each of these is part of the program of helping the group to achieve a conventional or acceptable adaptation, and as such is dependent on the other. But at any given point, one may be central to the entire agency program or to the objectives of work with a specific group.

1. Control

In this event, the older, more serious delinquents, commonly involved in gang-fighting, are selected. In general, they are the gangs which constitute the greatest threat to the welfare and security of the community, and the agency is pressured from the public outcry. The basic strategy is to service all the conflict gangs of an area. Surveillance and authority management is extensively developed, and the worker must assist and collaborate with organizations and community groups to exercise control over the behaviour of gang members.

2. Treatment

For this objective, the delinquent is identified and selected on the basis of psychological or interpersonal difficulties. The youth who is not the most socially destructive or from the most deprived families or disorganized neighbourhoods is often selected for this approach. For the worker, the focus is on highly specialized skills in psychotherapeutic procedures both with the individuals and the parents.

3. Opportunities

This type of service focuses on youths in the worst slum areas of the city, and distinction between delinquent and non-delinquent tends to become

---

blurred. An attempt is made to modify existing programs, to create or expand opportunities for these youths. The workers primary effort is to develop and organize these resources.

4. Value Changes

In neighbourhoods where crime is institutionalized the major purpose of the worker is to change the values and to bring about significant change in adult patterns and institutional structures aimed at crime.

5. Prevention

With this focus, individuals are selected at an early period in their development of delinquent patterns and the group will be in its early formation stage, less delinquent, or will consist of generally younger youths. Presently, it appears that there are no detached work programs committed primarily to the purpose of prevention because agencies do not have the necessary resources at their disposal as yet.

Depending on its assessment of the critical and manageable factors contributing to delinquency, the agency, implicitly or explicitly, will determine its priority of purpose. The type of group selected and the program adopted follow from this decision.

Supervision

The detached work supervisor is an administrator, teacher and supporter. His many activities includes: community relations, staff selection, staff training, planning, coordination and control, resolution of intra-and inter-agency problems, program evaluation, and ad hoc supervision. He must measure the effectiveness of his program and make systematic valuations of the practice of his workers. In essence, as an administrator, he is concerned with getting the job done with the effectiveness, efficiency, and feasibility of his programs.

Staff training and development is a continuing responsibility of the supervisor. Organized training programs, such as staff meetings, supervisory conferences, university courses, and special workshops, tend to be common during initial orientation periods. Because of the complex, sensitive, and critical nature of the worker's relationship with gang members, and because of the extraordinary amount of skill required to develop a beginning relationship with the gang, most agencies require the worker to undergo a fairly extensive orientation program. Periodic re-exposure to special training programs, once the worker is in the field, seems essential for his continued professional development.

Principally, the supervisor's teaching role involves role analysis. He must understand the worker's perception of his own role, prescribe job expectations for him, and assist him to test out appropriate role performance in actual contact with gang members. Also, he helps the worker resolve conflicts and to use himself in a manner that improves his performance and enhances his confidence.

As a supporter, the supervisor must have a genuine concern and understanding for the personal and social needs of the workers as well as those of the group. Some inherent problems will require the supervisor's special interest and understanding, especially during the initial period where the supervisor's repeated expressions of confidence in the worker assumes great importance.

In conclusion, detached work is not a new discipline or profession, but an invigoration of a very old approach to helping people. It is free and flexible, and at the same time, planned and disciplined. It emphasizes intimacy

---

and deep involvement in resolving human problems. There are limitations in the approaches to helping delinquents and their families by established large-scale organizations, but detached work can maximize the contributions such organizations can make to rehabilitation. Ultimately, the great value of detached work is not in the fruits of its direct service to delinquent youths, but in its being a model of practice for any group working with highly alienated people.\textsuperscript{14}

While studying detached work programs in a number of major North American cities, it was thought that a model would allow us to concisely and uniformly present the characteristics of each program. The model established includes:

(1) Objectives of the program.

(2) Over-all strategy.

(3) Intake procedure.

(4) Programming.

(5) Group composition.

(6) Outcome.

(7) Evaluation.

Because of the information available and the number of years the Chicago Y.M.C.A. Detached Work Program has been in operation, it will be our major program illustration. The other programs will be presented in phrase form.

A. THE CHICAGO Y.M.C.A. - Program for Detached Workers 1963.\textsuperscript{15}

1. Objectives

a.) control of delinquency

b.) prevention of delinquency


\textsuperscript{15}Program for Detached Workers, Youth Consultant Project Developmental Report, Y.M.C.A., Chicago, January 1963.
2. **Over-all strategy**

In March 1956, the Y.M.C.A. assigned one man to the streets in an effort to gain a relationship with youth gangs in order to control their delinquent behaviour. This "youth gang" pilot project later became the program for detached workers. At no time during its development has the program been a rationally designed project with a specific theoretical basis. It always has been, and remains, a highly pragmatic, experimental, and realistic undertaking which incorporates much of the milieu of the youths and the areas with which it is involved. The absence of a pre-ordained specific aim and structured content for the Program, combined with the controlled, gradual growth in staff, is viewed as an advantage in this type of program.

As previously mentioned, the initial intervention was aimed at control, but as the Program progressed the focus gradually shifted towards prevention of delinquent behaviour.

Some assumptions the agency makes about gangs include: all gangs are different, few gang members are emotionally disturbed, gangs usually are not formed organizations, gang leaders can be worked with, gangs will accept legitimate activities. The detached worker is expected to determine, in a somewhat informal but nevertheless empirical fashion, what "his" gang is like and, pragmatically, and how best he can work with it.

3. **Intake Procedure**

Street gangs were known to the agency and assessed adequately before a worker moved into a street gang. In this way, the right worker could be selected for the appropriate gang in order to best meet the needs of the gang. The boys did not come to the agency seeking help, consequently the intake procedure consisted of the worker intervening into an already loosely formed group.
4. Programming

a.) Control

The agency makes use of paid volunteers (consultants). Their main duty is to attempt to control delinquency as well as they can, but especially to control behaviour while their group is engaged in program activities. The detached worker is the key element in the selection, training, and management of youth consultants.

In this area each worker operates in his own manner but these are two absolute commandments:

1) The worker must take action even if it is only to leave the scene of a situation he cannot alleviate, rather than stay and legitimize it by his presence.

2) The worker must not allow himself to be put in a compromising position or be middled between two opposing forces.

The areas of subculturally approved activities, the main emphasis has been on the way in which these activities are conducted, the behaviour that accompanies them, and their consequences. The area where the worker is expected to wield the most influence and control is in gang fighting. Here he works through the gang leader. Where crimes are for profit, he has little direct influence, but by making employment available and attempting to point out the consequences of such behaviour he can exert some influence. The study does not mention what specific activities the worker uses.

b.) Prevention

Increasingly the Program has become involved in secondary preventative activities in community areas where it is not required to devote all of its energies to essentially negative control. The aim remains the lessening of delinquent activities but the methodology shifts to include more far-reaching causality.
These have included organizing athletic teams, program-wide tournaments in softball, basketball, and pool. The intent has been to increase mobility and lessen fears of other areas of the city. In addition, there is value to be learned from participation in an organized, rule-bound activity with punctuality being emphasized. As the program progressed, it spread to a much larger neighbourhood and the critical features of this development were the use of youths as staff in operating activities. Two more serious program activities which have been attempted are a youth employment service and a school drop-out prevention project.

5. Group Composition

At first, while aiming or focusing on control, the groups were already loosely formed and small in number. As previously mentioned, with time and progress, the membership enlarged, especially where the focus was on prevention.

6. Evaluation

At no time has the Program had a stable, specific, "treatment-focus" developed from one theoretical point of view. It has been constantly changing, dynamic, and shifting its emphasis to whatever it feels is currently appropriate. Much of what the Program does is produced by the individual worker on his own, in response to a particular situation. The management of the Program attempts to see that the worker is aware of all of the ramifications, alternative lines of action, implications and probable consequences of these alternatives.

There are three theoretical aspects that seem important:

a.) The subculture -

The Program believes that in order for a worker to show results, he must be able to deal effectively with the subculture in which he is involved.

b.) Informal Small Group Process -

The emphasis here is on the worker's direct influence on the groups.
The aim is not to attempt change in individuals through group pressures, but instead to utilize youths in leadership positions to change group norms and expectations.

c.) Opportunity Structure -

This involves not only providing activities and status seen as immediately desirable by the youths, but also to develop involvement in opportunities seen as significant by the general community—specifically in the areas of schooling and jobs.

In summary, the Program is seen as an alternative subculture or system consisting of legitimate activities, with emphasis on education and employment rather than delinquency.

B. NEW YORK

1. Objectives

a.) To provide activities that emphasize positive features of youngsters' lives and offer satisfactory alternatives to delinquent behaviour.

b.) Channels for expression of grievance and collective social action.

c.) To channel defiant behaviour into less harmful forms and to provide alternatives.

2. Over-all Strategy

a.) Intervention of trusted adults.

b.) Alter basic values of gang members.

c.) Use of deep, personal ties to convince youths to relinquish delinquent activities.

d.) Agent of control.

e.) Interprets consequences of behaviour

f.) Mediates disputes of explosive situations.

---

16 Reaching the Fighting Gang, New York City Youth Board, 1960.
g.) Make available tangible educational and vocational opportunities.
h.) To be a liaison between the group and community institutions.

3. Program
   a.) Must be in keeping with the class and youth style or it cannot offer alternative satisfaction to defiant behaviour.

4. Intake Procedure - Not included.

5. Group Composition
   a.) Use of indigenous and naturally formed groups in specific neighbourhoods.

6. Outcome
   a.) Not specified.

7. Evaluation
   a.) A need to establish accurate measurement between self-reported misconducts and official statistics to discover the relationship between demographic and social structure of various urban neighbourhoods.
   b.) Extensive survey needed of origins and distributions patterns of delinquent behaviour.
   c.) Need to record material to make information available to co-operative agencies.
   d.) Need training program on an extensive basis.

C. BALTIMORE\textsuperscript{17}

1. Objectives
   a.) To change anti-social behaviour to two groups of delinquent and pre-delinquent youths.

\textsuperscript{17}Reaching Hard to Reach Youth, Health and Welfare Council of Baltimore Area, January 1964.
b.) The staff was assigned from the bureau of recreation.

c.) Goal was increased participation in leisure time activities and development of a positive attitude towards authority and a decrease in illegal activities.

2. Overall Strategy
   a.) Choose groups that promise rehabilitation.
   b.) Oral test for candidates.
   c.) Work with police department and schools.
   d.) Records on individuals kept but limited to selections of maximum relevance.
   e.) Modify group behaviour, extend limits, and provide models.

3. Program
   a.) Must be mobile.
   b.) Needs ample time.
   c.) Included social group work, out trips, physical activities and actual services (e.g., dental care).

4. Intake Procedure - Not specifically stated.

5. Group Composition
   a.) Selected by indigenous interviews.
   b.) Membership limited to thirty.
   c.) Usually one sex group.

6. Outcome
   a.) Professional social work training not essential except for supervisors.
   b.) The worker must be able to tolerate defiant behaviour.
   c.) The worker must have physical strength, skills, patience, and understanding.
   d.) Operate on the same level as the delinquent.
7. Evaluation
   a.) Co-operation with the voluntary and public agencies within the project was disappointing.
   b.) Problems with law enforcement officials.
   c.) School attendance did not seem to be affected.
   d.) One-third of the children in the project were involved in further delinquencies.

D. WINDSOR

1. Objectives
   a.) To work with recent law violators, school behaviour problems, and youths with poor employment records.
   b.) To produce better functioning of these individuals in the area of social problems and to help with unemployment and accommodation.

2. Overall Strategy
   a.) To locate and initiate conversation with groups.
   b.) To use community resources to assist the youths.

3. Program
   a.) High percentage of street work, in pool halls and dances, with resultant referrals to appropriate agencies.

4. Intake
   a.) Age range from 16 - 20.
   b.) High number of unemployed.
   c.) Low educational standards.

5. Group Composition
   a.) See intake and objectives.

18Youth Services Report, United Services of Greater Windsor, March, 1966.
6. Outcome
a.) It is not possible to be precise regarding to extent of the problem.

7. Evaluation
a.) A detached worker can establish a working relationship with hard core problems.
b.) The worker cannot give up cases on referral because of lack of co-ordination and co-operation by existing agencies to the total service of the individual.
c.) The community is interested.
d.) Facilities for the accommodation of the program are urgently required.

In conclusion, many central tendencies or universals can be drawn from the programs in various large cities. Generally, the goals, principles, population dealt with, and methodology are similar because of the aggressive, hostile nature of the target youth populations.

The Detached Work Program in Vancouver differs from those in other centres in a number of areas:

1. The Delinquent Population
a.) There is no highly developed delinquent gang structure.
b.) There are no highly concentrated tenement slum areas.
c.) There are no highly concentrated alienated racial sub-groups.

2. Staffing
a.) There was no use of indigenous leaders.
b.) University student volunteers were used. They were not paid.

3. Objectives
a.) The objectives of the Boys' Clubs of Vancouver closely resembled the first objective of the Windsor program (see page 33). They
were very similar to the Baltimore objectives (page 32).

b.) The Vancouver Detached Work Program had the additional aim of prevention with non-delinquent and pre-delinquent groups.

4. Overall Strategy

Vancouver workers moved into communities without as extensive an assessment as was performed in other centres.

5. Program

The Vancouver approach closely approximated the Baltimore approach.

6. Intake Procedure and Group Composition

The groups dealt with by the Boys' Clubs of Vancouver often contained boys and girls and ranged in size from 15 - 30.

7. Outcome and Evaluation

Refer to (page 27)

The outcomes of the Baltimore program and the results of this thesis were similar with the exception of organizational support and police co-operation. In Vancouver, organizational and police co-operation was very positive.

The Detached Work Program of the Boys' Clubs of Vancouver approximated the "Balanced approach" as proposed by Spergel, described on page 22 of this thesis.
CHAPTER III

AN EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE EFFECT OF THE ORIENTATION PROGRAM OFFERED TO DETACHED WORKERS BY THE BOYS CLUB OF VANCOUVER IN THE SUMMER OF 1966

Spergel has stated that, "Ideally for assignment to delinquent groups, a worker should be available who has a natural facility in relating to adolescents, particularly delinquent ones, who is deeply concerned with the welfare of people in the lower class communities, and who is prepared by professional training, preferably Social Work, to understand and have an effect on behavioral processes at the individual, group and organizational level".1

In consideration of the above statement, it is assumed that any Agency involved in Detached Work Programs would necessarily offer their own orientation programs, bearing in mind the unique problems presented by an individual or community due to its demographic conditions. (Note)

However, authors such as Bernstein have gone so far as to state that the detached worker's real equipment is, "...himself, his Agency and his community resources."2 He goes on to say that, "Crucial to the work are the Detached Worker's motivations, maturity, skill, knowledge and values."3 Bernstein assumes that the working conditions under which detached work is carried out make a, "...staid, regular and quiet family life impossible."4

---

NOTE: By demographic conditions we are including such information as: the neighbourhood description, the social agencies and organizations in the region, their purpose and structure and methods of operation, social and economic attitudes, and manifest behavioral and cultural conditions.
He also sees emphasis being placed on a high degree of autonomy for the detached worker to operate within. In the field, there is the need for self-awareness and preferred supervision. The worker then can be free to examine critically his own participation in the program.

Although no accurate statistical research was carried out in Bernstein's book, he has managed, by employing subjective interview techniques with the line workers involved in the program, to present a list of training needs necessary for detached work. They are stated in order of importance to the workers:

1. Increased skills with an understanding of individual and family dynamics. It was felt that the impact of the worker's daily experience was greater than that of the orientation of the Agency.
2. Group work, with a desire for further knowledge and skill.
3. Interaction between social welfare institutions and the community.
4. Diagnostic skills.
5. Miscellaneous concerns. (e.g. coaching in athletics, job availability statistics and public relations).

Finally, the New York City Youth Board has delineated what they consider to be the duties of a Street Club Worker (equivalent to a Vancouver "line detached worker" for the purpose of our study) "Duties under Supervision to:

Establish contact with anti-social youth groups, develop friendly working relationships with leaders and members of such groups, modify their attitudes and redirect their individual and group activities into constructive and socially acceptable channels, prepare members of such groups to accept remedial treatment and therapy available through various community agencies such as casework agencies, health clinics, community centres, employment services, educational institutions, religious centers, keep records, perform related work.

Minimum requirements: Association or experience with leaders of members of one or more anti-social youth groups for one year.\textsuperscript{6}

In most programs an operational frame of reference for the detached worker to operate in is carefully defined and because many of the U.S. programs have been in existence for some time\textsuperscript{7} one might assume that specialized training programs would have been developed to correlate fairly closely with Agency policy statements. (See appendix for Vancouver Detached Worker Policy Statement)

In most cases in the literature, however, this is not the case. The roles and skills expected for any particular position are defined, some more clearly than others, but the training programs both at the orientation and in-service levels, are left somewhat vague and diffuse.

The Welfare Council of New York found that, "lack of theoretical consultation handicapped workers", and that, "a background and experience in social work were necessary because the detached worker needs specialized training as well as the appropriate personality characteristics.\textsuperscript{8}"

Before we examine how the Vancouver Detached Work Program compared and contrasted with the preceding statements, we feel it necessary to briefly comment on the rationale, structure and purpose behind the orientation program offered by the Boys Club to their line work staff.

In the 1966 report, it is stated that, "Preparation of the staff should be developed in view of the fact that most had not been engaged in detached work previously."\textsuperscript{9}

\textsuperscript{6}Reaching the Fighting Gang., New York City Youth Board, 1960., p. 278.
\textsuperscript{8}Working with Teenage Gangs, The Welfare Council of New York City, 1950, pp. 131 - 133 and Chapter 12, p. 139.
It is further stated that, "...it would be most beneficial to orient them (detached workers) to the Boys Club operation as well as preparing them for detached work."\(^{10}\)

The rationale for the orientation program is generally clearly stated. The actual program (see appendix) would seem to cover most of the areas which workers involved in other programs stressed as being important.

Theoretically, the structure and planning had incorporated all the necessary areas except the following:

1. How, when and where to work with the families of the youths involved in the programs.
2. Practical ways to initiate community organization and development.
3. The extent and use of supervision.
4. The working relationships with existing organizations within the community and the extent to which they could be utilized.'

Before breaking down and categorizing the responses to the questionnaire given to the line workers, we must necessarily examine the stated criteria for staff selection. We are assuming that this significantly affects their performance in the field in the areas of skill, knowledge and competence.

From the 1966 report it stated, "Staff selection:

1. Recruitment was primarily voluntary. (The line workers received no salary)
2. Local clubs were seen as providing indigenous leaders. (two out of seven of the workers had been previously involved in Boys' Club Work)
3. Personality selection included:
   a. An ability to relate to youths.
   b. A willingness to work in unstructured setting.

\(^{10}\text{Ibid.}, p. 6.\)
c. Experience with working with youth considered essential.

d. A commitment of not less than two evenings a week.\textsuperscript{11}

We note here that sections b, c, d, are relatively easy to determine but a, tests such areas as motivation, security and many other variables not readily available by standard observation techniques.\textsuperscript{12}

The questionnaire administered to the line workers was the same one used by the Boys Club in their orientation program, with ten additional questions to cover areas which the research team wished to correlate with similar questions on the Agency Administrators' questionnaire. (See Appendix D for copy of Questionnaire.)

Our reason behind using the same questionnaire as the Boys Club is that they had used it extensively during their orientation program, and had both pre-orientation and post-orientation questionnaire data available. We felt we should stay with the same tool, partly for the sake of consistency and partly to determine what reactions would be forthcoming from the workers five months after completing the program. Also, reactions to a field experience would provide us with three sets of data to analyze. (Note: The pre-test

\textsuperscript{11}ibid., 1966 Report, p. 7: Actual Staff Breakdown as follows:
1. Age range 19 - 29, one + 30
2. Sex 12 male, 4 female.
4. Educational background: Social work (4) Corrections (2) Recreation (4) Education (2) Undergrad (3).
5. Experience: Most had worked with adolescents; three had been detached workers. (Not stated for how long, where, in what program and in what capacity). One had no experience.

\textsuperscript{12}Organization Questionnaire; Page 64; Questions 15 - 19 give Ideal Staff Breakdown. (See Figure # III., p. 72) We note that no standardized tests were given during the worker selection or the "abilities Test" (Peterson & Inglis) in Explorations in Personality., H.A. Murray, Science Edition 62. p. 441.
of the orientation program administered to the workers intending to take part
in this program was given just prior to the beginning of it. The post-test
of the orientation program was administered immediately after completion of
the orientation program. Both of the above tests were given by the Director
of the Detached Work Program. The final test was administered individually by
one student researcher in February 1967.)

Another important area we wanted to test was the effect of the orien-
tation program on worker performance. Among the seven workers interviewed,
four had attended the complete orientation program and three had not. We hop-
ed to test areas of significant difference (if any) in knowledge, skill and
performance.

The questionnaire was administered by one of the research team to
maintain similarity in personal interview techniques. The respondents were
interviewed in the following settings. Three at the school of social work,
one at home, two in school libraries and one at work. All respondents answ-
ered the questionnaire; although, one individual felt that most of the quest-
ions were irrelevant. Also, most of the respondents felt questions 7(a) (b)
(c) on page two of the questionnaire to be personal and unrelated to any study.
(See Appendix D) A breakdown of the four worker responses to three administra-
tions of the same questionnaire, Designated A, B, C, D and of the responses
of three workers to one administration of the same questionnaire. Designated
1, 2, 3, follows:

PRE (Orientation)    POST (Orientation)    FINAL (Administered Feb. 1967
#1. If you were to start as a detached worker today, how do you think you
would do?

A. Good Good Good
B. Fair Poor Better
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRE (Orientation)</th>
<th>POST (Orientation)</th>
<th>FINAL (Administered Feb. 1967)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair-Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#2. What did you get out of the Orientation Program?

A. Understanding of youth.

Information and met the staff.

Couldn't say. Didn't know what it would consist of. Interesting and informative; made material meaningful. Oriented me to Detached work generally.

B. Understand youth

Learn about self and adolescents and group work.

Lot of interesting things. Not too useful to the actual program itself. Not well related to what to do when working with groups.

C. Expectations and a framework.

Information on roles and techniques.

Primarily insight into detached work. Aims and basic concepts. How do you approach a group. To learn and identify personal skills.

D. _______ 

More to be learned.

Methods of contact; use of resource people and material. How to apply assets constructively.

#3. What did you hope to accomplish from your experience this summer?

A. Increase skill to work with youth.

Improve effectiveness.

Most important thing is to build relationship with the group.

B. Learning experience.

Insight into self, adolescents.

Experience: (a) with teens, (b) with detached work, (c) of a personal nature.

C. Realize self-potential fully.

To see if can work successfully with a group of youths.

Any real ability to work with teens. Not too concerned with group work as such. If could relate, would get caught up in their problem. Self assurance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRE (Orientation)</th>
<th>POST (Orientation)</th>
<th>FINAL (Administered Feb. 1967)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D. Satisfaction of helping and the knowledge gained.</td>
<td>To reach out and mobilize a group.</td>
<td>Learned a lot. Personality change in self. Double standard hard to compromise. There is inconsistency in counseling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. __________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>Learned how to relate to kids. See them in their own environment. Developed a perception of what the problems were. A respect for the approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. __________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>A basic skill in doing detached work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. __________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>Closer contact with adolescent. How I would fare in a non-structured approach. To see if I could be a detached worker.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#4. What did you accomplish with a group (or individuals) in detached work this summer?

A. Prepare youth to seek help. Guide or advise towards constructive outcomes. Confidence to meet the group. Build a relationship with the members. Didn't understand the behaviour problems. Did better on the one to one basis. Attempted to use group dynamics (no example). Didn't deter delinquency or school drop-out. Agency policy not adequately explained. (e.g. workers were told to get involved with the families only at the end of the project.) Overall policy of program not well enough interpreted. Good supervision.

B. Attitude change and constructive habits of living. Some movement towards constructive goals. In isolated individual cases understood the behaviour. Did use the group process for limit-setting. This took a long time to develop. Used subtle structure and control. Wasn't with the group long enough to deter delinquency or drop-out. Only got to where we could begin to work with them. Agency didn't make its purpose clear.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRE (Orientation)</th>
<th>POST (Orientation)</th>
<th>FINAL (Administered Feb. 1967)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. Instill self-responsibility</td>
<td>Help the group make decisions.</td>
<td>Understood behaviour and was consciously aware of the group dynamics. Used limit setting. No deterrence of delinquency or school drop-out, never really tried to accomplish that. Knew Agency policy O.K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Understanding.</td>
<td>Help mobilize and find themselves.</td>
<td>To mobilize the group. Used resources within and without the community. The Boys Club and Alex House for dances and team sports. Understood group behaviour, but not on an individual basis. Group process: Yes and No. Slightly deterred delinquency. Understood Agency policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Understood the group as a whole. Learned how to deal with the police and the playground staff. Used buildings and facilities. Understood behaviour problems and utilized group dynamics by changing the group composition. Acted in role of counsellor to members who began to open up by the end of the group meetings. Limited deterrence, but gave vocational guidance. Aware of Agency policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Understood behaviour and used knowledge of pre-delinquent and acting-out behaviour. Didn't deter delinquency or drop-out, as three or four members charged with NSF cheque-passing while in the group. As long as the worker there, the group kept out of trouble. Agency policy not understood because did not attend the orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Co-ordinated efforts to plan activities. Worker with individuals on their problems and understood behaviour on an individual basis. Attempted group techniques in a minimal way. Didn't deter delinquency or drop-out. Understood agency policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PRE (Orientation)

**#5. What did you contribute to detached work?**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Uncertain; perhaps self.</td>
<td>What skill I have, self.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Convey a positive value system.</td>
<td>Uncertain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Anything within my ability.</td>
<td>Realize my self potential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Past personal experience.</td>
<td>As much as I can do.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POST (Orientation)

- Working with youth. Not that much to offer; basic principles. Channel behaviour towards positive outcomes.
- Noble idea. Felt young social workers disinterested in life. The gang crowd was also bored with living. Confusion began after the group was approached in that did not know exactly what to do, or offer.
- Never had any conception; just thought of self.
- Use my past experiences. Have been in an institution and could teach youth the communities accepted behaviour patterns and show the consequences of delinquent behaviour.
- Help kids get through ages and stages and a personal experience.
- My own time was most valuable thing from the kids point of view.
- No response.

### FINAL (Administered Feb. 1967)

1. Working with youth, Not that much to offer; basic principles. Channel behaviour towards positive outcomes.
2. Noble idea. Felt young social workers disinterested in life. The gang crowd was also bored with living. Confusion began after the group was approached in that did not know exactly what to do, or offer.
3. Never had any conception; just thought of self.
4. Use my past experiences. Have been in an institution and could teach youth the communities accepted behaviour patterns and show the consequences of delinquent behaviour.
5. Help kids get through ages and stages and a personal experience.
6. My own time was most valuable thing from the kids point of view.
7. No response.

### #6. From the schedule re-rate each session in descending order of importance to you. (See p. 2, questionnaire in appendix D)

In the breakdown of question six, we are assuming that the pre- and post-orientation test data is not accurate as the result of non-controlled administration. However, in the final questionnaire administration, the de-

---

13From the subjective interviews with each worker, we were informed by them that they were not overly careful when they completed the pre- and post-orientation questionnaires. Some used random selection; some did not pay too much attention to the questions; and some were hostile to any form of questionnaire administration; and this reduced the accuracy and objectivity of their rating schedules. The questionnaires were also administered as a group; thus the factors of collaboration and influence relationships reduced the accuracy and reliability of the rating.
gree of accuracy is increased as each question was verbally put to the respondent in a one to one interview setting. In spite of this, some of the choices were obviously random after the first and last three were selected. From the analysis of this question, we wish to determine the following:

1. The rated order of importance of each question over the three responses. From this we hope to determine the consistency of the worker in his responses; the amount of change induced in the worker between each administration of the test; and the significant difference, should this occur.

2. We have worked out a prediction table for each question, and we will examine the responses to determine which areas of the orientation program should be stressed for future training because of their weighted importance.

Statistical Procedure

The three sets of data (i.e. the pre-post-orientation ratings and the final ratings) were plotted on a frequency polygon.

We then chose the post orientation graph and the final graph to determine $D$ and $D^2$ (if this was not available we chose the pre-orientation and the final and in one case the pre-and post-orientation data).

$\rho$, the rank-order correlation coefficient, was then calculated by applying the formula

\[ P = \frac{\sum D^2}{N (N^2 - 1)} \]

This showed us the extent of correlation between the related measures and in two cases was significant in that a negative $\rho$ (correlation) was indicated, showing a tendency for reversal between the two measures. The means of $D^2$ were calculated to give some indication as to the extent of change each worker showed in his responses to the two measures. A greater mean would indicate more change and more flexibility as the result of the integration of the field experience. (Refer to Chart #1, page 46)
The mean of each worker's response to each question on each test was calculated giving three means for every question as indicated by the three tests.

The means were then rated giving an indication of the trend each question had and these were plotted on Chart #2, page 47.

Chart #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detached Worker</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Rho</th>
<th>Test Sequence</th>
<th>Mean of $D^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>13 - 13</td>
<td>+ .242</td>
<td>Pre - Post</td>
<td>21.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>13 - 13</td>
<td>- .820</td>
<td>Post-Final</td>
<td>33.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>13 - 13</td>
<td>+ .305</td>
<td>Pre-Final</td>
<td>19.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>13 - 13</td>
<td>- .780</td>
<td>Post-Final</td>
<td>34.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both workers B. and D. show a significant rho, indicating that their responses to the final test were tending towards the exact opposite to the post-orientation test. We assume from this that two worker's experience in the field during the summer of 1966, plus their unique personality factors (not tested), and their indicated degree of flexibility (shown by the means of $D^2$), shows that they might have been more committed to the project and were probably more effective as detached workers. This assumption needs to be tested more thoroughly using larger samples. We can, however, state that for future staffing of detached work programs, that the following points might be considered:

1. Workers should be selected who indicate a high degree of commitment to the project.

2. The orientation program seems to have little effect on the worker's performance and it would seem that a guided field experience would be more valuable.
3. If an orientation program is to be given the trends on the pre-, post- and final tests would indicate that the following areas should be stressed:

Questions 2, 3, 8, 10 should be stressed and emphasized.

Questions 12, 11, 7, 6, 5, were rated low and could perhaps be combined into one lecture.

Questions 13, 9, 4, 1, stayed even.

Chart #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Predicted</th>
<th>Direction Predicted</th>
<th>Direction Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>←</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>←</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>←</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>←</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions 7 (a), (b), and (c) were generally felt to be inconsequential, personal and not acceptable. Most of the workers felt this in some
way was construed for the Boys Club Staff and not for their own personal benefit. On the whole, most workers stated that they had good relations with the Boys Club Staff; although, there was some conflict among them at times as to where the program was going.

Questions 11 - 20 were asked because we wanted to determine to what extent "community organization" and "community development" ideas were understood and employed in the light of "systems theory" for social change. Also, we wished to see how closely the Vancouver detached workers compared to those of other major urban centers around such questions as: (a) What are the advantages of being single when one is a detached worker? (b) Perceptions of role and client population.

#11. Are you married or single? Did you feel this affected your work as a detached worker?

A. Single. The hours and time spent with the group affect one's personal life. There would be more demands on a family man.

B. Married. There needs to be a balance, and maturity is helpful. The time-span of an older person to the youth is hard for mutual understanding.

C. Single. No effect.

D. Single. The detached work job should be full-time, not part-time. One should have commitment and accept responsibility for the group task. This point was not stressed enough in the orientation program. People worried about too many things outside the project.

1. Single. The time element would be too demanding for a married person.

2. Single. One is free to do things without other responsibilities; however, a married person might do the same.

#12. How long were you involved in the project?

All responses indicated that all workers had been involved in the project from May - September 1966.

#13. Do you see the Staff at the Boys Club capable of doing detached work?

A. Capable, yes, but there was some opposition to the program within the clubs, and no specific reason was given why the program started.

B. Capable, given time.

C. Capable, but most of them didn't have the interest, and there was too much "pubbing" and not enough planning. Staff felt coerced because the directors of clubs forced the program on them, and this caused a lot of antagonistic feelings.

D. The people, yes; but not with regards to the time involved. One shouldn't have two jobs.

1. Both good and bad. There was a conflict over being traditionally building based. The Boys Club philosophy is O.K. and they have a good administration to work with kids.

2. Some, very few. Most did not have enough time and there was too much conflict between themselves. The orientation of recreation is different from social work and the former would give up easily on problems. The groups had to prove themselves to the staff.

3. Yes and no. It depended on the individuals.

#14. In what way could the program administration be improved?

A. By laying down a strict policy, maintaining this, and following through with more direction to the staff.

B. Project time too short. Lines of communication between administration and what was expected from the workers was not too clear. No one really knew what was expected.

C. More inner direction needed. Workers sometimes hesitant at expressing
their views. Program director often too directive.

D. The administration set up the program the right way theoretically, but practically it didn't work out. Team and individual meetings too time consuming and too much T-Group emphasis. Workers too involved and worried about themselves rather than with the kids. Administration dealt with the problems of the worker O.K. (e.g. Supervision), but not with the problems of the groups' inadequacy.

1. More supervision both group and individual. We only met once for supervision all summer. Need full-time workers.

2. Poor co-ordination between the teams; staff meetings were a total flop. No problems were solved in supervision and there was trouble getting it. If didn't attend orientation program, no agency policy was given to the worker.

3. Supervision was adequate both in the team and the individual session. Little more co-ordination needed. More interpretation of worker's role from the administration. More communication with other Agencies.

#15. Do you think the Detached Work Program should be expanded or more research developed to examine what is presently being done?

A. More research to see if there is a real need for a detached work program before anything is expanded.

B. Joint. I approve of the method, but there should be research into its practical application.

C. Yes to both.

D. More research. The program should be expanded, but we need to look into the screening process, the need for volunteers and the levels of commitment with regards to the workers.

1. Both.

2. Should be expanded and more research. The groups could go a long way with
more time if they were picked up earlier. Also, the groups fell apart when we left. We need more money and resources.

3. The program should be expanded.

#16. What does Community Development and Community Organization mean to you from a Detached worker's standpoint?

A. The terms are new to me. Community Organization is self-organization through lay efforts. Community Development is professional guidance for the community.

B. Building within a small community; development of human and physical resources to meet a need. Expand organizations and open lines of communication.

C. Community doesn't realize it has a problem. No one in the community is willing to take the initiative to start any programs.

D. To recognize the community as an entity. Help the community recognize the group and vice-versa. Community turns its back on the group, but it should know why, and what the groups are doing. The group doesn't understand why the community is this way.

1. To get the community to look at the kids and then do something about it. Enable the community to pull its resources together. (e.g. Meetings being held at parents' home instead of the park).

2. To develop the resources in an area.

3. More facilities for adolescent groups. To organize the parents and get them interested. Need more time.

#17. Did you employ any of these concepts in your practice last summer? Give examples:

A. Didn't employ any of these concepts. Some of the administrators may have worked with some of the adults in the community.

B. None of these ideas employed. One needs at least a year in the field.
C. No utilization of the concepts. Felt the need, but no time to do anything. Concentrated on the group. As a part time worker, I was not prepared to spend four nights a week doing detached work.

D. Not really.
1. No.
2. Generally no.
3. No time to do this.

#18. Were they successful?

From the above responses to question 17 no information was available to complete this question.

#19. What do you think of the idea of a Metropolitan Teen Committee?
A. Don't know anything about it.
B. Good idea basically.
C. Haven't heard much about it.
D. No knowledge. If it means Kiview Boys Centre; theoretically, it is a good idea; but practically, it stinks! There is a lack of trained building-supervisors.
1. Planning for kids is not a good idea. Should involve the teens themselves.
2. Heard nothing about it. If Kiview, the idea stinks and won't meet with any success.
3. A good idea.

#20. What in your opinion is an Unreached Youth?
A. Someone not involved in the community, mainly because they are not exposed to it.
B. An alienated person who doesn't know what to do with self. Probably a nuisance to the community and always trying to do things which irritate the community. They have the image of "bad" kids.
C. Primarily, one who isn't free to talk to someone else openly and honestly with no judgement involved.

D. A youth who hasn't really had a chance to see the consequences of some of his delinquent activity. Hasn't had the community introduced to him on a constructive rather than destructive level. Poor self-image. A teenage gang at the incubator level.

1. A kid unable to utilize the resources available to him. A delinquent, or pre-delinquent with alcohol problems, poor family background, promiscuity, poor self-image, sense of nothingness and hedonistic.

2. There are not the resources of development of self, his family or his community. People who have nothing going for them.

3. Pre-delinquents. Those who have had no contact with social agencies. Kids who have never been reached emotionally.

As stated before, section three will examine the foregoing responses to the structure questionnaire in relation to the goals stated in the 1966 report on detached work, as they specifically apply to the "line-workers". (That is, Section II, 1 - 5, Section III, 1 - 3 and Section IV, 1 - 7, Appendix A)

We can assume that each worker did contact a group or groups during the summer of 1966 and spent some time with them. However, from the subjective responses in questions #17 and 18, (page 51) we can see that practically no work was done with the families of the youths involved, and only sporadic work with individuals on a problem-solving or advice-giving basis - especially from those workers whose main focus and training was in the area of social work. (See question 4, page 42. It should be noted that workers 1, 2, 3, have a social work background, workers A and D, primarily a Boys' Club and recreation focus and training, and B, and C, no specific training at all.)
This is understandable when one looks at the staff breakdown (page 39). None had any stated knowledge of working with groups per se, or dealing with problem families in a non-structured, non-agency approach. This applies especially to the Boys' Club Staff whose main focus and purpose is not ostensibly a family service agency, but is inclined to work with the boys from these problem families, with an emphasis on the leisure time approach (i.e. as opposed to "treatment").

Generally, the responses to the question: "What in your opinion is an Unreached Youth?" clearly indicates the worker's perceptions of the needs of the individuals and groups contacted. (See page 52). However, assessment of a need or a social problem without some adequate resource to alleviate the problem is not a great deal of help to the individuals concerned. Adequate diagnosis helps to identify the problem, but not always to solve it.

As little or no work was done with the families, and as the time span of the program was limited, other sources such as the Family Service Agency should have been relied on to help with the obvious needs of these families. The accomplishments in the way of meeting the expressed needs of the target population by the detached worker's intervention is not known. It can only be measured, in the case of a delinquent group, by reduced contacts with the Youth Preventive Squad and court contacts. (See figure #7, p. 80). In the case of a non-delinquent group, the aim is better social functioning (should a scale ever be devised to accurately measure this), less family stress, fewer problems with authority, and presumably, better school or work adjustment. (Note: Refer to Figure #7 and Delinquency Statistics, page 80)

We can categorically state that no program of two months duration, with generally inexperienced workers, on a part time basis, for no monetary returns, is likely to be tremendously effective; in many cases it is merely a
stop-gap measure for the worker to either gain experience, to improve his skills and techniques, or to provide him with insight and knowledge into a different area of work not previously experienced. (See question 3, pages 41 & 42).

No statistical data was gathered to determine conclusions for goals three and four; section II of the Summer Project - 1966 with regards to community organization and development. (Question 18, page 51).

The workers stated that they did not perform community organization or community development tasks. This might have been achieved by setting up a program of detached work within a framework of coded variables and realistic goals for the workers to achieve on a step by step basis, with some reality base.

Goal four has within it terms that do not readily lend themselves to analytic breakdown. No research instrument was devised to test the effectiveness of the worker's mobilization of those with whom he worked. We shall have to refer here to the teen-questionnaire and the statistics of the Youth Preventive Squad to give indications in this area. (Refer to Figure #7 re: Delinquency statistics, page 80). However, on the whole, workers did not feel that they deterred delinquency or school drop-out to any extent. They did, however, help the groups plan recreation activities. Generally, most of the workers were only at the beginning stages of group development in their work with the teens (i.e. group identification and cohesion) when the project terminated, and therefore, many of their initial expectations could not be fulfilled.

If one assumes that the use of group work techniques, such as: developing indigenous leadership, promoting democratic decision making within groups, the development of group discipline, limit setting, altering group status systems, integration of the group into the community, learning social
skills, corrective learning experiences and programming should be employed in detached work, it would take a completely separate study to determine the extent of application of these techniques and the results gained in the Vancouver project.

Question #4, pages 42 and 43, indicate that each worker consciously used group process and dynamics in working with their groups, especially in the areas of limit-setting and planning recreational activities. Three social workers out of the seven detached workers had a tendency to work with individuals and their problems more in the role of individual counsellor than with the group as a whole.

Three workers stated they did not understand agency policy in relation to their work with the groups, and four stated they did. This appears to have a limiting effect on worker performance and gives the worker a feeling of working in a vacuum. (Question #4, pages 42 and 43).

Two workers stated that they tried to integrate their group into the larger community in a limited way, mainly by using the neighbourhood agency facilities for recreation and dances. The Kiview Boys Club and Alexandra Neighbourhood House were the two agencies used. (Question #4, pp. 42 & 43)

With regards to Agency goal number five, trends would indicate from the questionnaire administered to the agencies that Neighbourhood Agencies are not involved with referrals from the detached workers. (Note: See Figure #1, page 70). Detached workers were involved with few referrals from agencies.

In relation to Agency goal III, sections 1, 2, 3, the workers responses in all cases would indicate that, although most of them were aware of what was meant by community organization and development on an intellectual level, none of these concepts were used in practice in the field. Most of the

---

workers concentrated all their time in working with the groups they had con-
tacted. (See questions 16, 17, & 18, pages 50 - 51). In general, one might
feel that any community organization or development initiated in such a short
time span with little preparation or planning is, in fact, an unrealistic
expectation for the worker to achieve.

The sponsoring agency should in future set down clear cut guide-
lines for the workers in these areas, stating how much a worker is expected
to accomplish during the programs' duration, and provide tools for them to
measure their effectiveness.

Agency goal number IV is analyzed in the breakdown of question 6
in the structured interview. (pages 10, 11, 12, and 13 (pages 46 - 47) and
five graphs. See Appendix )

Analysis of the worker's responses to questions 11 - 20 are as
follows: (These are not correlated with any particular goals but serve a
general information purpose.)

11. All workers but two felt it to be an advantage to be single because
of the demand of time and the irregular working hours demanded to
perform detached work. They also felt it allowed a freedom of per-
sonal movement without family obligations. Most felt the job should
be full-time.

12. Already answered on page 49.

13. All workers felt ambivalent about this question. They all felt some
dissention within the sponsoring agency in two or three areas:
   a. The problem of moving out of a building based program.
   b. The different orientations of social work and recreation
      caused some conflict of interest and approach.
   c. Not enough time to do the job well.
14. Responses broken down fell into the following patterns:
   a. Need for stricter policy definitions from sponsoring agency.
      Five yes, two no.
   b. More supervision. Three, yes.
   c. Too much supervision. Two yes.
   d. Poor co-ordination between the teams and a lack in overall communication. Four yes.

15. All but one felt that the program should be expanded with more research carried on jointly as the program progresses.

16. 17. 18. have already been discussed. (See page 53)

19. Generally all the workers were not clear on this question and gave varying answers. (See page 52).

20. The responses to this question are self-explanatory (See pages 52 & 53).

In conclusion we must say that the detached workers benefitted greatly from their field experience and this put many aspects of the program into perspective. However, most of them were not well enough prepared to perform detached work as it is visualized in Chicago or New York. (Bearing in mind that the presenting problems are quite different). The sponsoring agency on the other hand set down goals that were far too idealistic in relation to the limitations of the project, and often failed to come close to their expectations in worker performance. More work needs to be done to measure the worker's performance on the job, and an orientation and training program may be built around this research.
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF DATA REGARDING HYPOTHESES

General Reasoning behind Administering the Agency Questionnaire

1. To discuss the extent of the working knowledge that the Vancouver Agencies and Organizations have of the Detached Work project. (by working knowledge we mean: an understanding of the goals of the programme, the population to be served, the manner in which the Agency or Organization may be involved as a referral resource both in a give and take relationship, the benefits which the community might derive from the existence of such a programme as a demonstration project to indicate a more extensive involvement with the communities' youth. By Agencies or Organizations, we mean: schools, churches, social work agencies and other institutions, both social and otherwise.)

2. To determine the extent of involvement in the:

   a) founding and planning and implementation of the Detached Work Programme

   b) of ongoing consultation, evaluation and assessment of the D.W.P.

The questionnaire was administered to seventeen organization administrators (see page 61). The list was provided by the Director of Detailed Work Services and included all those organizations which had been contacted, or informed of the programme. It also included those organizations which had some contacts with the youths contacted by the detached workers. As well, some organizations had direct contact with the 29 youths questioned from the Prince Edward Park group (specifically) Tupper Secondary School, the Cambie Y.M.C.A., the Area Development Project, the Youth Prevention Squad).
QUESTIONNAIRE TO ORGANIZATION ADMINISTRATORS

The Questionnaire to Organization Administrators was developed before any hypotheses had been formed. It was used primarily as an information-seeking device that would hopefully produce some relevant material that would merit further consideration. Early in November, little other information or data was available to the students from the Boys' Club that would provide a substantial basis for the formulation of a more meaningful tool. Consequently, there are severe weaknesses evident throughout the questionnaire:

A. The areas selected for exploration were:

1) The organization's knowledge of interest in and involvement with the Department of Detached Work. The questions in this section by and large, were ambiguous and certain words used may have confused respondents, thus making the answers largely irrelevant. The questions were neither precise nor comprehensive enough to be meaningful. Although, the results obtained indicate that the communication patterns and education process with other organizations were not as complete and as far-reaching as was claimed, or attempted by the Boys' Clubs.

2) Ideas and attitudes towards present and future administration and financing of the Detached Work Program. This block of questions was more clearly stated, though the respondents did not appear knowledgeable enough to make competent, confident or reliable answers to the questions.

3) The area of "Delinquency Perceptions" left too many concepts unclearly defined to provide respondents with a more tangible decision-making base. Further, the number who knew about the program provided too small a sample group to be meaningful. And, their knowledge of the areas of inquiry is questionable.
based on several sample comparisons from sources such as Youth Preventive Squad figures on Police and Court contacts and responses of teens to the same questions.

4) The results of questions on "Staffing" went as expected though the question lacked clarity in its sub-divisions. The questions were not well-structured.

5) The area of "Referrals" proved a difficult area for the students in posing the questions, and for the respondents in answering, as they had no reliable data to quote from. The material did elicit some data that may be useful for those organizations interested in and concerned with inter-agency communication, coordination and use of services.

The data obtained from the questionnaire has been used wherever possible to compliment more meaningful data from the "Questionnaire to Unreached Youth".

It is acknowledged that this material is extremely unreliable and invalid, but it provides a perspective of what organization administrators perceived as the achievements of the Detached Work Program.

In administering the questionnaire, the three students agreed on methods of administration. Then, the list of agencies (See page 62) was divided amongst ourselves and administered individually. Inconsistencies would be the result of student variations in administration of the questionnaire.

List of Organizations Interviewed in Prince Edward Park Area

Boys' Clubs of Vancouver
Alexandra Neighbourhood Services Association
Children's Aid Society
Catholic Children's Aid Society
Family Service Association
Probation Branch
Tupper High School
Gladstone School
Youth Prevention Squad
Parks Board
Social Service Department (City)
Cambie-Y.M.C.A.
Area Development Project
Metropolitan Health
St. Patrick's High School
Cedar Cottage Neighbourhood House - D. Sleight
Grandview Community Centre

17 Organizations

THESIS: DETACHED WORK PROGRAM
BOYS' CLUBS OF VANCOUVER

NAME OF ORGANIZATION

POSITION OF INTERVIEWEE

QUESTIONNAIRE TO ORGANIZATIONS: You are requested to answer all questions as
fully, knowledgeably and factually as possible. If you do not know the answer or are unsure,
please state so but give a reason if this is possible. If you do not understand the question,
or you feel it is unclearly stated, please state so and ask for clarification. The results
depend upon your complete and unbiased responses. Your participation is greatly
appreciated.

1. DOES YOUR WHOLE ORGANIZATION HAVE KNOWLEDGE OF THE DETACHED
   WORK PROGRAM OF THE BOYS' CLUBS OF VANCOUVER? Yes 44
   No 44
   Don't Know 12
2. DID YOU RECEIVE ANY INFORMATION IN THE FORM OF WRITTEN REPORTS, TALKS, OR PERSONAL CONTACTS ABOUT THE DETACHED WORK PROGRAM?  
   Yes 75  
   No 13  
   Don't Know 12  

3. WAS YOUR ORGANIZATION CONSULTED PRIOR TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A DETACHED WORK PROGRAM SPONSORED BY THE BOYS' CLUBS OF VANCOUVER?  
   Yes 31  
   No 56  
   Don't Know 13  

4. IS YOUR ORGANIZATION REPRESENTED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF THE DETACHED WORK PROGRAM?  
   Yes 56  
   No 38  
   Don't Know 6  

5. DID YOU KNOW THAT SUCH A COMMITTEE EXISTED?  
   Yes 63  
   No 31  
   Don't Know 6  

6. SHOULD THE BOYS' CLUBS OF VANCOUVER BE CONDUCTING THE DETACHED WORK PROGRAM?  
   Yes 75  
   No 0  
   Don't Know 25  

7. IF NO, DO YOU THINK THE PROGRAM IS UNNECESSARY?  
   Yes 6  
   No 0  
   Other 94  

8. WOULD YOU PREFER A DIFFERENT VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATION TO ADMINISTER THE PROGRAMME?  
   Yes 0  
   No 50  
   Don't Know 50  

9. WOULD YOU PREFER A PUBLIC ORGANIZATION TO ADMINISTER THE PROGRAM?  
   Yes 13  
   No 63  
   Don't Know 24
10. Would you prefer a combination of voluntary organizations to administer the program?  
Yes ___38___  
No ___25___  
Don't Know ___37___

11. Would you prefer both public and voluntary organizations to administer the program?  
Yes ___38___  
No ___50___  
Don't Know ___12___

12. Should the detached work program be financed by public monies?  
Yes ___44___  
No ___25___  
Don't Know ___31___

13. Should the detached work program be financed by private monies?  
Yes ___38___  
No ___25___  
Don't Know ___37___

14. Should the detached work program be financed by a combination of public and private monies?  
Yes ___69___  
No ___13___  
Don't Know ___18___

15. Ideally, who would you select as line workers to staff the detached work program?  
Professionally trained social workers?  
Yes ___81___  
No ___6___  
Don't Know ___13___

Another professionally trained person?  
Yes ___56___  
No ___0___  
Don't Know ___44___

16. Indigenous leaders from the community?  
Yes ___38___  
No ___19___  
Don't Know ___44___
17. VOLUNTEERS?

18. ANY COMBINATION OF ABOVE?

19. WHAT WOULD YOU CONSIDER TO BE THE MOST APPROPRIATE AIMS OF A DETACHED WORK PROGRAM?

A. DELINQUENCY CONTROL?

B. DELINQUENCY PREVENTION?

C. DELINQUENCY TREATMENT?

OTHER?

20. DO YOU THINK THE DETACHED WORK PROGRAM SHOULD BE EXPANDED IN VANCOUVER?

21. IN YOUR OPINION, HAS THE DETACHED WORK PROGRAM BEEN SUCCESSFUL IN DETERRING DELINQUENCY?

22. REDUCING DELINQUENCY?
23. IMPROVING THE ATTITUDE OF TEENS TOWARDS AUTHORITY?

Yes 36
No 0
Don't Know 64

24. REDUCING FAMILY CONFLICT OF INVOLVED TEENS?

Yes 19
No 13
Don't Know 68

25. REDUCING NEIGHBOURHOOD CONFLICT OF INVOLVED TEENS?

Yes 50
No 0
Don't Know 50

26. INTERESTING TEENS IN PARTICIPATING IN OTHER ORGANIZATIONAL ACTIVITIES?

Yes 56
No 0
Don't Know 44

27. IS YOUR ORGANIZATION CAPABLE OF HANDLING REFERRALS FROM THE DETACHED WORK PROGRAM?

Yes 56
No 13
Don't Know 31

28. DOES YOUR AGENCY WANT REFERRALS FROM THE DETACHED WORK PROGRAM?

Yes 50
No 25
Don't Know 25

29. DOES THE DETACHED WORK PROGRAM WANT REFERRALS FROM YOUR ORGANIZATION?

Yes 36
No 0
Don't Know 64

30. IS THE DETACHED WORK PROGRAM CAPABLE OF HANDLING REFERRALS FROM YOUR ORGANIZATION?

Yes 44
No 13
Don't Know 43
31. IS YOUR ORGANIZATION PRESENTLY INVOLVED WITH REFERRALS FROM THE DETACHED WORK PROGRAM? 

Yes 6
No 75
Don't Know 19

32. IF YES, WOULD YOU ESTIMATE THE NUMBER OF REFERRALS TO BE LESS THAN FIVE (5)?

Yes 13
No 13
Don't Know 74

33. DOES REFERRAL FROM THE D.W.P. TAKE THE FORM OF YOUR AGENCY PROVIDING THE SERVICES OF A PROFESSIONAL WORKER?

Yes 19
No 38
Don't Know 43

34. DOES REFERRAL TAKE THE FORM OF PROVIDING THE SERVICES OF A VOLUNTEER WORKER?

Yes 13
No 44
Don't Know 43

35. IS THE DETACHED WORK PROGRAMME PRESENTLY INVOLVED WITH REFERRALS FROM YOUR ORGANIZATION?

Yes 19
No 50
Don't Know 31

36. IF YES, WOULD YOU ESTIMATE THE NUMBER OF REFERRALS TO BE LESS THAN FIVE (5)?

Yes 6
No 31
Don't Know 63

37. DOES REFERRAL FROM YOUR ORGANIZATION TAKE THE FORM OF THE D.W.P. PROVIDING THE SERVICES OF A PROFESSIONAL WORKER?

Yes 25
No 19
Don't Know 56
38. Does referral from your organization take the form of the D.W.P. providing the services of a volunteer worker?  

Yes: 19
No: 25
Don't Know: 56

39. Does Vancouver need a representative metropolitan committee to assess the need for, extent, success and value of adolescent programmes?  

Yes: 69
No: 19
Don't Know: 12

40. Would your organization like to know more about the detached work programme?  

Yes: 63
No: 25
Don't Know: 12

41. Could your organization take a more active role in the detached work programme?  

Yes: 50
No: 6
Don't Know: 44

42. Could your organization take a more active role in the detached work programme by providing the services of a professional worker(s)?  

Yes: 19
No: 63
Don't Know: 18

43. By providing the services of a volunteer worker(s)?  

Yes: 25
No: 50
Don't Know: 25

44. By providing the use of facilities?  

Yes: 50
No: 38
Don't Know: 12

45. By providing financial aid?  

Yes: 13
No: 69
Don't Know: 28
Because of ambiguous wording and poor formulation, questions one to five were relatively useless. From the questions, there is an indication that a great deal of effort to interpret the Detached Work Programme to their respective organizations did not occur as evidenced by the 56% negative response to questions. If 75% of the respondents received information on the programme, of the total interviewed, 31% did not interpret the programme to their charges for some reason or another. This figure directly correlates with the "no" responses to question 5. Whether this is significant is difficult to say.

The correlations, given in number of organization responses, were included without comment for three main reasons:-

A. The ambiguous wording of many of the questions.

B. The lack of knowledge of the students to provide accurate interpretations to the meaning of the responses.

C. The overall poor structure of the research tool.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
<th>Yes-Yes</th>
<th>No-No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 and 4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 and 4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 and 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 and 12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 and 13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 and 14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 and 12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 and 13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 and 14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 and 12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 and 13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 and 14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 and 12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 and 13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 and 14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 and 28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 and 29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 and 30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 and 31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 and 32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 and 33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 and 48</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 and 49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 and 49</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure #1 indicates that Agencies in the area where Detached Work was practiced are capable of handling referrals; but either through poor public relations and communication, or a general lack of co-operation and involvement in the programme, only received a small percentage of the cases dealt with by the Detached Worker. No reason is given in the 1966 report to substantiate this, and we are also unaware of the services provided both by the Agencies and the Detached Work Programme with the cases actually handled in Figure #II.
SERVICES: FIGURE #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF. FROM ORGANIZATIONS</th>
<th>SERVICES BY D.W.P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOLUNTEER</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REFERRAL FROM D.W.P.</th>
<th>SERVICES BY AGENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOLUNTEER</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The large gap between stated capability and a willingness to provide service, and actual service rendered is indeed a comment on the provision of services for the client in the light of community agency power structures. There seems to be a lack of concern for new programmes and how they fit into existing service patterns and vice versa. (Figure II). The question can surely be raised: How is the Detached Worker expected to initiate community development and organization programmes when Agencies and Organizations in the area cannot co-operate and co-ordinate services? We must also consider the whole problem of service overlap and multiple service goals. We can see from Figure #IV that without planning, in the main, professional service could not be offered by neighbourhood agencies already probably heavily indebted in staff deployment; although, the four or five agencies that could offer volunteer services, and the eight or nine that could offer facilities should be incorporated to a greater extent in the Detached Work Programme should it continue.
### STAFFING: FIGURE #3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PREFERRED BY ADMINISTRATORS</th>
<th>ACTUAL D.W.P. STAFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES %</td>
<td>NO %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals From other Fields</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total staff on Detached Work Project 15

With regards to Chart #III, the percentage breakdown would indicate that social workers were rated heavily over all other staff in preferred staffing (81%) but in actual fact only consisted of 47.3% of the Boys' Club line staff. The reasons are fairly obvious. Social workers cannot and will not generally work overtime on a volunteer basis. The Detached Worker has a heavy responsibility and the job should require full-time staff. Why a large percentage of other professionals found the time and energy to work on the Detached Work Program as volunteers is at this time hard to speculate, and any number of views could be put forward. We would have to examine such areas as motivation and commitment to answer this accurately. We can state that the program's short duration, uneven hours of work, newness of approach and non-building-based philosophy might have been significant factors.
COULD YOUR ORGANIZATION TAKE A MORE ACTIVE ROLE IN D.W.P.?

FIGURE #IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50 %</td>
<td>6 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To Provide:</th>
<th>YES %</th>
<th>NO %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service of Professional</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service of Volunteer</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Facilities</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again from Figure #III, more use should be made of indigenous and volunteer workers and this would be supported heavily from the literature on Detached Work.

The conclusions are as follows:-

1. Communication between organizations is weak (25% of the organizations contacted were not informed of the programme).

2. Communication within organizations is selective (31% of the organizations contacted had information on the Detached Work Programme but did not pass it on).

3. Of the organizations knowing of the programme, 100% saw the Boys' Clubs continuing with the programme.

4. The question of referrals, which ties in with communication is evidenced in Figures #I and II (pages 75 & 76). Greater inter-organization communication and information sharing is required to develop the interplay beneficial to those members of the community who make use of "services" offered by both groups.
QUESTIONNAIRE TO UNREACHED YOUTH

The development of the Questionnaire to Unreached Youth occurred under more favourable conditions. More information was available, if not data. Hypotheses had been roughly developed from a base of assumptions, but the students' inexperience showed here. The hypotheses were and are not extremely well refined. As a result, in formulating the questionnaire, many irrelevant questions were asked - that is, questions that did not require asking. The relevant questions were fairly well-defined as well as the concepts used in them. Other questions could have been asked to solicit the types of information required to provide more meaningful data relating to the hypotheses. In addition, there was not sufficient time to explore all the areas where valid data might be derived.

Further, the questionnaire was not administered consistently or under ideal conditions. It was administered in two group settings. There was noise, cramped quarters, uncomfortable seats, no desks, etc. The most consistent factor throughout was the manner in which the students explained the meaning and content of the questionnaire. Each question was read, explained and the respondents answered. Then the student went on to the next question, and so on.

The youths contacted identified with a very loose grouping called "The Prince Edward Park Group". Prince Edward Park is a patch of grass situated at 23rd and John Street in South Vancouver that does not have regular recreation services during the summer. There were 29 respondents to the questionnaire of a possible 40 names provided by the Director of Detached Work Services. Eleven youths were not contacted for several reasons:-
a) moved away (3);
b) living elsewhere in the city (2);
c) incarcerated (3);
d) unable to contact (5).

This was one of seven groups "served" by Detached Workers during the Summer Project - 1966. The students had planned to contact two groups, but time did not permit this. To validate findings, a control group is essential. Time again did not permit this. Thus, statistical evidence is based on base figures provided by the respondents.

The honesty of the replies of the respondents is evidenced by the fact that 76% stated contacts with police, and this figure was borne out by statistics from the Youth Prevention Squad.
THESIS: DETACHED WORK PROGRAMME  
BOYS' CLUBS OF VANCOUVER  

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR REACHED "UNREACHED GROUPS"

YOU ARE ASKED TO READ, THEN ANSWER EACH QUESTION VERY CAREFULLY AND ACCURATELY. A SINCERE AND HONEST ANSWER IS REQUIRED, OR THE RESULTS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE WILL BE DISTORTED. WE APPRECIATE YOUR PARTICIPATION.

1. Name in Full (Last)________________________(First)________________________  (Please print)

2. Address:______________________________________________________________

3. Sex: Male 79  Female 21
4. Marital Status: Single 100  Married 0

5. Are you living with both your Natural Parents?  
   Yes (52)  No (45)  Other (3)

6. Are both your Natural Parents living together?  
   Yes (59)  No (38)  Don't Know (9)

7. Do you attend school?  
   Yes (62)  No (31)  Other (7)

8. What was the last grade you fully completed?  
   Grade 8 - (2)  9 - (7)  10, 11, 12 (20)

9. What programme were or are you taking?  
   Academic 4  General 22  Other 3

10. If you have not completed your Secondary School Education, do you plan to do so?  
    Yes (38)  No (17)  Don't Know (45)

11. Do you plan to continue your formal education beyond Secondary School at a University or similar institution?  
    Yes (40)  No (31)  Don't know (29)

12. If you are not in school, are you working full time, or at least nine months a year?  
    Yes (28)  No (48)  Other (24)

13. Do you have a Trade?  
    Yes (7)  No (69)  Not Applicable (24)

14. Are you prevented from full time employment because you do not have a trade and/or sufficient experience?  
    Yes (31)  No (41)  Not Applicable (28)
15. Are you not employed because you do not want a job and, therefore, are not looking for one?
   Yes (3) No (52) Not Applicable (45)

16. As a result of contact with the Detached Worker, have you decided to continue your education or training?
   Yes (10) no (79) Other (11)

17. Have you had any contact with the police as a discipline measure?
   Yes (76) No (24)

18. Have you been to Court on any kind of a charge other than for a parking or speeding ticket?
   Yes (45) No (55)

19. Do you drink alcoholic beverages?
   Yes ($83) No (17)

20. Have you ever drunk alcoholic beverages?
   Yes (93) No (7) Don't Know (0)

21. Do you take illicit drugs?
   Yes (3) No (97)

22. Have you ever taken illicit drugs?
   Yes (10) No (90)

23. What was the nature of the Activity?
   A. Athletic Activities 9
   B. Group Activities 10
   C. Hobbies
   D. Other 10

24. Did your involvement with your group's Detached Worker deter your delinquency?
   Yes (7) No (45) Don't Know (48) Not Applicable ( )

25. Did your involvement with your group's Detached Worker reduce delinquent behaviour?
   Yes (7) No (48) Don't Know ( ) Not Applicable (45)

26. Did your involvement with your group's Detached Worker prevent delinquent behaviour?
   Yes (10) No (45) Don't Know (45) Not Applicable ( )

27. Did your involvement with your group's Detached Worker improve your attitude towards authority?
   Yes (14) No (59) Don't Know (27) Not Applicable ( )

28. Did your involvement with your group's Detached Worker develop better relations with your family?
   Yes (7) No (59) Don't Know (34) Not Applicable ( )
29. Did your involvement with your group's Detached Worker reduce neighbourhood conflict?
   Yes (21)   No (34)   Don't Know (45)   Not Applicable ( )

30. Did your involvement with your group's Detached Worker help you develop interest that you spend sometime at each week?
   Yes (48)   No (38)   Don't Know (14)   Not Applicable ( )

31. Did your involvement with your group's Detached Worker interest you to participate in other organizational activities?
   Yes (34)   No (55)   Don't Know (11)   Not Applicable ( )

32. Do you consider your group a delinquent group?
   Yes (45)   No (38)   Don't Know (17)

33. Do you consider your group a problem group?
   Yes (38)   No (45)   Don't Know (17)

34. With the exception of dances, have you participated in programmes offered by:
   A. Boys Clubs?
      Yes (62)   No (21)   Other (17)
   B. YM/YWCA?
      Yes (21)   No (62)   Other (17)
   C. Community Centres?
      Yes (41)   No (45)   Other (14)
   D. Neighbourhood Houses?
      Yes (28)   No (59)   Other (13)

35. With the exception of dances, do you participate in programmes offered by:
   A. Boys Clubs?
      Yes (14)   No (62)   Other (24)
   B. YM/YWCA?
      Yes (0)   No (72)   Other (28)
   C. Community Centres?
      Yes (14)   No (66)   Other (20)
   D. Neighbourhood Houses?
      Yes (17)   No (62)   Other (21)
TEEN QUESTIONNAIRE

Most of the youths worked with were attending school. Although a large percentage stated that they had completed Grade 9, most were registered in the general high school programme.

Of those who stated that they were working, only 7% stated that they had a trade certificate. (The nature of this certificate is also held in question.)

Generally, the Detached Worker did not significantly influence the target group to continue their education and only 38% indicated that they intended to do so.

In accordance with Hypothesis #3 (page 10), there seems to be a high correlation between incomplete high school education (i.e. Grade 10 completed), a broken home and Court and police contacts. This, however, should be tested with a larger sample group.

FIGURE V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attending School &amp; Grade Breakdown</th>
<th>Working Full Time</th>
<th>Did the Detached Worker Influence you to Continue Your Education?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr. 8, Gr. 9</td>
<td>Gr. 10, 11, 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Group 29
6 males selected who stated they were from broken homes.

Correlation between a broken home & delinquency & court contact
20.6% of total group had not completed Grade 10.
Of this sample all 6 boys had had police contact and 4 had had court contacts.
DELINQUENCY PERCEPTIONS: FIGURE #6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation of D.W.P. Re: Delinquency and Attitudes</th>
<th>Agency %</th>
<th>Teens %</th>
<th>Don't Know or Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deter Delinquency</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Delinquency</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevent Delinquency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve attitude towards authority</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop better relations with family</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce neighbourhood conflict</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help develop organized leisure time interests</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures from both questionnaires reveal "Perception Discrepancies" as to the impact and accomplishments of the Boys' Clubs Detached Work Program. It may even be forwarded that the Teens may be more accurate and honest than the "Authorities", that is, organization administrators.
### Prince Edward Park Group - 29 Youths Interviewed (24 under 18; 5 over 18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delinquent to D. W. P.</th>
<th>Offences Prior to D. W. P.</th>
<th>Offences After D. W. P.</th>
<th>Type of Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18/29</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nov. 64</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>May 64</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dec 64-Feb 66</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Feb. 65</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Oct. 65</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Feb-Dec. 65</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Feb. 65</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sep 64-Jan 66</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jan. 66</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Oct. 64</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aug. 64</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dec 62-Feb 65</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mar. 65</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Feb. 66</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Feb. 66</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>June 66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statistics from the Youth Preventive Squad completely substantiated Police and Court contacts reported by the Teens on the "Questionnaire For Reached "Unreached" Groups".
FIGURE #8

PERCENTAGE OF TEEN GROUP WHO HAVE BEEN INVOLVED IN DELINQUENT BEHAVIOUR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police Contacts</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Appearances</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drink Alcohol</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been Drunk</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take Illicit Drugs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have taken Illicit Drugs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship between Delinquency Rate &amp; broken homes</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results Regarding Delinquency Patterns

- Had more Contacts During and After Programme than Prior to it: 33.3%
- Had Contact During, Before and after: 44.4%
- Stayed Constant in Behaviour: 22.3%
- Behaviour Improved: 22.3%

Hypotheses One and Two were not substantiated by the data gathered from the Sample Group. For example, 33% of the Sample Group had contacts with police and Courts during, and after, contacts with the Detached Worker. But 22.3% who had prior contact with police and Courts, decreased their "delinquent" activities.

Hypothesis Three was substantiated. Of the Sample Group, 46% of the youths who had had police or Court contacts were from "broken homes".

Hypothesis Five as substantiated. Of the group of six youths who met the conditions, all six were from broken homes, had less than Grade 10 education and had police and/or Court contacts.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

If the thesis appears to be hypercritical of the Detached Work Programme of the Boys' Clubs of Vancouver, the development is a conscious one. The Boys' Clubs have shown they want and are able to accept valid and constructive criticism. Whether stated positively or not, the basic stand of the students includes the following assumptions:

A. As a programme and an approach assumed by an organization, the Detached Work Programme is reasonably valid.

B. As a means of contacting that portion of the population who are by-passed (and who by-pass) in regular organizational, leisure-time, building-centred situations, the service has been invaluable. It has revealed, without a doubt that a void exists in service patterns and that such an approach merits further consideration by other groups.

C. As a means of narrowing the gap between "alienated" youths and authority, and complimenting authority aims, the service is being recognized as invaluable.

D. As a concept in organizational decentralization, the impact is yet untested and untried on any large scale.

It is with these and related positives in mind that the thesis has been written - to provide an outside analysis of an organization's expansion pains. It is inevitable that mistakes occur in a process unique to this community.
The idea of the Detached Work Programme preventing the spread of Juvenile Delinquency is not borne out by our statistics.

The following factors might be instrumental in drawing this conclusion:

1) Inadequate research tools.
2) Short time-span of detached work programme.
3) Staff Turn-over.
4) On the basis of worker responses, the orientation programme "would seem to be insufficient in order to qualify the WNE-staff" to perform Detached Work effectively with target populations.

With regards to formulated hypotheses regarding police, Court contacts, broken homes, educational factors:

1) The duration of the presence of the Detached Worker seemed to be a significant variable in the extent of the impact on target populations. This was expressed by both the workers and the youths contacted.
2) Some research is required to explore the workers' personalities as a variable in detached work.
3) The lack of work with families seemed to create a communication void which negated the effective impact of the Detached Worker.
4) The time factor also prevented the worker from effecting any on-going communication patterns with existing community organization structures. If Spergel is accurate this process is vital in a "Balanced Approach" to effect the kinds of outcomes seen as vital and desirable to the
Vancouver situation.

5) We recognize the fact that in dealing with the teen populations, our own schedules were not conducive to setting up a valid and reliable research system that would adequately test our hypotheses. We should have had a control group matched with our Sample Group.

If the Boys' Club have the opportunity to build research into future Detached Work Programmes we would strongly recommend that this evaluative and analytical component be built in.

The Boys' Club throughout the inception of the Detached Work Programme have attempted to build in research tools and components into their activities.

However, internal research by the Boys' Club in this particular programme provided only descriptive material for analysis.

It is preferable in this situation to have statistical tools that are objective, reliable and valid and which can be verified and supported with facts.

The student's work has accomplished little from the standpoint of valid and reliable research methods. The data collected was not statistically formulated or sufficiently valid enough to accept or reject the hypotheses. However, enough questions are raised (from a positive and negative viewpoint where the service is concerned.) Thus, it is suggested that research in this area that forwards valid and reliable objective data would be essential in order to provide more than an opinion for the grounds of increasing or decreasing the expenditure of funds for such a programme. The aim is outcome of services and
and service-giving patterns rather than concentration on process and methodology, and the consequent assumption that the outcomes are "good" - that is, that delinquent acts are being reduced, deviant behaviour reduced, emotional and intellectual stability restored to those populations dealt with, etc.

With this in mind the following recommendations are made:

A. Objective researcher to test aims and outcomes using larger sample populations and over a greater time interval to evaluate both long and short term effects of the programme on target youth behaviour.

B. Internal re-evaluation with knowledgeable consultants to determine what effect the initiation of a Detached Work Programme has on the Boys' Club's internal structure and organization, and further what accountability does the agency provide to insure that the community has adequate communication regarding the programme plans and knowledge regarding the expenditure of both voluntary and tax-based monies.

C. Viewing material obtained in the thesis with the aim of considering the observations and their anticipated impact on the Detached Work Programme and the organization as a whole.
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APPENDIX A

BOYS' CLUBS OF VANCOUVER

REACHING FURTHER - MOBILIZING UNREACHED YOUTH

SUMMER PROJECT - 1966

STATEMENT OF GOALS

I. AGENCY GOALS:

(1) To develop a department of detached work in the Boys' Clubs of Vancouver.

(2) To work toward the involvement of other agencies in this Project, not only in an advisory capacity, but also in a direct service capacity.

(3) To provide services to "Unreached Youth".

(4) To build in research and documentation for the purpose of gaining more understanding of the nature of detached work and its value and application.

(5) To explore the possibility of the use of the Kiview Building as a teen-age centre.

(6) To develop an orientation and in-service training program to enhance the effectiveness of detached workers.

(7) To work toward the formation of a committee for teen-age program on a metropolitan basis.

II. GOALS OF THE DETACHED WORKER IN WORKING WITH INDIVIDUALS, GROUPS & FAMILIES:

(1) To locate and establish contact with unreached groups, individuals and their families.

(2) To assess the needs and interests of these individuals, groups and/or families.

(3) To implement a plan of action to meet these needs.

(4) To motivate and/or mobilize the internal and external resources for the self-realization and benefits of the individual, group and/or family.
(5) In areas where intensive help is indicated, to prepare the individual, group or family for referral to appropriate resources. (i.e., F.S.A., Children's Aid, Vancouver General Hospital, John Howard Society, etc.)

III. GOALS IN WORKING WITH THE COMMUNITY:

(1) To enhance the mobilization of resources in the community through the co-ordination and co-operation with/by other agencies.

(2) To initiate new programs in communities where the need is indicated.

(3) To work toward the involvement of local citizens in assuming responsibility for community concerns and developing self leadership.

ORIENTATION AND TRAINING GOALS

IV (A) ORIENTATION GOALS:

(1) To orient the workers to the project design and goals

(2) To inform the workers of the agency function, structure and lines of communication.

(3) To delineate the respective role functions of Staff.

(4) To develop an atmosphere of support, mutual respect and cohesiveness.

(5) To provide basic understanding of adolescent development and symptomology.

(6) To expose the workers to the role expectations, basic philosophy, use of relationships, stress and conflict, as well as methods of contact and "process" and "phases" in working with groups.

(7) To orient Staff to the value and use of recording procedures.

(B) TRAINING GOALS:

(1) To reinforce the support, preparation and cohesiveness of the workers.

(2) To provide for the integration and application of the content of the orientation program.

(3) To draw in resources for the further development of workers.

(4) To provide for the ventilation of feelings and emotions of the workers.

SUBMITTED BY: John Fleming.
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BOYS' CLUBS OF VANCOUVER

REACHING FURTHER - MOBILIZING UNREACHED YOUTH

SUMMER PROJECT, 1966

STATEMENT OF POLICY:

The following policies are set forth as guidelines for detached workers in carrying out their roles.

(1) The detached worker will identify himself/herself at all times as a staff member of the Boys' Clubs of Vancouver to groups, agencies and the community at large.

(2) While the worker may be in situations where a social behaviour may be exhibited, the worker will not condone this behaviour to take part in illegal activities.

(3) In working with individuals or groups, the detached worker will attempt to develop self-responsibility for their actions, programs and activities.

(4) The worker will seek the active participation and co-operation of law enforcement agencies, especially where the welfare and safety of the individual or other members of the community are in danger.

(5) In carrying out his responsibilities, the worker shall not consciously violate the law, or aid and abet anyone else in so doing.

(6) All records and recordings are to be kept in a central file and are not to be taken from the agency.

(7) It is our policy to share information with allied organizations where it is acceptable and beneficial to the individuals and groups served.

(8) The value of public relations for this program is recognized; however, it is our policy that publicity and public relations will be cleared with the Project Director and Staff with the understanding that the interest of individuals and groups served will be our foremost consideration.

(9) In working with individuals and groups, it is our policy to utilize the services and resources of the Boys' Clubs of Vancouver.

(10) It is our policy to seek out and utilize, wherever possible, the services and resources of other organizations, both public and voluntary.

SUBMITTED BY:

John Fleming.
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**BOYS' CLUBS OF VANCOUVER**

**REACHING FURTHER - MOBILIZING UNREACHED YOUTH**

**SUMMER PROJECT - 1966**

**ORIENTATION PROGRAMME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>May 2nd</th>
<th>May 4th</th>
<th>May 5th</th>
<th>May 9th</th>
<th>May 12th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction of Staff</strong></td>
<td><strong>Adolescent</strong></td>
<td><strong>Legal Aspects of</strong></td>
<td><strong>Working with Groups in Detached Work</strong></td>
<td><strong>Programme Training</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency Structure</strong> - B. Robinson</td>
<td><strong>Development</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Individual</strong></td>
<td><strong>- Roles of the Worker</strong></td>
<td><strong>- Role</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Design</strong> - B. Wilson</td>
<td><strong>and</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Group</strong></td>
<td><strong>- &quot;Process &amp; Phases&quot;</strong></td>
<td><strong>Playing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Goals</strong> - G. Strom</td>
<td><strong>Symptomology</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Worker and the Law</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>- Methods of Contact</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Goals</strong> - R. Kolbus</td>
<td><strong>Hugh Evans</strong></td>
<td><strong>Resource Person</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7:00-8:15</th>
<th>8:30-9:45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COFFEE BREAK</strong></td>
<td><strong>COFFEE BREAK</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic Philosophy &amp; Role Functions</strong> - J. Fleming</td>
<td><strong>Adolescent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policies</strong> - D. Bradshaw</td>
<td><strong>Use of stress &amp; Conflict (i.e. Police, Court, etc)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Symptomology</strong></td>
<td><strong>- Implications for our work</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources</strong></td>
<td><strong>Resource Person</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boys' Club Staff</strong></td>
<td><strong>- Roop Sebaran, Blair Wilson</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15 MINUTE SUMMARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>- RESEARCH ANALYSIS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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POST-TEST

ORIENTATION PROGRAM

B.

1. If you were to start as a detached worker to-day, how do you think you would do? (Circle one).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. What did you get out of the Orientation Program?

3. What did you hope to accomplish from your experience this summer?

4. What did you accomplish with a GROUP (or individuals) in detached work this summer?

1. Did you understand the behaviour problems in your group?

2. Did you use group process and dynamics to effect the groups behaviour?

3. Did you deter delinquency of school drop-out?
4. Did you understand Agency Policy?

5. What did you contribute to detached work?

6. From the Schedule, re-rate each session in descending order of importance to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Project Design, Research &amp; Goals</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Basic Philosophy &amp; Role Functions</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Adolescent Development &amp; Symptomology</td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Use of Stress and Conflict</td>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Use of Relationship, Counselling</td>
<td>10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Role Playing</td>
<td>11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Methods of Contact</td>
<td>12.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. (a) List the members of total staff you feel you know well.

8. ___________________________________________________________________

7. (b) Which members of the above do you feel would be of assistance if you needed it?

9. ___________________________________________________________________
7. (c) Which members of the above (7a) do you feel would not be of assistance if you needed it?


8. Are you married or single? Did you feel this affected your work as a Detached Worker?

9. How long were you involved in the project?

10. Do you see the Staff at the Boys' Club capable of doing Detached Work?

11. In what ways could the programme administration be improved?

12. Do you think the Detached Work programme should be expanded or more research developed to examine what is presently being done?

13. What does Community development and Community organization mean to you from a detached worker's standpoint?

14. Did you employ any of these concepts in your practice this last summer? Give examples.

15. Were they successful?

16. What do you think of the idea of a Metropolitan Teen Committee?

17. What in your opinion is an Unreached Youth?
DETACHED WORKERS NOT ATTENDING ORIENTATION PROGRAM

QUESTIONS

RATING

- #1
- #2
- #3

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 th