1

**PM-1 3½" x 4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT**

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file / Votre référence

Our file / Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

**STREET SURVIVAL TRAINING:
ASSESSING THE STREET SMARTS PROGRAM**

by

TIMOTHY T. SIMBOLI, M.A.

**A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the degree of**

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Psychology

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

May 16, 1995

©copyright

1995, Timothy T. Simboli

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-612-08854-5

Canada

11/10/2011 1. Sample 1

Dissertation Abstracts International is arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

1576

SUBJECT TERM

2	4	5	1
---	---	---	---

SUBJECT CODE

U·M·I

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS	
Architecture	0729
Art History	0377
Cinema	0900
Dance	0378
Fine Arts	0357
Information Science	0723
Journalism	0391
Library Science	0399
Mass Communications	0708
Music	0413
Speech Communication	0459
Theater	0445

EDUCATION	
General	0515
Administration	0514
Adult and Continuing	0516
Agricultural	0517
Art	0273
Bilingual and Multicultural	0282
Business	0688
Community College	0275
Curriculum and Instruction	0272
Early Childhood	0518
Elementary	0524
Finance	0277
Guidance and Counseling	0519
Health	0680
Higher	0745
History of	0520
Home Economics	0278
Industrial	0521
Language and Literature	0279
Mathematics	0280
Music	0522
Philosophy of	0998
Physical	0523

Psychology	0525
Reading	0535
Religious	0527
Sciences	0714
Secondary	0533
Social Sciences	0534
Sociology of	0340
Special	0529
Teacher Training	0530
Technology	0710
Tests and Measurements	0288
Vocational	0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS

Language	
General	0679
Ancient	0289
Linguistics	0290
Modern	0291
Literature	
General	0401
Classical	0294
Comparative	0295
Medieval	0297
Modern	0298
African	0316
American	0391
Asian	0305
Canadian (English)	0352
Canadian (French)	0355
English	0593
Germanic	0311
Latin American	0312
Middle Eastern	0315
Romance	0313
Slavic and East European	0314

**PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND
THEOLOGY**

Philosophy	0422
Religion	
General	0318
Biblical Studies	0321
Clergy	0319
History of	0320
Philosophy of	0322
Theology	0469

SOCIAL SCIENCES

American Studies	0323
Anthropology	
Archaeology	0324
Cultural	0326
Physical	0327
Business Administration	
General	0310
Accounting	0272
Banking	0770
Management	0454
Marketing	0338
Canadian Studies	0385
Economics	
General	0501
Agricultural	0503
Commerce-Business	0505
Finance	0508
History	0509
Labor	0510
Theory	0511
Folklore	0358
Geography	0366
Gerontology	0351
History	
General	0578

Ancient	0579
Medieval	0581
Modern	0582
Black	0328
African	0331
Asia, Australia and Oceania	0332
Canadian	0334
European	0335
Latin American	0336
Middle Eastern	0333
United States	0337
History of Science	0585
Law	0398
Political Science	
General	0615
International Law and Relations	0616
Public Administration	0617
Recreation	0814
Social Work	0452
Sociology	
General	0626
Criminology and Penology	0627
Demography	0938
Ethnic and Racial Studies	0631
Individual and Family Studies	0628
Industrial and Labor Relations	0629
Public and Social Welfare	0630
Social Structure and Development	0700
Theory and Methods	0344
Transportation	0709
Urban and Regional Planning	0999
Women's Studies	0453

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Agriculture	
General	0473
Agromony	0285
Animal Culture and Nutrition	0475
Animal Pathology	0476
Food Science and Technology	0359
Forestry and Wildlife	0478
Plant Culture	0479
Plant Pathology	0480
Plant Physiology	0817
Range Management	0777
Wood Technology	0746

Biology	
General	0306
Anatomy	0287
Biostatistics	0308
Botany	0309
Cell	0379
Ecology	0329
Entomology	0353
Genetics	0369
Limnology	0793
Microbiology	0410
Molecular	0307
Neuroscience	0317
Oceanography	0416
Physiology	0433
Radiation	0821
Veterinary Science	0778
Zoology	0472

EARTH SCIENCES
Biogeochemistry 0425
Geochemistry 0996

Geodesy	0370
Geology	0372
Geophysics	0373
Hydrology	0388
Mineralogy	0411
Paleobotany	0345
Paleocology	0426
Paleontology	0418
Paleozoology	0985
Palynology	0427
Physical Geography	0368
Physical Oceanography	0415

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Environmental Sciences	0768
Health Sciences	
General	0566
Audiology	0300
Chemotherapy	0992
Dentistry	0567
Education	0350
Hospital Management	0769
Human Development	0758
Immunology	0982
Medicine and Surgery	0564
Mental Health	0347
Nursing	0569
Nutrition	0570
Obstetrics and Gynecology	0380
Occupational Health and Therapy	0354
Ophthalmology	0381
Pathology	0571
Pharmacology	0419
Pharmacy	0572
Physical Therapy	0382
Public Health	0573
Radiology	0574
Recreation	0575

Speech Pathology	0460
Toxicology	0383
Home Economics	0386

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Pure Sciences	
Chemistry	
General	0485
Agricultural	0749
Analytical	0486
Biochemistry	0487
Inorganic	0488
Nuclear	0738
Organic	0490
Pharmaceutical	0491
Physical	0494
Polymer	0695
Radiation	0754
Mathematics	0405
Physics	
General	0605
Acoustics	0786
Astronomy and Astrophysics	0606
Atmospheric Science	0608
Atomic	0748
Electronics and Electricity	0607
Elementary Particles and High Energy	0798
Fluid and Plasma	0759
Molecular	0609
Nuclear	0610
Optics	0752
Radiation	0756
Solid State	0611
Statistics	0463
Applied Sciences	
Applied Mechanics	0346
Computer Science	0984

Engineering	
General	0537
Aerospace	0538
Agricultural	0539
Automotive	0540
Biomedical	0541
Chemical	0542
Civil	0543
Electronics and Electrical	0544
Heat and Thermodynamics	0348
Hydraulic	0545
Industrial	0546
Marine	0547
Materials Science	0794
Mechanical	0548
Metallurgy	0743
Mining	0551
Nuclear	0552
Packaging	0549
Petroleum	0765
Sanitary and Municipal	0554
System Science	0790
Geotechnology	0428
Operations Research	0796
Plastics Technology	0795
Textile Technology	0994

PSYCHOLOGY

General	0621
Behavioral	0384
Clinical	0622
Developmental	0620
Experimental	0623
Industrial	0624
Personality	0625
Physiological	0989
Psychobiology	0349
Psychometrics	0632
Social	0451

The undersigned hereby recommend to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
acceptance of the thesis,

"Street Survival Training:
Assessing the Street Smarts Program"

submitted by

TIMOTHY T. SIMBOLI, M.A.

in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Chair, Department of Psychology

Thesis Supervisor

External Examiner

Carleton University

August 30, 1995

Abstract

Street youth have always existed within urban centres. These are youth who live without adult care or supervision in unpredictable and dangerous environments. Little reliable information about these youth exists as research is very difficult and the results often inconclusive. Recently a more adequate picture of street youth has begun to emerge.

These youth leave their family homes for many different reasons but often because of conflict, abuse, and neglect at home. These problems are exacerbated by school and peers. Street youth present few identifying features. Males and females leave in relatively equal number and running can begin as early as eight. Service systems to meet the needs of street youth focus primarily on the basic necessities, food, shelter, and clothing. Some service systems provide crisis counselling, medical help and legal assistance. Few services have set out to maximize the preventive aspects of their work. Fewer still have evaluated or even documented their efforts.

The Street Smarts program was designed to meet the informational needs of street youth, capitalize on their strengths and emphasize developmental features. It is a series of 10 weekly workshops on a variety of highly relevant topics, lead by two experienced youth workers. Eight series were offered at three different venues. A total of 279 street youth participated in 68 individual workshops. Group size varied from 1 to 14 individuals, and attendance was inconsistent

although participation at the workshops was high.

A study was initiated to explore the lives of street youth and the impact of the Street Smarts program. Twenty-nine youth in the Street Smarts program agreed to participate in the study and comprised a street-treatment group (ST). A further 28 street youth who chose not to attend were recruited from street drop-in centres to be interviewed, these formed a street-comparison group (SC). Another 42 youth living in their familial homes were recruited from recreation centres and formed a home-comparison group (HC). Attrition was extremely high among the street youth, particularly the SC group.

A structured interview was developed to assess youth on personal attributes, basic knowledge, psychosocial competence, and hopelessness, as well as soliciting feedback from Street Smarts participants. Youth were paid an average of \$10 for each of three interviews conducted at two month intervals.

Results indicate that street youth represented a typical sample of street youth evident in the literature, with some limitations. Comparisons of street youth subjects with HC underscored the deficits faced by street youth in sense of well-being, resourcefulness, competence, environmental relations, school and running history. A comparison of SC and ST yielded few differences to explain the choice to participate. SC youth were more entrenched in streetlife and less connected to school. Improvement for ST youth on psychometric measures was found only in a decrease in number

of reported worries at four months. Participant satisfaction measures revealed more positive impressions and indicated that Street Smarts had been effective from their viewpoint.

The street environment was found to be unsafe, unseen, and unpredictable. Street youth reported both immediate and long term effects from their time on the street. Yet the majority of youth survive without long-term deficits. Those who possess attributes similar to those reported in the literature on resilient children tend to have the better chance for survival. These attributes were competence, problem solving abilities, autonomy and a sense of purpose. The literature suggests that these attributes can be augmented by environments outside the home that are properly protective. These are characterized by clear expectations, opportunities to participate and caring individuals, features found in the Street Smarts program.

Recommendations to improve the methodology consisted of shortening the interview, interviewing on the street and at sites accessed more reliably, employing single application designs, asking more direct subjective information, and increasing payment. In spite of these measures it is doubtful if a rigorous methodology is even possible with street youth.

Recommendations regarding Street Smarts were to maintain the group and leader format, continue to emphasize participation and learning, offer a thematic mini-series of workshops, and continue to provide food.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the many people in my life who helped make this endeavour possible. My deepest appreciation:

To the youth of Street Smarts. Believe in yourself, don't give up.

To my advisor, Dr. Mario Cappelli, whose encouragement and advice kept me focussed and progressing when I was lost or floundering.

To Dr. Kim Matheson, Dr. Tina Daniels, Dr. Tulio Caputo, and Dr. Ian Manion, for their input and comments into a difficult and adventurous project.

To Dr. William Jones whose support throughout my academic career has meant so much to me.

To Dr. Steve Feder who provided the initial spark for the Street Smarts program and contributed throughout.

To the volunteers, researchers, and professionals who worked long hours on this project; Charlotte Knight, Brian Evoy, Paul Lavigne, Pam Storey, Karen Hicks, Mara O'Brien, Bill Cameron, Tracey Bell and many others. I couldn't have done this without you.

To my friends who have shown an interest and belief in my pursuit, and who provided relief and laughter along the way.

To my parents, brother and sister, (over-achievers all) their perseverance and dedication provided me with the inspiration and determination to continue and provided the foundation for who I am.

To my two wonderful children, Andrew and Christine, whose love, playfulness, and wonder sustained me through many long hours and bring me new joys each day. Daddy's home!

Most importantly, to my wife Joan. Your patience, support and understanding persisted through a severe testing. Your love and the life we have are my safe place, my sanctuary. I dedicate this work to you.

Table of Contents

	Page
Acceptance Sheet	ii.
Abstract	iii.
Acknowledgements	vi.
Table of Contents	vii.
List of Tables	ix.
List of Appendixes	x.
 1. Introduction	 1
2. The Street Experience	4
a. Terminology	5
b. Running Away	8
c. Street Youth	15
d. Life on the Street	18
e. Street environments	23
f. The Effects of Living on the Street	25
g. Service Systems	27
h. Comparable Services	32
3. The Street Smarts Program	39
a. Overview	39
b. Fundamental Values	40
c. Format	42
d. Group Atmosphere	43
e. Leaders	44
f. Content	45
g. Evaluation Strategy	46
4. Method	50
a. Subjects	50
b. Procedures	58
c. Measures	60
d. Analysis	69
5. Results	75
a. Street Youth	77
b. Street - Home Comparisons	87
c. Participation, SC - ST Comparisons	88
d. Treatment Effects	93
I. Standardized Measures	93
i. Changes over time	93
ii. Comparisons at posttest & Follow-up	93
II. Satisfaction Measures	95
i. CSQ	95
ii. CSQ-st	102
iii. Unobtrusive Measures	104

6. Discussion	107
a. Street Youth	109
b. Street - Home Comparisons	123
c. Participation, SC - ST Comparisons	130
d. Treatment Effects	132
I. Standardized Measures	132
i. Changes over time	132
ii. Comparisons at posttest & Follow-up	134
II. Satisfaction Measures	136
i. CSQ & CSQ-st.....	136
ii. Unobtrusive Measures	139
7. Conclusions	145
8. References	162
7. Appendix	171

List of Tables

Table	Title	Page
1.	Mean age for participants by gender and group.	55
2.	Number of Participants by Group over Time.	56
3.	Comparisons of Subjects Continuing and those Dropping Out on Major Variables.	57
4.	Comparisons of Genders on Major Variable - t-tests.	78
5.	Comparisons of Genders on Major Variables.	79
6.	Correlations of Age with Major Variables.	80
7.	Comparisons of Street Youth with Youth at Home on Major Variables - t-tests.	89
8.	Comparisons of Street Youth with Youth at Home on Major Variables - Chi ² .	90
9.	Comparisons of Youth in ST Group with Youth in SC Group on Major Variables - t-tests.	91
10.	Comparisons of Youth in ST Group with Youth in SC Group on Major Variables - Chi ² .	92
11.	Pre - Post Comparisons for Youth in Street Smarts - Paired t-tests.	96
12.	Pre - Follow-up Comparisons for Youth in Street Smarts - Paired t-tests.	97
13.	Comparisons of Adjusted Mean Scores between Youth in the ST Group and Youth in the HC Group at Posttest.	98
14.	Comparisons of Adjusted Mean Scores between Youth in the ST Group and Youth in the HC Group at Follow-up.	99

List of Appendices

Appendix	Description	Page
A.1	Topic Menu	171
A.2	Sample Outlines	172
A.3	Session Log Outline	187
A.4	Consent Form	188
A.5	Personal Information Form (PIF)	191
A.6	Attitude and Perception Survey (APS)	192
A.7	Basic Information/Awareness Questionnaire (BIAQ)	199
A.8	Beck Hopelessness Scale (BHS)	201
A.9	Client Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ)	202
A.10	Client Satisfaction Questionnaire Short (CSQ-st)	205

**STREET SURVIVAL:
ASSESSING THE STREET SMARTS PROGRAM**

She calls out to the man on the street,
sir can you help me.
Its cold and I've nowhere to sleep,
is there somewhere you can tell me?
Oh, think twice,
its another day for you and me in paradise.
Collins, 1989

Introduction

Life on the streets has long been glamorized by the imaginations of authors and story-tellers. The popular medias of today have distorted our picture of the street and sensationalized the youth who are its inhabitants. However, in the past two decades a more realistic image has begun to emerge through research. The day to day reality of street life is that youth, vulnerable by their lack of maturity, destructive upbringing, or psychopathology, exist in a world that can alternate between boring and life-threatening. Some thrive in this environment, but for the vast majority the experience is negative and surviving is a most optimistic outcome (Reuler, 1991; Whitbeck & Simons, 1990; Yates, Pennbridge, Swofford & Mackenzie, 1991). Street youth may be playing, literally, in a world where the risks are terrific and the consequences real.

Adolescents move towards adulthood through a series of stages of disengagement from the child-parent relationship. For most this growth is natural and healthy, if somewhat disconcerting. But for some the experience is traumatic and stormy. For a multiplicity of reasons some youth will abruptly leave their parental or custodial home. Prematurely independent, these youth lack many of the basic necessities of life; proper nutrition, shelter, and clothing. But beyond these, street youth are also removed from experiences that are considered essential to proper growth and development at a key point in their lives (Young, Godfrey, Mathews & Adams, 1983). The challenge they face is to survive these experiences and proceed on to productive lives as capable, responsible adults. Many have been able to do so, and they speak of individuals, events and experiences that were crucial in enabling them to overcome their predicaments. Our response to these youth must permit them to halt the deterioration in their circumstances and allow them to draw from their own resiliency (Rutter, 1987).

In most urban centres there exists a service network that tries to address the needs of these youth, but the challenge is enormous and the resources scarce. Not surprisingly, it is the survival needs that are first addressed; shelter, clothing, food, and health care. But many of these youth are isolated, unprepared, preoccupied, and lacking judgement, while others are misinformed, and

exhibit mis-attributions and distortions of reality (Denoff, 1987; Hartmann, Burgess & McCormack, 1987). Often, little attention or energy is devoted to providing these youth with the information, skills, competence, and self-confidence necessary to survive on the street, to leave the street without further handicap, and to mature reasonably into adulthood. Some energies must be devoted to compensate for the fact that these youth are denied the experiences that can help them mature. Services are needed to provide them with basic living skills, basic education, constructive adult relationships, positive peer relationships, stability, self-worth, and a sense of belonging (Young et al., 1983). Such services must encourage participation by street youth, be positive, prospective, and constructive, and be conducted by caring and concerned individuals. It is with this purpose in mind that the program Street Smarts was developed. Street Smarts is a short term group experience lead by trusted adults designed to provide basic, relevant information to youth who are currently living life on the streets and allow these youth to regain a measure of control in their lives.

This thesis critically reviews the street experience in detail, documents the development of the Street Smarts program, and evaluates its efficacy. The Street Smarts program was offered to street youth and the impact of that experience on the participants assessed and compared to other youth not participating in the program.

Results provide valuable information on street youth in Ottawa-Carleton and elsewhere. Information will be presented to identify the street youth that participated in this study relative to other street youth and other samples. Outcomes derived from participation in the Street Smarts program will demonstrate important features for programs addressing the needs of street youth, as well as the impact of this particular approach. New and innovative ways to assess street youth were employed and will be presented.

The Street Experience

The concern for the sensationalism that has surrounded this topic can sometimes overshadow the serious nature or extent of the problem. Although there is a lack of documentation in existence before 1960 to allow comparisons of prevalence, the current situation has been widely described as critical. The evidence is abundant and conclusive. The estimated number of youth who run from their home in the United States range from 600,000 to 1,300,000 annually (Roberts, 1982; Wurzbacher, Evans & Moore, 1991; Yates, Mackenzie, Pennbridge & Cohen, 1988; Young et al., 1983). During the first six months of 1992, 972 youth under sixteen ran away from their homes in Ottawa (Community Task Force for Homeless/ Street Youth, 1992). One in eight youth will run from home before their eighteenth birthday (Young et al., 1983). Axthelm (1988) reported that more than 5,000

youth in the U.S. die unidentified and are buried in unmarked graves each year (cited in Kennedy, 1991).

The review that follows will present information on (a) terminology, (b) running away, (c) characteristics of street youth, (d) life on the streets, (e) street environments, (f) the effects of living on the street, (g) surviving the street, (h) service systems, and (i) comparable services.

Terminology

What label best describes the population under consideration? Various terms have been coined and used; runaways, homeless, gamins, vagrants, curbsiders, push-outs, absconders, indigents, street urchins, throw-aways, street youth, castaways, runners, in and outers. These terms relate to personal characteristics of runaways, situational factors of their lives, the process by which they left home, or theoretical bias. These labels are indicative of the variety of perspectives, opinions and theories held by researchers and writers. Such varied terminology also reflects a phenomena that is vast and varied, experienced by each youth in a unique and highly personal fashion. However, the terms homeless, runaway, and street youth are the more generic descriptors available. A common feature of these is that they apply to youth who are away from a stable, sanctioned residence, overnight.

Homelessness, as it applies to youth, has been defined by the U.S Department of Health and Human Services as "a

situation in which a youth has no place of shelter and is in need of services and shelter where he or she can receive help and care." (General Accounting Office, 1989, p. 12). However, homelessness has been used in several different contexts; it has also been used to describe those youth living in families that are without residence as a family. While this is a tragic and demanding situation, it does not carry the additional danger of being without adult supervision, nor does it involve a choice by the youth. A runaway situation is defined by the same body as one "in which a youth is absent from his or her home or place of legal residence at least overnight without permission" (p.13). While this definition does indicate the individual nature of running away, it does not represent the older youth, it does not include the youth that is ejected from the home, nor does it include those whose absence is simply ignored. Because of these limitations these two terms are often used in conjunction as complimentary adjectives, i.e. runaway and homeless youth. Yet these two terms still do not adequately represent the environment in which these youth live. The most salient aspects of the youth under consideration are the potentially damaging effects of their environment and related experiences.

The environment in which these youth exist is the inner city, a milieu best described by the term the streets. This term provides a vividly realistic image of conditions

characterized by an underworld of distrust, danger, and deceit. It also provides a universal descriptor, equally applicable to Third World and North American urban centres. UNICEF noted three categories of street youth; Candidates for the street, Children on the street and Children of the street (quoted in Williams, 1993). The first refers to the less common phenomena of children who work the streets (selling, panhandling, etc.) but live with their family and assist the family by their actions. The last two terms have particular relevance in the context of this study. Children on the street are those with inadequate or sporadic family support, while children of the street are those who function without family support. These two definitions indicate a graduated perfusion into street life. While it must be recognized that the depth of involvement and consequent individual needs do indeed vary, for our purposes the distinction of degree is less material than the simple fact that the street becomes the predominant milieu for these youth.

Street youth is a term that ties together the key concepts of rejecting the family home and running away, and is graphically descriptive of the resulting experience. Young et al. (1983) suggest that there are three essential aspects to the designation; age, absence of permission and length of absence. This is the basis for the term street youth used in this study. These are youth between ten and

twenty four years of age, currently sleeping in temporary, unpredictable or threatening situations, without sanctioned adult supervision. In a more simplistic fashion: the act of leaving the parental or custodial residence precipitously is called running, youth who run from their homes are runaways, they become homeless when they stay away, and they can be called street youth when the street becomes their home.

Running Away

There is an abundance of hypotheses to explain why youth leave their families. Early explanations focused on the youth themselves. Running was seen variously as an economic defection from the family or social class, deviance, an indication of psychopathology, delinquency, a sign of mental deficiency, or a childish act of rebellion (Gordon, 1979). Many of these theories hold that running is the result of the immaturity, weaknesses and problems of the child. However, other authors have recently suggested alternative perspectives.

More sophisticated explanations of running and other adolescent behaviour emerged as society came to understand the complexities of human behaviour in general, to appreciate the dilemma of adolescence in particular, and to listen to the youth themselves (Gordon, 1979; Johnson & Carter, 1980). Kurtz, Jarvis and Kurtz (1991) postulate five major categories of street youth based on the situational and intentional factors related to the run. These describe

the common aspects of running and include youth separated from homeless families, youth escaping abuse at home, youth ejected from the family, youth who leave custody settings, and youth who are illegal immigrants. However these labels are restricted primarily to the escape aspects of running. Other theories of running are based on an approach-avoidance dichotomy and characterize youth as either running from something distasteful and/or running to something attractive (Brennan, 1980).

Several authors have advanced constructive interpretations of the phenomena of running. These suggest that street youth may be more capable than they have been given credit for; in fact, they may be acting responsibly and making statements through their actions. Young et al. (1983) see several mechanisms at work. They suggest that youth leave (a) to solve their problems, (b) as an expression of independence, and (c) in reaction to or rejection of predominant values. For example, Kufeldt and Nimmo (1987) noted the same purposefulness among some youth in their sample, and coined the term in and outers to identify those runaways who "use the run as a temporary coping mechanism" (p. 537). Some authors take even more positive perspectives. Gordon (1979) noted the similarities between running away and the protest movements of the sixties and seventies, while Johnson and Carter (1980) saw running as the actions of today's radical children. Palenski

and Launer (1987) noted that the process of becoming a runaway was similar in effect to developing a career.

Common to the theories and observations noted above is the view that these youth, whether through their inadequacies or their strength, are solely culpable for the decision to leave. While there is an element of truth to that view (for the most part running is a conscious decision by the youth) it does not take sufficient account of environmental or systemic influences. Parents, siblings, school and peers effect the individual in profound ways. The youth's experience with their parents has been frequently identified as the principle reason why they chose to leave home. Several authors have identified youth that were literally or figuratively abandoned by their parents. The actions of these so-called throw-aways was either provoked or tolerated (Hier, Korbust & Schweitzer, 1990; Kurtz et al., 1991). This dynamic is difficult to assess, for while the parental attitude may provoke the run, it may also be a reaction to a deteriorating parent child relationship and likely has elements of both. A review by Adams and Munro (1979) reports 18 studies that found parent-child tensions of various sorts to be major factor in the youth's departure. While the role of the parents may be obvious, it must be remembered that much of this research is based on youth reports and often on their retrospective recollections and perspectives. Parent reports may, and do, supply a

different perspective describing the child as incorrigible, unmanageable, or even violent (Adam & Munro, 1979; Spillane-Grieco, 1984).

Even if one were to accept that the parents are key in the youth's decision to run there is sufficient reason to believe that there are other factors involved. Whitbeck and Simons (1990) have employed causal path analysis to examine the interplay between the individual, their peers, and familial factors. These authors found that, while abusive families provide a basic training for aggression, time on the streets with deviant peers increases the probability that adolescents will become involved in deviancy themselves and that they will be victimized. As a further example, Palenski and Launer (1987) outline a process of reciprocating influences in the progression towards becoming a street youth. They suggest that the primary step for the youth was family disengagement, when "the everyday routine of being a member, being interested, responsible or accountable to family was no longer important" (p. 350). As the problems accumulate the family becomes less a source of refuge or support, and more negative and effacing. As this is happening there is an increase in the connection to and influence of the youth's peers. Peers provide support, a sense of purpose and information. In the midst of these dynamics a situation will likely arise and the decision to run from the family will seem a viable solution to the youth

amongst a shrinking set of alternatives. Once that path is chosen and acted upon, the youth is left with the task of "managing the residuals", i.e. dealing with the feelings of disorganization and uncertainty, and the need for justification.

Among the factors that cause youth to run away, the prevalence of physical, sexual, and emotional abuse, and neglect within the family is simply too high among runaways to be ignored. Information collected in the United States indicates that amongst youth entering shelters, 5.6% report sexual abuse, 18% report physical abuse, and 19.3% report parental neglect (U.S Dept. of Health and Human Services, 1982; cited in Powers, Eckenrode & Jaklitsch, 1988). Farber, Kinast, McCoard and Falkner (1984) estimate that 75% of all runaways are adolescents who run due to negative experiences at home, school or in the community, 5% run because of neglect, and 20% to find adventure. In Ottawa, of 65 street youth interviewed, 63% reported physical abuse, and 32% reported sexual abuse in their family of origin (Community Task Force for Homeless/Street Youth, 1992). Probably the most frightening aspect of abuse is the finding by Whitbeck and Simons (1990) that those who run from abuse tend to run more frequently and tend to be more victimized on the streets. Those "who have the most from which to run appear to be those who are also most at risk when they run" (p. 124). This finding was particularly true of young females.

Farber et al. (1984) noted that abuse rates among runaways range widely from 8% and 65%. Variations of this magnitude require some explanation. Other factors may interact with rates of abuse (the influence of gender, duration, and number of runs will be discussed below) and there is an increase in numbers of reports for abuse generally. However, further explanation can be found in the manner in which nation-wide data has been collected. Powers et al. (1988) "discovered a significant level of under-reporting to the federal government regarding the prevalence of abuse and neglect among runaway and homeless youth" (p. 93). Their findings show that assessments done at the time of admission and used for national survey purposes failed to identify 26% of the maltreated youth identified using an assessment done at discharge.

Given the lack of reliable figures and the transiency of some street youth, it is difficult to accurately assess the flow of runaway youth in terms of volume, frequency or destination. Many runners arrive at the homes of friends and relatives and such situations often do not entail any deep involvement with the street. Of 972 youth under 16 who ran in Ottawa in the first half of 1992, 97% returned home (Community Task Force for Homeless/Street Youth, 1992). Youth who do become involved on the street often run with considerable frequency; for example, Whitbeck and Simons (1990) report that 73% of their sample had run from their

homes three or more times and 40% had run more than 10 times. At the other end of the continuum are those youth that never return home, whether on their first or subsequent runs. Yates et al. (1988) estimate that nearly 25% of the one million youth in the U.S. who run away "are considered to be homeless street kids, a drifting un-centred population of children living on their own" (p. 820).

The length of time these youth are away from home varies widely from several hours to permanently. Hartmann et al. (1987) found that among the 55 females in their sample, 40% had been away from home for less than a month, 40% for more than a month but less than a year and 20% for a period of time longer than one year. The distribution for the 89 males in their sample indicate a general shift to longer absences (21%, 48%, and 31% respectively).

The dynamics of running away are clearly too complex to be explained by a single or simple set of theories. It is likely that a multiplicity of factors in wide variety of combinations and permutations is at work. However, these theories are difficult to assess because street youth are difficult to assess. Street youth, for the most part, are hidden from the adult world and are only available for assessment when they seek service, are sought out and/or caught (Adams & Munro, 1979). As well, the vast majority of studies that have been conducted have examined youth only after they have run away, which does not allow determination

of cause and effect with any confidence. The body of knowledge concerning the phenomena of running is growing, but with difficulty, and fraught with uncertainty.

Street Youth

Who are street youth? Just as it is difficult to find one single theory to explain why youth run from their homes, so it is difficult to draw a single composite picture of these youth (Smart & Adlaf, 1991) or to separate street youth from their experiences. Several authors have tried to describe prototypical street youth. Brennan (1980), using a cluster analysis approach, was able to identify two classes of runaways with three and four subtypes respectively. These were based on personality characteristics and background of the youth. The two classes were labelled "highly delinquent and alienated" and "not highly delinquent and non-alienated." The first class was comprised of the sub-types; young over-controlled escapists, middle class loners, and unbonded peer-oriented runaways, while the second class included; rejected peer-oriented runaways, rebellious and constrained middle class dropout girls, normless rejected unrestrained youth, and rejected pushouts. But individuals differ greatly even within such typologies. Categorical systems of this sort may represent an example of the scientific fallacy. Although they may allow us to label these youth more specifically, they do not necessarily lead

to a better understanding of their situation, their needs, nor suitable responses.

An alternative approach to more complicated categorical labels is to examine the simplest of personal characteristics for evidence of important factors. Gender, age, and school history have been examined in various studies. One finding that is counter to common impressions is that running away is not a male dominated activity as once thought. Studies report that there are almost equal numbers of females and males leaving their homes for the streets. The incidence of female street youth reported in research range from 43% to 60% (Adams & Munroe, 1979; Kurtz et al., 1991) and females accounted for 56.9% of the 39,817 youth served by American runaway and homeless youth facilities (Powers et al., 1990). It must be noted that the circumstances of their departure, and other parameters, may vary significantly by gender, but the simple fact is that girls are at least as likely as boys to be on the streets.

Many runaways begin the behaviour at a surprisingly young age. Studies have reported eight and nine year olds on the streets (Yates et al., 1991). Entry into adulthood dictates an upper limit of age for runaway youth, but interestingly, many runaways consider themselves and act as runaway youth long past the age of majority and into their mid-twenties. The mean age for street youth found in the research was approximately 16 years old (Reuler, 1991;

Whitbeck & Simons, 1990) but this average may be distorted as younger ages may be underrepresented. There is reason to believe that younger street youth lie out of fear of child welfare authorities (Children's Aid Society of Ottawa-Carleton, 1992; Community Task Force for Homeless/ Street Youth, 1992; Kufeldt & Nimmo, 1987). As would be expected, older youth have run more frequently and for longer periods of time than their younger counterparts (Kufeldt & Nimmo, 1987).

Street youth have reported that difficulties in school were among the precipitating factors for their behaviour. Failure, in school or elsewhere, creates a humiliating experience that decreases the sense of self worth in the individual and may provoke conflicts within the parent child relationship. Underlying these dynamics may be a distaste and rejection of the rigid expectations of the school system (that may also present as a rejection of parental expectations and control, leading to conflict and running). Kufeldt and Nimmo (1987) found individuals in their sample to be behind their cohort by two years. Over half the youth in an Ottawa sample had not completed the first year of high school and nearly 45% reported that they had attended special education classes at some point (Community Task Force for Homeless/Street Youth, 1992). With so few academic qualifications, little experience and no skills, these youth find it extremely difficult to gain employment. Those that

do often discover the same difficulties in the work environment that caused them so much concern in the school environment. This is not to imply that street youth are unintelligent but does belie that they tend to be under-educated by conventional standards.

One of the more striking features of the street youth population is that in many ways it is featureless. Demographic variables that might be expected are not found with any significance in this group; ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and family composition have not been found to have any profound or universal influence on who runs away.

Life on the Street

For those youth who run away to live on the streets, it is often a case of "out of the frying pan and into the fire." While running may have dealt with the immediate problem for many of these youth, they now find that life on the streets creates additional concerns. Street youth are immediately confronted with their reality and quickly become preoccupied with acquiring the basic necessities for life. Shelter, food, and safety must constantly be sought from whatever sources are available. Street youth must rely on their own initiative to meet these needs where once they relied on their families. Such foraging is continuous, unpredictable, and unrestricted by common social convention.

The longer a youth exists in the street environment, and the greater the knowledge of the street, streetlife and the people there, the more they are drawn into it. It has been found that increased time on the run and increased distance travelled from home, increased the chance that the youth was drawn into the subculture of the street, e.g. crime, prostitution, violence and drug dealing (Kufeldt & Nimmo, 1987; Whitbeck & Simons, 1990). This reflects the youth's increasing reliance on the street environment and the reduced number of available alternatives.

Many street youth are involved in various forms of criminal behaviour. However, the picture is somewhat inconclusive. This uncertainty is due in part to the variety of activities that society labels as criminal. For example, simply running away from home is considered a status offence in many jurisdictions, while panhandling and vagrancy may also be illegal. It is also difficult to distinguish between criminal behaviour as a reaction to the press of living on the street and criminal behaviour as a pre-existing pattern. In Ottawa, although 83% of the respondents had committed a crime since they had left home, fully 75% reported that they had committed crimes prior to leaving home (Community Task Force for Homeless/Street Youth, 1992).

It would be wrong to portray street youth simply as habitual criminals exploiting those around them. Their lives are characterized by a lack of resources, inexperience,

scepticism of traditional services, reduced sanctions and inhibitions, and the absolute necessity to meet their basic needs. Such factors create desperate and predatory behaviours in street youth, but also leave them vulnerable to various sorts of exploitation. Assault, violence and intimidation are common experiences for the youth on the street (Community Task Force for Homeless/Street Youth, 1992), and the more un-seasoned and ill-prepared the youth, the more substantial the risks (Whitbeck & Simons, 1990). On the street their need for money leads them to pursue the fast buck. The least risky of their activities can be panhandling for change, which, while demeaning, does not carry the risks inherent in other criminal activity. The more risky activities include theft, prostitution and drug trade.

Street youth become involved with drugs to a greater extent than non-runaways (Cohen & MacKenzie, 1991), and do so more as a coping strategy than for recreation (Smart & Adlaf, 1990). Drug and alcohol use among street youth was commonly reported at rates exceeding 80% and was often of the most dangerous types of drugs and drug usage (Kennedy, 1991; Smart & Adlaf, 1990). Studies have reported that street youth have ten times the incidence of intravenous drug use (Yates et al., 1988; Smart & Adlaf, 1991). Often sharing needles, these youth greatly increase the risk of contracting hepatitis and AIDS. The problem is such that

street youth themselves have reported that the largest single problem they will face is drug and alcohol abuse (Community Task Force for Homeless/Street Youth, 1992). For many street youth it is a small step from drug use to involvement in the drug trade. The financial rewards can be considerable, and some see dealing as a viable means of coping with their predicament.

Prostitution or bartering for sex are common occurrences among street youth, both female and male. A third of the street youth interviewed in Ottawa stated they had traded sex for food, money or drugs (Community Task Force for Homeless/Street Youth, 1992). Reuler (1991) reports that 50% of the street youth in a health clinic population were involved in heavy prostitution and a further 25% in occasional prostitution. Similar rates are noted throughout the literature, along with the observation that few use prophylactics. Consequently, a high proportion of health concerns among street youth are related to sexually transmitted diseases. This has lead some to predict that the next wave of the AIDS epidemic will be seen in the street youth population (Hersch, 1988).

While on the street, youth endure a broader range of health problems, to a greater extent. This is the result of poor hygiene, improper nutrition, and unhealthy environments (Feder, 1991). These youth often suffer alone and untreated, afraid to use the health system and unaware of the tragic

and sometimes fatal consequences they face. The emergence of safe clinics; allows patients to receive relatively anonymous health care. These are often the only venue for medical treatment that street youth will use. The experience in these clinics reflect some of the typical health concerns of street youth. Smart (1991) reports that 70% of the youth seen in a Seattle health centre were diagnosed with acute health problems. The Greenhouse Clinic in Portland, Oregon found that respiratory (28.6%), dermatology (16.6%) and gynaecology (10.5%) cases were the most frequent categories of diagnoses (Reuler, 1991). Yates et al. (1988) reported significantly higher rates of pelvic inflammatory disease, hepatitis and scabies among street youth. Many of these concerns were the result of common illnesses that had progressed to significant levels or were the result of the lifestyle and environment in which the youth lived.

Given the circumstances in which they live, combined with the stress and trauma many experience prior to running away, it is not surprising that high rates of emotional and mental health problems have been reported among street youth. A large portion of street youth are clinically depressed and/or express suicidal ideation. Yates et al. (1988) reported that 83% of their subjects were diagnosed as depressed and 18.2% as suicidal and Kennedy (1991) found 58% experienced suicidal ideation in his research. Cohen and MacKenzie (1991), in a study comparing homeless and non-

homeless youth, found three times the rate of depression and five times the presence of suicidal action among the homeless. Adlaf and Smart (1990) found one third of their sample of Toronto street youth were depressed and 42% had attempted suicide, while locally 60% of the street youth surveyed in Ottawa had committed some form of self-mutilation (Community Task Force for Homeless/Street Youth, 1992). These figures indicate the troubled nature of youth living on the streets. As in other areas of concern, there is reason to believe these youth are either not accessing or are incapable of using the services that they need most.

Street Environments

Other parameters were found to effect the experience of street youth. The size of the population centre, the distance travelled, the time of year, and the weather were factors which may interact. Studies from a broad sampling of cities (e.g. Ottawa, Los Angeles, Seattle, Calgary) have noted that populations of street youth fluctuate with the season and the weather. In most cases, the estimated number of street youth doubles during the summer months, but no satisfactory explanation has been documented. It may be presumed that summer vacation time, with the increased familial interaction, can disinhibit the youth and provoke a run. It is also likely that inclement weather would cause youth to reconsider leaving in the winter. However, the seasonal fluctuation in street youth numbers is just as

evident in Southern California where the winter is more temperate than it is in Canadian cities.

The street experience varies within and between cities. The extent of the street scene is directly related to the size of the population centre. In larger cities it is possible that the sheer number of people living on the street increase the opportunities to become entangled in the experience. This would account for some of the differences noted between the largest of the centres, such as Los Angeles and New York, and the more moderate sized, such as, Ottawa, Seattle and Des Moines. Youth in these cities were on the streets for longer periods of time and were less likely to ever return home (Community Task Force for Homeless/Street Youth, 1992; Hersch, 1988; Smart, 1991; Whitbeck & Simons, 1990; Yates et al., 1991). This is not to say that there is any less reason to be concerned for youth living on the streets of Seattle or Des Moines or Ottawa, compared to those in Los Angeles or New York. Even within a given metropolitan centre there are different street scenes. Some differ in qualitative aspects (i.e. more or less prostitution, more racial intolerance, etc.) or quantitatively (more individuals, wider area, etc.), but each presents much the same challenge as the next. The experience can be just as traumatic and damaging regardless of where street youth locate.

The Effects of Living on the Street

Life on the streets can be dangerous during the time that the individual is experiencing it, but long term problems may also result. Some youth will emerge from street life in a stronger position than might be expected. The factors involved in positive outcomes will be reviewed below. At this point, suffice it to say that, with proper supports and personal strengths, street youth stand a fair chance of surviving the street experience relatively unscathed. However, the downside risks can be tremendous and too damaging to ignore. The ultimate danger being death.

The level of disruption and trauma in the lives of these youth, both before and after they run, bodes poorly for their personal development and adult adjustment. However, the distinct contribution of the running behaviour and experience prior to running is moot. For many the option of not running is impractical, and in some instances may be a less damaging alternative. This dilemma can not be satisfactorily resolved to any conclusive degree, however some indications of distinct effects have been suggested. The most immediate outcome for many youth is that the return to the family home is a difficult and often insurmountable problem (Young et al., 1983). Many find that the run exacerbated problems at home and choose not to return. Young et al. (1983) report that in 45% of the instances where the youth returned home the parents responded with increased

discipline and greater severity. In Seattle, service providers believe that half of the youth on their streets will need alternatives to their family although less than 10% are ready for independent living (Smart, 1991). Many outcomes relate to problems acquired, or opportunities lost, during the course of life on the streets.

It has been suggested that involvement with the criminal justice and child welfare systems may be counter-productive for these youth. The experience may serve to educate youth in the behaviours of those they meet. Street youth may make enduring contacts with more criminally oriented individuals as the result of attempts to deal with the youth's problems. The Children's Aid Society of Ottawa-Carleton (1992) noted that their own in-care services can in fact "compound their problem" (p. 10). There is also evidence that females receive harsher treatment through the criminal justice system than do males (Young et al., 1983).

Health problems that are acquired during the time the youth is on the street, through both exposure and improper treatment, can have many long term and tragic outcomes. In particular, drug use and sexual behaviour contribute to the health problems of street youth and AIDS may be the most disastrous possibility. But many street youth ignore these risks. At times with conviction of invulnerability of common among youth and at times because the dangers are not immediately evident. For example, AIDS is not often seen as

an obvious danger because it can remain invisible well into adulthood by virtue of its long incubation period (Hersch, 1988). Drug use among street youth have lead to addictions that become never-ending concerns. Indiscriminate sexual behaviour has increased the risk of other sexually transmitted diseases besides AIDS, but has also produced an increase in the number of pregnancies. As many of these are not terminated the number of young street couples and young single mothers has increased. Effects are felt not only by the young parent(s), who must now raise a child under difficult circumstances, but also by the offspring who may suffer through improper parenting and development (Young et al., 1983).

Service Systems

Services for homeless people have been available since homelessness was recognized. Civic and church efforts to assist the indigent have a long history of providing for the basic needs of the poor and less fortunate. A street youth population with its own distinctive needs has long been recognized, and a systematic response to address their unique requirements has been developed in most major urban centres. However, few cities have systems which are capable of meeting the overwhelming demand for service for the most basic of needs. For example, an improved shelter system in Los Angeles still turned away 1,829 youth in 1989 (Yates et al., 1991). It is estimated that youth shelters in North

American cities serve less than half the street youth population (Hersch, 1988). In spite of these inadequacies often the only reliable and available source for basic needs for the individual is found in the social service system. Yet the use of social services by street youth has been tentative and sporadic. Reasons for this lack of access can be found in systemic biases, natural distrust, and inadequate, demeaning and inappropriate services. "Many of what we define as 'problems' are conversely seen by the youngster as 'solutions', for which no services are needed or sought" (Yates et al., 1985, p. 228). These systemic problems will be reviewed in general, with particular attention to the urban area under consideration and the service system in which this study was conducted.

Street Smarts was designed to compliment existing services for street youth in Ottawa, Canada, a metropolitan region of nearly one million people. A very thorough and informative representation of the street experience in this city was provided by the Community Task Force for Homeless/Street Youth (1992). Based on interviews with 65 street youth, of an estimated population of 250 at that time, the authors concluded that concerns for this group were well-founded and services were inadequate, poorly planned, and under-funded. The description of the service system for street youth in this region was augmented by a review of other reports addressing services in the Ottawa-

Carleton region including Youth in Conflict with the Law Committee, 1989; Youth Services Bureau, 1991; Children's Aid Society of Ottawa-Carleton, 1992.

There are 18 beds in this region to serve a population that fluctuates between 100 and 250 street youth. Medical services are available from walk-in clinics and the outreach efforts of a few physicians, but the medical problems outstrip the availability of diagnostic services. Assistance for substance abuse and addiction problems are hard to access. Assessment and referral services are awkward for street youth in Ottawa to approach, and actual treatment has only recently become available in this country. Free food is available from a number of soup kitchens in Ottawa, but many street youth find dining with adults uncomfortable, and the under-sixteen population would not risk giving their age (a requirement in many centres) for fear of being identified and apprehended. As a consequence many prefer to eat from the garbage of restaurants (Children's Aid Society of Ottawa-Carleton, 1992). Clothing can be obtained from various churches and charities, yet the type and amount of clothing is often inadequate for the severe weather that can be experienced in this city. With no place to keep a second set of clothes and no place to wash those they do possess, street youth often live in dirty clothing. The scarcity of suitable footwear is a particular problem. Welfare can be arranged but the system is complicated throughout the

province of Ontario. A mentor is needed to get started and, again, the youth must provide personal information. These conspire to limit the youth's desire and ability to access the welfare system. Counselling is available in some fair measure. Drop-in centres allow youth to come in to receive help, while outreach service workers go onto the street to meet the youth on their own "turf". In most instances the counselling efforts are focussed primarily on enabling street youth to have their basic and critical needs met.

A feature common to all these efforts is that the youth must seek help, or, in some way, identify themselves as needing help. This is a subtle, systemic barrier to the youth that prevents them from actually receiving help. Wanting and receiving help can be a sign of weakness that is unfashionable and risky on the street. Some youth see themselves as powerful and invulnerable with problems that they can be handled alone or that will not significantly effect them. Other youth are simply naive, unaware of the dangers they face, or oblivious to what can be done to resolve their problems. These dynamics serve to make it hazardous and difficult for street youth to seek out help.

Such systemic problems have been identified elsewhere, and yet, recommendations commonly focus on expanding existing types of service and not on providing new or innovative sorts of assistance that extend the current range of services. Kennedy (1991), in reviewing the system of

services for street youth in San Francisco, noted a lack of creativity in service development, yet he made recommendations for a continuum of services that do not include proactive, educational or occupational efforts. Yates et al. (1991) examined the street youth service system in Los Angeles solely in terms of shelter and outreach, a perspective that concentrates on the symptomatic relief of the problem in the short term. Two local studies (The Community Task Force for Homeless/Street Youth, 1992; Youth Services Bureau, 1991) have identified quite clearly that street youth in Ottawa have an interest in both learning and employment, yet neither made any recommendations to address these needs and capitalize on the apparent interests of the youth. In contrast, Smart (1991) incorporated a broader perspective for her examination of the Seattle street youth system. She suggested four intervention points in the process of a youth running away; (1) prevention and early intervention prior to the youth leaving home permanently, (2) emergency assistance while on the run, (3) stabilization, and, (4) transition.

Transition services, according to Smart (1991), include basic skills, employment preparation, remedial education and job training. Smart identified the need for coordination and expanded partnerships among health, social, philanthropic, educational, and government sectors to address the needs of street youth, and for innovative ways to deal with this

population. These challenges are as substantial as the need for a tremendous increase in funding. There are few examples of programs that attempt to overcome these difficulties, even fewer that have any credible documentation of their efforts, and fewer still that include any evaluative efforts.

Comparable Services

Only a few examples of programs for street youth similar to services provided by Street Smarts exist, fewer are adequately documented, and fewer still are evaluated. Those meeting this criteria will be reviewed below. The Threshold Project (Schram and Giovengo, 1991) is one such effort which is similar to Street Smarts in intent, clientele, and some program components. "Threshold is designed to offer a series of more progressive independent living experiences to young women 16 - 18 years of age" (p. 568). Clients proceed through three stages of successively less restrictive living conditions. In the second phase they are expected, encouraged and assisted to obtain employment and attend school. Throughout the project clients participate in regular group and individual sessions with professional staff from a variety of agencies dealing with basic living skills and other concerns.

Evaluation of Threshold included medical, knowledge, and psychosocial components, as well as client profiles, presenting problems and client outcomes. Subjects in the

evaluation were 24 clients who entered the second phase of the project over a 19 month period ending July, 1989. Ten of these young women achieved at least one positive outcome (defined as a stable living arrangement, involved in employment or education, and free of substance abuse or criminal involvement), six of the clients were unavailable for follow-up, and eight did not meet any of the positive outcomes. There were no significant predictors of success among the ideographic measures, although the authors suggested that absence of criminal involvement and shorter time on the street "appear" to be related to positive outcomes. The intervention may be criticized at the outset for an approach that was too proscriptive and too intrusive for a street youth population. A number of problems exist in the evaluation of this program, some typical of the field and others due to flaws in the design. The authors admitted that the battery of questions was too long and compliance suffered as a result. Follow-up was difficult and detailed outcomes were unavailable which lead the authors to create a more simplistic definition of success. The authors did not relate the types or extent of services received to outcomes in any manner. Small sample size, lack of control or comparison groups, and lack of treatment specification restrict the ability to make definitive remarks. Consequently, many of the conclusions drawn by Schramm and Giovengo are speculative. However, qualitative information

and community opinion provide support for the program. There was an effort to collaborate with a wide range of existing services, the focus was on practical information and utility, and the project was future oriented.

Another innovative approach to dealing with the problems of street youth can be found in the evaluation of an alternative street school for youth involved in prostitution by Wurzbacher et al. (1991). This work is cited because of the high incidence of prostitution and sex trade among street youth that has been documented and because subjects in this study were predominantly street youth or potential street youth (49% homeless, 11% group homes, 35% emergency shelters).

The major independent variable examined by Wurzbacher et al. (1991) was attendance at an alternative street school. The school was a nontraditional, drop-in, open enrolment classroom emphasizing basic academic skills. The objectives of the school were to allow positive teacher-pupil interaction, cooperation, and goal identification within a milieu of positive reinforcement and basic behaviour management. Subjects were referred from a Seattle multi-service youth agency and were self assigned to one of three conditions: attenders (attending for a minimum of 30 days), refusers, and unable to attend. The 114 youth (58 females and 56 males, mean age 15.9 years) who participated where administered a battery of three self-report measures

(Reynold's Adolescent Depression Scale, Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, and the Quality of School Life Scale) as well as a background interview. These were readministered after 50 days.

Wurzbacher et al. (1991) evaluated outcome in terms of prostitution behaviour, depressive symptomatology, self-esteem and attitudes towards school. Overall, subjects showed the high incidence of abuse and running to be expected with this population; 68% physical abuse, 78% sexual abuse, and 95% running behaviour. No distinction was found on the basis of gender, place of residence, or ethnicity. A comparison of prior abuse and running behaviour with group selection showed few differences between those unable to attend and those who attended, but several distinctions emerged between those groups and refusers. Refusers were found to have experienced first sexual abuse, first physical abuse and first running away at a much younger age than other subjects, as well as more depressive symptomatology, lower self-esteem, more negative school sentiment and, among males, more prostitution events. The refusers presented the familiar pattern of the most needy youth being the most resistant to help. In terms of outcomes, only attenders showed reduced depressive symptomatology, improved school sentiment and reduced prostitution behaviour, while all three groups showed increased self-esteem. The authors suggested a number of

possible mechanisms to explain the success of the school attenders: (a) the structure and timing of the classes may preclude continuing prostitution activity, (b) an increasing number of emotional needs may have been met by the staff, (c) social contact in the school setting can reduce depressive symptomatology, and (d) the acquisition of skills and competencies. Wurzbacher et al. (1991) concluded that "adolescents involved in street life and prostitution can benefit from services that encourage the acquisition of skills and promote competency" (p. 553).

The most obvious inadequacy in the study by Wurzbacher et al. (1991) was that the report did not sufficiently specify the intervention, which makes it difficult to assess the extent and quality of the educational experience. Noticeably absent was any mention of schedules, location, number and type of teachers or leaders, and curriculum. It seems unwise to administer the battery of measures to the subjects in written form. School difficulties and possible literacy problems experienced by these youth would seem to indicate an oral interview. The authors concluded that the improvement in self-esteem noted in the attenders group was the result of the intervention. Yet similar improvements were noted among refusers and those unable to attend. The possibility exists that different mechanisms were at work, e.g. a regression to the mean effects among the group with

the lower self esteem scores (the refusers) and a treatment effect among those reporting higher scores.

As with the work of Schramm and Giovengo (1991) reviewed above, the intervention employed in Wurzbacher et al. (1991) may have been too proscriptive in its approach and consequently limited its success. Although the youth had the option of attending, the purpose of the intervention was to decrease their prostitution behaviour. As oppositional behaviour can be a common reaction from adolescents, compliance, attendance and therefore outcome may have been improved had there been less emphasis on changing specific behaviours. Wurzbacher et al. (1991) concluded that "more traditional services, such as counselling and health education, should consider incorporating service delivery models that involve a high level of client participation and promote the acquisition of specific skills." (p. 554). These sentiments are similar to the basic principles for protective environments noted above.

As demonstrated, opportunities for personal growth and development denied street youth by virtue of their behaviour and lifestyle can have a myriad of consequences. The lack of education, support, social contact, and stability may ultimately be more damaging than missing some meals. These may influence the youth's attitude towards learning, and towards themselves throughout their lifetime. They may be inhibited in their capacity to learn and uncertain of their

abilities. Available services are often inadequate, limited in scope, and, in some ways, inappropriate to respond to the needs of street youth. Additional services are required to meet the varied needs of street youth. Systems are particularly inadequate in creating environments that promote self worth, respect individual strengths, encourage self determination, and empower their clients. A program has been developed that attempts to rectify this situation and provide a complimentary service for the existing system. A detailed review of the Street Smarts program follows.

The Street Smarts Program

Overview

We have seen that street youth have been easily discounted and discarded by the general public as incorrigible, unmotivated, unproductive, and troublesome individuals, who have little hope of becoming responsible or caring adults. We have seen that service providers, albeit unwittingly, have set up networks that are systemically flawed. They are often distrusted, problem oriented, and distant. In spite of a caring, client-centred approach, access is often difficult for the very clients they wish to serve.

Street Smarts is an alternative approach to serving street youth that enables individuals to capitalize on their strengths and provides them with useful information in a manner which is enjoyable. The objectives of the program are (a) to provide a safe, consistent, and welcoming environment that emphasizes learning and sharing; (b) to enhance the sense of well-being and competence among the youth through their participation in the experience with personable, caring adults; (c) to address the informational needs and resourcefulness of the participants; and (d) to assist in the development of more supportive relationships for the street youth in their world. Street Smarts is a series of informative and interesting workshops and seminars designed to enhance the skills, knowledge, and personal satisfaction

of street youth. Participants are encouraged to acquire essential information, practice various social and interpersonal skills, and enjoy the challenge of learning.

Preliminary work on the Street Smarts program began in the Ottawa-Carleton region in the winter of 1992. A group of professionals working with youth held a series of meetings focussed on the needs of street youth in the Ottawa-Carleton region. Participants at these meetings clarified the fundamental values, established operating procedures, identified many of the topics, and initiated a network of experts from which to draw. Prototypes of the sessions were first presented to residents of the Salvation Army Youth Resource Centre (SAYRC) in the Spring of 1992. The SAYRC is a shelter for male and female street youth 16 to 18 years of age in downtown Ottawa. That experience helped shape the original concepts into more workable form. At this time the name and current approach were established. The Street Smarts program will be reviewed in detail below, in terms of its values, format, group atmosphere, leaders, content, and evaluation strategy.

Fundamental Values

The majority of street youth have experienced an educational system that is impersonal, unresponsive, and dissatisfying. Many view the experience of learning as distasteful, boring, and pedantic. Often school failure, either socially or academically, has provoked or contributed

to the departure from the family home. This can create attitudes which stifle participation in any educational experience and produce lifelong limitations. Those involved in Street Smarts actively express respect for the competence and skills possessed by the individuals.

Street Smarts was founded on the belief that individuals will become part of an informational experience if that experience is fun and provocative, if the information is clearly valuable, if the atmosphere is sociable, and if the leaders are caring, dynamic and knowledgeable. Stated goals do not dictate that youth must stop living on the streets. Participants are told that participation will help them survive and provide them with information, skills, and contacts that will permit them to make the changes that they choose.

The experience is lead by caring, open, and skilled adults who provide not only guidance and enable the process to be maximally effective, but also provide appropriate role models. The program occurs in a group context, based on the belief that street youth can learn most readily among their peers and that the group experience itself is an important vehicle to promote skill development. Within that milieu, the individual is treated with respect, empathy, and honesty, simply because it is the most humane and engaging approach. Without this approach, street youth would likely not participate. Each session has a particular focus and set

of objectives emphasizing specific, practical information, with immediate worth.

It must be noted that many of the values and beliefs outlined above are reflected in the basic premise of adult or popular education (Merriam and Caffarella, 1991). In this school of thought the student is seen as an equal participant. The teacher is viewed as a guide enabling the best experience possible and, further, as obligated to the participant. Teaching is more interactive in this instance and the participants have a much greater degree of control over their education.

Format

A Street Smarts series consists of ten, weekly, two-hour meetings, lead by two trained and experienced individuals. Adult guests with specific expertise are invited to attend as needed. A group generally consists of 10 street youth, of both genders, 16 to 21 years of age. The sessions, usually conducted in the early evening, proceed through several stages. Initially the group convenes and begins by discussing any pressing personal concerns. This is followed by the presentation or experience scheduled for that evening which may include a guest expert in a specified role. Presentation techniques vary with each topic to provide an interesting experience and capitalize on the skills, knowledge, and personality of the guests and leaders. This portion includes substantial time for

discussion. The final period is used for debriefing, evaluating the information section, planning, and group "housekeeping", as well as the introduction of the topic for the next session, and identifying any specific information the group would like emphasized.

Group Atmosphere

The group atmosphere is created by encouraging the values that will become the norms for the participants within the group milieu. This is accomplished by the leaders and the group participants themselves, through modelling suitable behaviour, discussing appropriate conduct, and enforcing and rewarding behaviour as needed. Participants learn and practice social skills within an environment that is relatively safer than their day to day existence. There is a concern among youth for privacy which must be honoured, therefore confidentiality is expected of all participants.

The site and time for the group meetings are important considerations for the ambience of the Street Smarts program. The schedule is flexible, responding to the needs of the participants, and to conflicting attractions (i.e. sessions would be cancelled on nights of free concerts, when welfare cheques were issued, etc.). The surroundings are comfortable, attractive, and easily accessed. Regular snacks and occasional meals, chosen by the youth, provide a warm, nurturing, and often necessary inducement. Beyond the actual group meeting, cohesion is fostered through a "buddy" system

among the youth to encourage attendance and by the leaders who maintain some contact with the youth between sessions.

Leaders

The leaders act as host, administrative support, and catalyst in the sessions. A two-leader, male-female, team model was selected to enhance participation when dealing with issues that have powerful gender-specific perspectives such as violence, abuse, sexuality, and relationships. Leaders were selected for their counselling skills, strong leadership abilities, an awareness of the issues facing adolescents (and street youth in particular), and a breadth of knowledge across many topics. The leaders all exhibited a sense of humour throughout that allowed for a relaxed, warm, and welcoming relationship to develop. Leaders sought to harness the group process without overpowering the participants and allow the group to develop confidence in themselves.

The leaders' skills in enabling the group process were complimented by the various adult guests that were invited to attend. Many of the qualities required of the leaders were also found among the guests, however, the primary role of the guest is to provide their expertise. They are selected based on the needs and wishes of the group and the type of presentation is determined by their personal skills and strengths in group leadership. For example, an individual with strong presentation skills might be asked to

deliver the information in didactic or monologue style, while someone with weaker group skills might be asked to simply attend a group as part of a discussion conducted by the group leaders.

A supervisor with expertise in adolescence, group dynamics, and clinical supervision guided the ongoing operation of the groups. Regular supervisory meetings with leaders and supervisor occurred throughout the series.

Content

The content of each session focussed on a topic from a range of important health, mental health, personal safety, and personal growth issues. The schedule of topics was determined at the initial session by group consensus and selected from a menu of choices provided by the leaders (see Appendix 1). This approach allowed the participants to have a measure of control and responsibility and to benefit from the experience of achieving a group decision. This provided structure for the scheduling of sessions, organizing of guests, ensuring a broad range of topics, etc. Participants could, and regularly did, suggest topics not included on the menu, and where possible these were arranged.

The method of presentation varied from week to week and included a wide range of instructional approaches and techniques, including group discussion, role plays, experiential games, audio-visual aids, lectures, and dramatic presentations. Selection of the approach used with

a given topic was based on suitability, teaching styles of the leaders and guests, and learning styles of participants.

The first session was an introduction to the group and included commitment building exercises. The topics for remaining sessions were selected by the participants, also during the first session. The menu for the remaining sessions included; street survival skills, housing help, budgeting and jobs, art therapy, health and nutrition, sexuality and safe sex, substance abuse, school and careers, managing stress, suicide, conflict resolution, abuse, violence, psycho-drama, exploitation, parenting, personal safety, etc.. A sampling of session outlines are attached as Appendix 2.

Evaluation Strategy

The literature shows that many street youth have been abused, neglected, or repressed while in their homes. They continue to be confronted by many new and/or familiar stressors. These youth are often ill-prepared for the experience of the street and their growth and development are further impeded by the choices they make. Few services exist to address the opportunities lost by street youth. Regardless of how important these services may seem we must be able to show a very cautious and uncommitted population of youth that they are not wasting their time by participating in programs such as Street Smarts. As well, social service policy makers must be assured that such

programs are cost - efficient, effective, and essential. That, in a delivery system that is seriously underfunded for existing programs, there is a need for programs such as Street Smarts.

The study has been conducted to determine (a) the extent of the problems faced by the street youth in our sample, (b) how street youth compare to youth living at home, (c) which street youth will participate in the Street Smarts program, and ultimately, (d) what are the effects for street youth who choose to participate. Attributes considered important for this study are those which have particular relevance for youth on the street, such as, running experience and family history, and to the objectives of the Street Smarts program; well-being, competence, resourcefulness, and healthy environmental relations. Other information that was collected will be reported as supportive data.

To examine the extent of problems facing street youth in this sample it was hypothesized that:

1. Street youth in this sample will present levels of well being, resourcefulness, school history, and running history, similar to other street youth populations.
2. Street youth in the sample will indicate a history of family conflict, a history of negative experiences

while on the street, and difficulty in coping with life on the street.

It was expected that youth living on the street would present as less healthy, less happy, and less capable than the youth in this sample who live at home. Arising from this expectation, it was hypothesized that:

3. Street youth in this sample will present levels of well being, resourcefulness, competence, and environmental relations that are less than levels found among youth living at home.

4. Street youth will exhibit more problems in school and running history than youth living at home.

It was anticipated that the street youth who choose to participate in Street Smarts would be those who felt they most needed the service, those who were less at ease with their life on the street, or those most comfortable with the Street Smarts format. As a consequence, it was hypothesized that:

5. Street youth who participate will present lower levels of well being, resourcefulness, competence, and environmental relations than levels found among street youth who choose not to participate.

6. Street youth who participate in Street Smarts will have spent less time on the street and have run less than street youth who choose not to participate in Street Smarts.

7. Street youth participating in the Street Smarts program will have had better experiences with the educational system than those who choose not to participate.

Finally, the effects of participating in the Street Smarts program were examined to determine what was gained by the participants. It was hoped that the lives of those participating would be improved and that the participants would develop some insight into the changes they experienced. To this end, it was hypothesized that:

8. Levels of well being, resourcefulness, competence, and environmental relations obtained from participants will improve from first to second to third administration.

9. The gains experienced by participants will be relatively greater than those obtained for street youth and youth at home over the same time periods.

10. Participants will express general satisfaction with the Street Smarts program.

11. Participants will be able to identify personal benefits resulting from their participation.

Method

Subjects

The street youth population is a most difficult and elusive group of subjects to assess. There is a well documented fear and suspicion of adults, services, and the system among the street youth that limits their desire to maintain stable contacts. It proved to be impossible to track youth from one series to another with any degree of accuracy. Youth would attend groups at several sites under different names. Matching the identity of a youth from Street Smarts with a youth in the study proved to be likewise impossible. Street youth would be identified by one name in group and a different name for the interviewer. It was only through the vigilance of the interviewers that participants in the study could be tracked from interview to interview. Consequently, any level of participation was highly regarded and the information obtained was deemed to be valuable. A total of 99 youth participated in the study, 58 males and 41 females with an average age of 17.46 years ($SD=1.85$, range 13.17 to 21.50 years). Subjects were assigned to one of three conditions; street-treatment group (ST), street-comparison group (SC), and home-comparison group (HC). Table 1 provides the gender by age breakdown for the three categories of subjects. Participation was voluntary throughout. Information and conclusions are therefore based on samples of youth who were willing to

participate and may not reflect the reality of all youth especially those who are adverse to interviews or secretive. This might effect the findings from street youth in particular (The Community Task Force for Homeless/Street Youth, 1992; Youth Services Bureau, 1991) but are unavoidable given the ethical demands of informed consent.

Fifty-seven youth were on the street at the time of the study and females constituted about one third of the ST and SC groups. Twenty-nine of the street youth participated in at least one of the Street Smarts series and these constituted the ST group (this represents about 20% of the total number of participants in street Smarts groups). These youth were recruited from the Street Smarts participants after the first session or were recruited from the drop-in centres where the groups were held and attended the next session of Street Smarts. In both instances these youth were utilizing the drop-in centres for various purposes. Services at the centre included crisis counselling, meals, and resource brokerage. While these youth, by the fact that they qualified to use the centre, were considered to be street youth, it must be recognized that these youth do not constitute all street youth types. Other youth that would qualify for the label street youth, such as suburban street youth (i.e. curbsiders) and youth less familiar with these drop-in centres (e.g. new in the city or new on the streets), would likely not avail themselves of this service

and would consequently be underrepresented in this population and in this sample.

An additional twenty-eight street youth did not attend the Street Smarts program and were designated as the SC group. These youth were likewise recruited primarily from the drop-in centres where the groups took place. In a few instances individuals were recruited through the street network and not directly at the centre. Similar restrictions on the range of street youth sampled for this study exist for this group as for the ST group. The average age of all street youth was 18.04, $SD = 1.92$, with the ST group younger than the SC group (SC mean age = 17.55 years, $SD=1.85$ and SC mean age = 18.53 years, $SD=1.80$). Other differences reviewed below suggest that the ST group might be less connected to the street as a group.

Forty-two youth were living at home at the time of the study and these formed the HC group. Unlike the street groups, females and males were equally represented in the HC group and the HC subjects were the youngest (mean age = 16.70 years, $SD=1.53$) of the three groups. These youth were recruited from community recreation centres, specifically from the Boys and Girls Club of Ottawa-Carleton. This population of youth had been used in other studies for comparison purposes (Offord, 1987) as an available and realistic source of adolescent subjects. However, as with all comparison groups, there are specific aspects of the

population that must be considered when making estimates of representativeness and generalizability. Youth who attend at these centres are those accessing community services and as such might be better positioned to take advantage of the protective features of that environment than youth not attending. Therefore comparisons are being made between youth at home accessing centres and youth on the street accessing centres. Staff at these centres report that the centres are available for all youth but are often attended by disproportionately higher numbers of youth from single parent families and families living below the poverty line. It is necessary to consider these factors in comparing groups. A more detailed examination of all groups will be provided in subsequent sections.

Street youth were reluctant to participate in the study, for example, only 29 of 144 youth in the Street Smarts program agreed to be interviewed at the outset. Refusal to participate at the outset stemmed from inherent secretiveness and suspicion, insufficient time or interest, and "study burnout". Several youth had participated in other studies in previous years and were loath to be subjects again (The Community Task Force for Homeless/Street Youth, 1992; Youth Services Bureau, 1991).

Attrition was considerable for all groups, but particularly for the SC group. Table 2 shows the number of subjects at each administration in each group. The SC group

was reduced by 75% from time 1 to time 2 and a further 50% during the remaining interval, making meaningful comparisons with this group over time impossible. Attrition was primarily the result of subjects dropping out of touch with the researchers and the centres where they had been contacted or interviewed. While it is usual for street youth to have erratic attendance, the extreme lack of continuity was not expected.

Comparisons between those who dropped out and those who continued in each category were conducted using a series of simple t-tests. This statistical approach was employed as an exploratory venture. These comparisons revealed no significant differences on the key variables (see table 3). The variables selected were those chosen for primary analyses as explained below. As well, these comparisons were conducted for the ST and HC group separately and also revealed no distinct effects from attrition. There were insufficient numbers of continuing SC subjects to make meaningful comparisons over time. So, while there may have been some systematic differences between continuing participants, those who declined to participate in the study, or those who dropped out, the available information does not indicate what those might be.

Table 1

Mean Age for Participants by Gender and Group

	ST ^a	SC ^b	HC ^c	Total
<u>Female</u>				
n	10	10	21	41
Mean age	17.65	17.94	16.95	17.36
SD	2.36	2.03	1.72	1.96
<u>Male</u>				
n	19	18	21	58
Mean age	17.51	18.85	16.57	17.52
SD	1.58	1.64	1.33	1.78
<u>Total</u>				
n	29	28	42	99
Mean age	17.55	18.53	16.70	17.46
SD	1.85	1.80	1.53	1.85

Note. ^a street youth in the Street Smarts program.

^b street youth not in the Street Smarts program.

^c youth living at home.

Table 2

Number of Participants by Group Over Time

	<u>ST^a</u> <u>n</u>	<u>SC^b</u> <u>n</u>	<u>HC^c</u> <u>n</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>n</u>
<u>Pretest</u>	29	28	42	99
<u>Posttest</u>	17	7	20	44
<u>Follow-up</u>	13	4	10	27

Note. ^a street youth in the Street Smarts program.

^b street youth not in the Street Smarts program.

^c youth living at home.

Table 3

Comparison of Subjects Continuing and Those Dropping Out on Major Variables

Variable	<u>Continuers</u> n = 44		<u>Dropouts</u> n = 57		t
	M	SD	M	SD	
Age	17.11	1.62	17.75	1.99	1.67
<u>Well-Being</u>					
Health Rating	1.70	.90	1.61	.69	.54
Fear Rating	2.64	1.08	2.81	.98	.79
No. of worries	2.36	1.17	2.09	.98	1.20
Hopelessness	5.65	4.57	5.50	4.37	.13
<u>Resourcefulness</u>					
Helping Places	2.00	1.27	1.97	1.00	.10
Solutions #	2.12	.89	1.78	1.15	1.27
Spending Rules	1.51	.89	1.39	.66	.63
<u>Competence</u>					
Psychosocial	58.81	9.22	61.94	11.87	1.46
Behavioural	19.50	3.39	20.38	4.78	1.05
Self Efficacy	18.78	3.64	20.82	4.24	2.54**
Self-World	20.53	3.42	20.74	4.33	.29
<u>Environmental</u>					
Pers. Supports	23.23	4.69	25.68	4.51	2.54**
Pers. Threats	6.67	3.52	6.41	3.53	.34
Phys. Supports	21.14	4.09	21.38	4.33	.28
Phys. Threats	4.35	2.50	3.90	2.31	.88
<u>School</u>					
Grade	10.68	1.64	10.74	1.35	.19
Average	3.55	1.23	3.47	1.20	.33
<u>Running</u>					
Age First Run	13.73	3.00	13.74	2.65	.01
Previous Runs	1.74	1.86	1.61	1.76	.34

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

Procedures

The Street Smarts program in its current format was presented in the Fall of 1992 at the SAYRC. At this time the evaluation protocol was designed and tested with participants. Two complete series were offered in the Spring of 1993 at the SAYRC and at the Drop-in Centre for street youth operated in downtown Ottawa by the Youth Services Bureau of Ottawa-Carleton (YSB). Three other series were offered in this Drop-in Centre in the Fall of 1993, the Winter of 1994 and the Spring of 1994. Another series was offered in the Spring of 1994 at a suburban Drop-in Centre for street youth also operated by YSB.

A chronicle of the intervention recorded the attendance, events and highlights in the session logs (a blank sample log is attached as Appendix 3). The integrity of the intervention was maintained through supervision with an experienced youth services supervisor, and through a review of logs and notes from leaders and guests.

In total, seven different Street Smarts series were offered at the three venues. The groups were lead by eight different individuals who worked in five combinations of leaders. Thirteen individuals from a variety of community, social and health organizations participated as guest experts. Sixty-eight separate sessions were offered with a total attendance of 279 youth. Some youth attended sessions in more than one series, but it was difficult to identify

these individuals or their number with any certainty because of the common practise among street youth of using different names. It is estimated that 144 different individuals (59 females and 85 males) attended at one time or another. Average attendance was four youth per session and ranged from one to fourteen individuals.

Subjects in the ST group were first recruited for the Street Smarts program through social services personnel working with street youth, and by means of posters and informal networks. These youth were subsequently asked to participate in the study. Participation in the Street Smarts program was not contingent on participation in the study. Although all youth in Street Smarts were invited to participate in the study, only 20% (29 of 144) chose to be interviewed. Street Youth who chose not to participate in the Street Smarts program but agreed to be interviewed comprised the SC group. These youth were contacted through the same networks and facilities as the ST group members. Youth for the HC comparison group were recruited through recreation facilities and social programs. All subjects were assured of confidentiality and were free to discontinue involvement at any time. Informed consent was obtained from all subjects (see Appendix 4). Participants in the study were free to attend the Street Smarts program at any time and a small number did join a series underway shortly after their initial interview. Subjects were paid for their time

in the interviews in increasing amounts to encourage continuing involvement: \$5 for the first assessment, \$10 for the second assessment, and \$15 for the third set of responses.

The protocol and measures used were adapted from a variety of sources, combining proven and successful features into a comprehensive evaluation. All consenting subjects received a battery of measures administered at three times coinciding with the start, conclusion, and two months after a Street Smarts series. The measures were administered verbally during a one hour structured interview conducted by a trained researcher. A verbal assessment was chosen over a written procedure to avoid difficulties with varying levels of literacy among subjects. Exceptions were made on several occasions when subjects would request to read and complete the form themselves. In these instances the interviewer remained with the subject to answer questions from the subject and to review the answers for completeness.

Measures

Research in the area of services to street youth and evaluation of outcomes has been sparse. There are few established options for the assessment of street youth and little to guide the selection of methodologies or measures. In some situations research among street youth has relied on instruments that are well documented with other groups, including clinical populations (Wurzbacher et al, 1991).

However, given the unique nature of street youth and their circumstances, this approach may be misapplying these measures. The choice at this stage of development in the field of street youth research is to use well documented instruments that may provide statistically valid but less meaningful results or to initiate the developmental process of refining newly created measures. The latter course of action was selected in this instance. Consequently, measures were employed that incorporated features suggested by existing measures, theory, clinical practice, and practicality. It must be acknowledged that the results obtained from these measures suffer from an absence of established validity and unknown psychometric properties.

The measures assessed personal information, psychosocial competence, knowledge, and general hopelessness. Measurement of the intervention was accomplished by recording attendance, logging activities, and reviewing notes of leaders and guests. Participant assessment was obtained through (a) a consumer measure administered at the end of the series, (b) a similar measure collected after selected sessions, (c) informal feedback in the seminars, and (d) focus groups conducted at the completion of a series.

The measures record information about the subject obtained from the subject and, consequently, provide a limited perspective. However, self reports have been used

elsewhere for various purposes and the information provided has been well received (Cohen et al., 1991; Kufeldt & Nimmo, 1987; Powers et al., 1990; Smart et al., 1990). In fact, self reports are the very foundation of participant oriented research (Tyler et al., 1991). Further, subjective measures often prove to be the only indicator available. The validity of these reports need not be diminished by an absence of corroborating evidence. It may be argued that in many instances the perception of the subject is more pertinent than the objective facts.

Individual responses were encoded by a trained researcher. Answers that were unclear or difficult to determine were reviewed with the interviewer, scorer, and supervisor, and a consensus score obtained. Data was analyzed using the Statistical Package for The Social Sciences (SPSS): PC+ for Windows (Norusis/SPSS Inc., 1993).

The Personal Information Form (PIF) is attached as Appendix 5 and consists of 34 questions dealing with such topics as; age, gender, language, ethnic identity, current living situation, street experience, health, past and present education, employment, and income. This measure was adapted from a format developed by the Community Task Force for Homeless/Street Youth (1992) to collect personal information from street youth in the Ottawa-Carleton area.

The Attitude/Perception Survey (APS) is based on the psychosocial competence paradigm developed by Tyler (1978).

Tyler proposed that individuals develop psychosocial characteristics in relation to various life contexts and that an individual's pattern of competence changes with changing contexts. This model suits the ever-changing experience of street youth. An instrument recently created by Tyler to assess psychosocial competencies has been used with street youth and marginalized youth in several different cultures (Tyler, Tyler, Tomasello, & Zhang, 1992; Tyler et al., 1991). In this measure, psychosocial competencies are assessed along the dimensions of self-efficacy (SEFF), self-world relations (SW) and behavioral attributes (BA). Tyler suggests that these interact within the individual and across different environments. The environment is assessed along parameters of personal supports (PES), personal threats (PET), physical supports (PHS), and physical threats (PHT). Each dimension is assessed using several questions each presented in five parts. For example, participants are asked to rate their personal happiness in general and then to rate personal happiness in the different contexts of home, school, street, and institutions. The instrument uses a five point Likert scale of 1 (the least) to 5 (the most).

Tyler et al. (1991), in a study involving street youth in Bogota, Columbia, assessed reliabilities for all scales. They reported Alpha coefficients for psychosocial competence in different contexts to range from .40 for the SEFF street

to .77 for SW home and in general ranging from .28 for SEFF to .53 for BA. A composite scale was created by summing the subscales for each context and in general, which yielded higher Alpha scores (.49 for general to .87 for institution). The environmental parameters yielded better reliabilities, only Alpha scores for PHT, in the home and institution contexts, fell below .63 (.46 and .36 respectively). Tyler et al. concluded that, while the general ratings were lower and "tentative", the reliabilities for the environmental parameters were more than adequate. They suggested that the small number of respondents (14) in the subject pool might be responsible for this result. However, this explanation does not adequately account for the difference between the psychosocial and environmental dimensions nor differences between contexts. Further work by Tyler and his associates (Tyler et al. ,1992) with 57 Latino youth in Washington, DC. yielded somewhat better reliability scores on all counts. Median Alpha for psychosocial scales was .68 while the environmental scales obtained a median Alpha of .69, only SEFF on the streets and PHS and PHT in institutions were judged to be less than adequate. Concurrent validity has been demonstrated by predictable internal correlations among contexts. Scores in various contexts were reported by Tyler et al. (1992) to be positively related to the experience of the youth in those contexts.

The original instrument was altered to a minimal degree to better reflect the street experience in the Ottawa-Carleton area and to allow a more consolidated interview format. Specifically; one question regarding availability of sex was omitted; context references to institutions were replaced by the term social agencies (defined for participants as places designed to help people); and the environmental and situational questions were assessed in general as well as in specific contexts (Tyler's instrument sought responses only for specific contexts). The APS (Appendix 6) is composed of 34 multi-part questions covering attitudes and beliefs of the youth about themselves, their social behaviour, their supports, their threats, and their living conditions. Psychosocial and environmental scale scores are derived from a simple summation of ratings on designated items.

The Basic Information and Awareness Questionnaire (BIAQ) (Appendix 7) was developed to assess the information acquired during the Street Smarts sessions. This is a knowledge based questionnaire created specifically for this study. The BIAQ consists of 23 questions assessing the respondent's awareness of issues and solutions, general information, and specific behaviours. Individual items are drawn from the learning objectives of the various sessions in the Street Smarts program. For example, question 23 asks the subject, "where can a person who has been abused go for

help?". This question is based on information provided during sessions dealing with street survival.

Beck's Hopelessness Scale (BHS) (Beck et al., 1974) (Appendix 8) was used to assess hopelessness, an important characteristic of the individuals under consideration. Beck, Weissman, Lester, & Trexler (1974) suggest "that a person's hopelessness can be objectified by defining it in terms of a system of negative expectancies concerning himself [sic.] and his [sic.] future life" (p. 865). Lack of hope may be expressed by street youth through an avoidance of future planning, giving up, taking risks, poor hygiene, or desperately seeking companionship. The street youth population exhibits a high incidence of substance abuse, suicidal ideation and behaviour, self abuse, and overall depression (Adlaf & Smart, 1990; Community Task Force for Homeless/Street Youth, 1992; Cohen & MacKenzie, 1991; Yates et al., 1988). These may result from the trauma of living on the streets, an accumulation of stressful events, or some predisposition. The BHS is a 20 item, true or false, questionnaire that deals with the individual's attitude and perception of their future. Overall hopelessness is the sum of keyed scores on the individual items, yielding a range of 0 to 20. Psychometric properties of the BHS are adequate for these purposes. Internal reliability analysis using a sample of 294 para-suicidal patients produced an Alpha of .93, with all inter-item correlations exceeding statistical

significance (Beck et al. 1974). Validity data from the same study found a correlation of .74, ($P < .001$) between BHS and clinical ratings of depression. The BHS was administered at time 1 to street youth (SC and ST) but technical problems precluded subsequent collection from these groups or information from HC group in sufficient numbers to be useful. Problems included refusal to answer, incomplete answers, and interviewer omissions.

The Client Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ) (Appendix 9) is a 27 item questionnaire used to obtain feedback from participants in the Street Smarts program at the conclusion of a series. This measure was administered to participants in the study at posttest and follow-up. The CSQ incorporates a client satisfaction measure developed by Larsen, Attkinson, Hargreaves, and Nguyen (1979) which consists of 8 questions, rated on a four-point Likert scale, dealing with the services received. Ratings are summed to yield a global client satisfaction score. Possible scores range from 8 to 32. The authors suggest that scores of 27 or more are considered high, while those of 20 or less are considered low. Internal reliability for the Larsen et al. (1979) instrument was assessed and Alpha scores of .92 and .93 from were obtained. They also found scores to be positively correlated with remaining in treatment and higher attendance for treatment indicative of a degree of external validity.

This measure was extracted to provide a global satisfaction score.

Other questions were added to the Larsen measure to provide more detailed and subjective feedback. These included questions regarding preferences, suggestions, impact, recommendations and conclusions. It also solicited general feedback on the structure, guests, leaders, topics, and general purpose of the program.

Other forms of feedback were developed, based on the CSQ, to collect information from as many participants as possible. These were not therefore restricted to those participating in the interviews for the study. A shorter version of the CSQ (CSQ-st, Appendix 10) was administered to participants after selected sessions (18 sessions in total) to provide additional information. As well, a final debriefing based on questions from the CSQ was conducted at the termination of each series. Spontaneous feedback and observations of group participants were recorded in session logs and supervisory notes.

Analyses

Analyses were conducted in four phases consistent with the objectives of the study. The first reviewed qualitative data collected from the all street youth (ST + SC). The second examined differences between street youth (ST + SC) and youth still at home (HC). The third stage determined differences between street youth who chose to participate in the Street Smarts program and those who chose not to take part (ST vs. SC). The fourth set of analyses represents the primary focus of this study: an examination of changes among the street youth who participated in the Street Smarts program (ST).

Street youth were interviewed in terms of their personal history, school involvement, running experiences, precipitating factors, street experiences, supports on the street, personal skills and attitudes, and future plans. The information obtained was then analyzed and summarized. Street - home comparisons were conducted through simple independent sample t-tests and Chi² analyses of scores at pretest. Variables used for these and subsequent comparisons were selected a priori and are described below. Each of these sets of analyses was repeated while controlling for gender and age. Participation choice was examined by comparing Street Smarts participants with street youth not participating in Street Smarts on pretest scores. Analyses proceeded in the same manner as with street - home

comparisons. The analyses of treatment effects reviewed the consequences of participation in the Street Smarts program as assessed by psychometric and satisfaction measures. Analyses of psychometric measures examined changes in participant and situational attribute scores obtained from individuals in the ST group over time, and in comparison to non-participants. Changes in the Street Smarts participants (ST) were examined using a paired samples t-test for scores obtained at each administration. The performance of the ST group with HC group at posttest and follow-up was examined by comparing mean scores while statistically controlling for pretest scores. As would be expected, the scope and methods available for the analysis of the psychometric measures was somewhat limited as a result of the high attrition rates experienced in the study and limited number of subjects. Similar comparisons with the SC group were conducted only at posttest. Further analyses of treatment effect were conducted using the various client satisfaction measures, subjective feedback and unobtrusive observations. The global satisfaction score and other CSQ information obtained from youth in the study were calculated and summarized. Information from other participants in Street Smarts, obtained through the CSQ-ST, focus groups, and sessions logs, were recorded and summarized.

This study was initially designed to employ a multivariate approach to statistical analyses, preferably

using repeated measures. However, a number of factors emerged in the course of conducting the study that precluded the use of such powerful statistical procedures. Foremost among these are the rates of attrition across all groups, but particularly among subjects in the SC group whose numbers were reduced to 4 at follow-up. In addition, underlying assumptions regarding homogeneity of variance, normal distributions, and homogeneity of variance/covariance matrices could not be adequately assessed. Consequently, analyses were restricted to the rudimentary and less powerful approach of comparing group means by t-tests.

It is well known that the overuse of large numbers of statistical comparisons (i.e. multiple t-tests) tends to capitalize on chance relationships among large sets of variables. Often statistical techniques designed to minimize significant, but spurious findings, such as Bonferroni and Scheffe corrections, are conducted in instances such as these. However, due to the exploratory nature of parts of this study it was felt that a less rigorous approach could be used and that any significant relationships that were uncovered would necessarily be viewed as tentative until confirmed through future, more focussed research efforts.

In addition, in order to reduce the number of variables and thus the number of statistical comparisons, a small number of "marker" variables were selected a priori. These were available within the measures collected. The selection

of the marker variables was guided by theory and existing research identifying important personal and situational attributes in the lives of street youth and relevant to the objectives of the Street Smarts program. Indicator variables for each attributes were then selected from various measures. The attributes include Sense of well being, Resourcefulness, Competence, Environmental relations, School relations, and Running history.

Sense of well being was selected as a positive outcome for the Street Smarts program. This attribute has been identified the broader literature on programs for street youth as an essential product of services (Michaud, 1988; Reuler, 1991). The marker variables selected to represent this attribute were: health self rating, feeling afraid, and number of reported worries (contained in the PIF); someone to talk to (contained in the BIAQ); and BHS total score.

Resourcefulness is conceptually related to adaptability and survival on the street. Youth who are resourceful will likely be more capable of meeting the new and changing demands placed on them. This attribute was indicated by: number of places to get help when abused, number of solutions generated for a problem, and number of budgeting rules (contained in the BIAQ); and days without eating, and receiving social assistance (from the PIF).

The attribute of competence has been identified as a cornerstone of Tyler's work in third world and immigrant

street youth (Tyler, 1978; Tyler et al, 1991; and Tyler et al, 1992). Tyler developed a measure to assess levels of personal competence along several dimensions, as noted above. While the measure is not widely researched nor validated it does represent a potentially useful instrument for the study of this aspect of street youth. Consequently, this instrument was used in much the same manner as suggested by Tyler. However, only general responses were used in calculations, responses related to specific environments were not analyzed within the present study although they had been collected. Total Psychosocial Competence (PSC) was calculated as the total of the subscales; Behavioural Attributes (BA), Self Efficacy (SEFF), and Self World (SW) from the APS. These subscales were also reported. These represent more specific aspects of the concept of competence. Behavioural Attributes (questions 1, 2, 8, 9, 12) assess the willful planning done by the individual within their life. Self efficacy (questions 3, 4, 14, 16, 17) reflects the pleasure they gain from the sense and exercising of control in their life. Self world attitudes (questions 5, 6, 7, 11, 15) depict the extent to which the individual sees their world as a benign and predictable place. Cronbach's Alpha was calculated for each of these scales for the data obtained from all subjects at time one. These revealed Alpha values for PSC of .859, BA of .655, SEFF of .786 and SW of .706.

Environmental relations as suggested by Tyler, 1978, reflect the perceptions of support and threat held by the individual. This information was also collected within the APS and included Personal Threats (PET, questions 23, 24, 26), Personal Supports (PES, questions 13, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22), Physical Threats (PHT, questions 25, 27) and Physical Supports (PHS, questions 30, 31, 32, 33, 34). Cronbach's Alpha was also calculated for these subscales and produced an Alpha for PET of .665, for PES of .863, for PHT of .495, and for PHS of .834.

School relations have been identified as variables related to family conflict, running and depth of involvement on the street (Kufeldt & Nimmo, 1987). Variables related to school relations would provide an indication of the extent of individual's involvement and connection to their school and the education system. This could also signify that the individual was more inclined to participate in a learning experience and more willing to become involved in Street Smarts. School relations were indicated; by last grade, reported grade average, enrollment, attendance and history of special education, all contained in the BIAQ.

Running history has a clear and immediate impact on the youth on the street. The risks on the street increase with time (Kufeldt & Nimmo, 1987) and frequency of running has been suggested to indicate the use of running as a coping mechanism (Palenski & Launer, 1987). This attribute likely

plays a mediating role within the running experience and consequently on the participation and impact of Street Smarts. Running history was indicated by; age of first run, running to another city, wish to return home, parental knowledge, and number of times run, all contained in the PIF.

Results

With gender and age potentially influencing other variables preliminary analyses were conducted to ascertain if and to what extent these might influence other findings. Comparisons between males and females in the study are presented as Tables 4 and 5. Significant differences between the genders were found on the "number of places to get help when abused", fear ratings and special education history. From table 4 we can see that females felt more afraid (2.35 for females, $SD = .92$ vs. 2.96 for males, $SD = 1.04$, $t(97) = 3.08$, $p < .01$) and could identify more places for help (2.40 for females, $SD = 1.17$ vs. 1.68 for males, $SD = 1.03$, $t(93) = 3.14$, $p < .01$). Table 5 indicates that males throughout all groups were more likely to report being in special education classes (57% for males vs. 26% for females, $X^2 94$, $N = 99 = 8.09$, $p < .01$).

Age influences were examined using Pearson correlations between age and the selected variables for all subjects (see table 6). Significant correlations were observed between current age and ten of the key variables; fear rating, number of spending rules, psychosocial competence and the three subscales associated with it, personal and physical supports, grade, and number of previous runs.

These analyses were augmented by repeating an analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) for all comparisons reported below using gender as a between groups variable and age as a

covariant. Throughout these analyses there were no significant interactions between gender and other grouping variables and age as the covariant was not found to make a significant contribution.

Street Youth

The information regarding youth on the street (ST + SC) at pretest was summarized. There were more males than females among street youth participating in the study (male $n=37$, 65%, female $n=20$, 35%). The sample was 18.03 years of age ($SD= 1.88$, range 13.17 - 21.50) although 3 youth refused to reveal their age. The predominant language was English ($n=38$, 67%), but French ($n=12$, 21%) was represented, as were other languages ($n=7$, 12%). However, all respondents were able to be interviewed in English without noticeable difficulties. Responses related to family composition indicated that seventeen of the twenty-four youth (70%) who reported the number of parents they had been living with, had come from two parent families. Average number of siblings was 1.9, with 5 youth (10%) being the only child.

The analyses of information from street youth will be presented in terms of their well-being, resourcefulness, school history, and running history. Supplementary information has been analyzed and is reported as well. Specific measures of competence and environmental relations from the APS were not analyzed at this stage because their

Table 4

Comparison of Genders on Major Variables
t-tests

Variable	<u>Males</u> n = 58		<u>Females</u> n = 41		t
	M	SD	M	SD	
Age	17.52	1.78	17.36	1.97	.42
<u>Well-Being</u>					
Health Rating	1.63	.86	1.70	.75	.09
Fear Rating	2.98	1.04	2.35	.92	3.08**
No. of worries	2.26	1.15	2.20	1.03	.30
Hopelessness	5.55	4.35	5.67	4.75	.09
<u>Resourcefulness</u>					
Helping Places	1.68	1.03	2.40	1.17	3.14**
Solutions #	2.00	1.31	1.92	1.26	.29
Spending Rules	1.54	.90	1.35	.61	.98
<u>Competence</u>					
Psychosocial	60.01	9.78	60.47	11.61	.21
Behavioural	20.02	4.13	19.73	4.04	.34
Self Efficacy	19.75	3.69	19.61	4.50	.17
Self-World	20.45	3.72	21.13	3.97	1.12
<u>Environmental</u>					
Pers. Supports	24.70	4.43	23.84	5.13	.86
Pers. Threats	7.19	3.76	5.76	3.05	1.94
Phys. Supports	21.45	3.89	21.00	4.56	.50
Phys. Threats	4.20	2.43	4.08	2.41	.25
<u>School</u>					
Grade	10.71	1.63	10.69	1.34	.07
Average	3.36	1.27	3.71	1.12	1.38
<u>Running</u>					
Age First Run	13.78	2.93	13.65	2.67	.16
Previous Runs	1.90	1.84	1.38	1.74	1.36

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

Table 5

Comparison of Genders on Major Variables
Chi²

	<u>Male</u>		<u>Female</u>		
<u>Variable</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>X²</u>
<u>Resourcefulness</u>					
Someone to Talk To	47	85	39	95	2.35
Social Assistance	21	40	14	40	.00
Day Without Food	21	38	14	36	.04
<u>School</u>					
Enrolled in School	36	63	30	75	1.52
Attending School	30	53	27	65	1.47
Special Education	33	57	11	26	8.09**
<u>Running</u>					
Run to Another City	18	60	11	68	.34
Wish to Return	7	25	2	11	1.29
Parents Know	22	81	10	58	2.70

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

Table 6

Correlations of Age with Major Variables

<u>Variables</u>	<u>r</u>
<u>Well-Being</u>	
Health Rating	.11
Fear Rating	-.24*
Number of worries	.07
Hopelessness	.10
<u>Resourcefulness</u>	
Places to Get Help	.04
Number of Solutions	.19
Spending Rules	.27*
<u>Competence</u>	
Total Psychosocial	-.30**
Behavioural Subscale	-.28**
Self Efficacy Subscale	-.23*
Self-World Subscale	-.28**
<u>Environmental</u>	
Personal Supports	-.31**
Personal Threats	.07
Physical Supports	-.37***
Physical Threats	.19
<u>School</u>	
Grade	.47***
Average	-.02
<u>Running</u>	
Age of First Run	.08
Previous Runs	.24*

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

importance is only found in their relation to results from comparison groups.

Well-being measures include health ratings, fear ratings, number of worries, and general hopelessness. Street youth rated their health and identified the reasons behind their ratings. Average health rating was 2.01 ($SD = .85$) on a 4-point scale, (a rating of 1 being very healthy) which corresponds to the description somewhat healthy. Reasons for their beliefs about their health varied greatly. More common answers of those rating their health as poor mentioned physical illness ($n = 17, 31\%$), smoking ($n = 11, 20\%$), and no food ($n = 6, 11\%$). Those rating themselves as healthy mentioned eating and exercise 6 times (11%). In terms of safe sexual practices, approximately half of the street youth in the sample ($n = 27$) always used condoms, while 10 (17%) used them half the time or less. However, all but one youth could identify reasons why they should be using condoms at all times. Dietary concerns have been a long standing concern for street youth and these findings supported that opinion. About half ($n = 28$) plan to eat healthy foods, regularly, but most youth (32 of 54, 59%) had gone at least one day in the previous two weeks without food. Twelve youth (23%) continue to eat occasionally at home, 41% (20 of 57) ate in three or more locations in the two weeks prior to the interview.

Most youth ($n = 46$, 81%) felt fearful while on the street. The most common primary fears reflected concern for their future ($n = 13$, 28%), being alone ($n = 11$, 24%), and personal safety ($n = 9$, 20%), with remainder of the respondents concerned with other items. On average, respondents mentioned 2.4 specific worries that they had ($SD = 1.05$). Analyses of Beck's Hopelessness Survey (BHS) produced an average score of 5.7 ($SD = 4.58$, range 0 - 17) which is in the low hopelessness range. Seven youth scored in the top third of the range (13 or higher).

Resourcefulness was examined through the number of places to get help, number of solutions to a problem, spending rules, having someone to talk to, having social assistance, and going one day without food. Questions related to getting and giving help were reviewed. On a practical level, most know where to get help if they were abused or assaulted ($n = 47$, 82%), but 6 (12%) had no idea where they would get help. Results indicate that 46 youth (80%) had someone to talk to, in whom they could confide and most ($n = 47$, 82%) had sound reasons for that trust. Fifty-three (93%) would help a friend who was upset, but nine of these (16%) made counterproductive suggestions. Most ($n = 52$, 91%) would try to help a friend who had overdosed, and 43 (81%) would take suitable actions. Eleven youth (21%) could not think of one sign that a friend was suicidal, most ($n = 47$, 82%) would try to help anyway, and 78% ($n = 37$) of

their responses would be helpful. All respondents could identify how they show they are upset but most of their actions were ineffective or counter-effective ($n = 51, 93\%$). When asked to provide an example of a problem and the steps they had taken to solve it 5 (10%) could not provide any explanation, while 41 (72%) could provide two or more steps they had taken.

Most youth had had jobs at some point in time ($n = 52, 91\%$), but much fewer were currently employed ($n = 17, 30\%$). Take home pay averaged a meagre \$50 a week and only two reported full time employment. Only 31 youth (54%) could or would identify other sources of funds and of these a third ($n = 10$) still received money from their parents. All sources of other funds provided less than \$100 per week and in 11 situations less than \$10 per week was obtained. Thirty-four youth indicated that they received some form of social assistance, of those, 31 reported varying levels of income between \$112 and \$821 per month. Most youth responded to the inadequate, varied, and unpredictable income by formulating rules for their spending of money. Forty-three (78%) reported having sort of budgeting process in mind, if not in fact. Twenty-three (40%) could specify one and twenty-two (39%) were able to name two or more budgetary rules they have for themselves.

Most youth (32 of 54, 59%) had gone at least one day in the previous two weeks without food. All but 4 youth knew of

2

PM-1 3½"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

at least one place they could get a bed for the night. Parents (37%), friends (31%) and the place where they are now staying (23%) would all provide them with a place to sleep, but only 2 youth (4%) felt they could get a bed at one of the shelters. Sixteen (28%) had spent at least one night at their parents in the past two weeks, while nine (15%) had spent one or more nights in shelters. Nineteen (33%) had spent a night with a friend and sixteen (28%) had spent a night in three or more different locations in the past two weeks.

Street youth were asked to describe life on the streets from several perspectives. When asked about the experience for most youth in general, 16 (31%) said it was fun or good, while the remainder reported that it was no good ($n = 11$, 21%), scary ($n = 6$, 11%), cold ($n = 2$, 4%), with no money ($n = 11$, 21%), and no food ($n = 3$, 6%). Respondents were evenly split in their positive and negative descriptions of their life on the street, 28 (53%) had positive comments while 24 (46%) had negative descriptors. Specifically, only 1 youth (2%) found life exciting, 15 (28%) said it was good, 12 (23%) said it was O.K., 11 (21%) said it was not good, 10 (19%) said it was hard and 3 (6%) said it was boring. When asked what they liked best about the street 47 (82%) mentioned the freedom they had, and 5 (9%) identified friends. When asked to report what they liked least about the streets the largest proportion identified violence ($n =$

16, 29%), followed by no place to stay ($n = 8$, 15%), the cold ($n = 7$, 13%), no money ($n = 7$, 13%), hunger ($n = 5$, 9%), lonely ($n = 4$, 7%). The remaining 8 youth (15%) identified other items.

Most street youth in the sample had plans for their future and what they wanted to be ($n = 46$, 85%). Fifty-two youth stated how they would go about getting to where they wanted to be in life, and 81% of those ($n = 42$) provided effective, reasonable steps.

School history included grade level, average grades, current enrollment, current attendance, and history of special education. The last grade attended ranged from grade 5 to second year of post secondary education, average last grade attended was reportedly 10.6 ($SD = 1.77$, $n = 55$). Average grades obtained in school were reported by youth and these indicated a mean grades average between 60% and 69% ($SD = 12.6$, $n = 54$), with only 7 (13%) reporting failing grades. Most youth in our sample were not enrolled in school at the time of their first interview ($n = 31$, 56%). Thirty-seven (67%) were not currently attending and on average had not attended for nearly six months ($SD = 6.09$, $n = 24$). At some point in their school lives, 64% (36 of 56) had been placed in a special education class.

Running history included age at the time of first run, number of times run, running to another city, wish to return home, and parental knowledge. Few had left home recently, 7

youth or 17% of our sample were on the street less than a year. The remainder had been away from home for periods up to 11.83 years. Average length of time on the street was 3.23 years ($SD = 2.51$, range 1 month to 11 years, 10 months). Average age when last at home was 15.26 years ($SD = 2.60$) and varied from 8 to 20 years of age. Only 4 youth, 8%, had never run from home before this time. Of the remainder who provided an answer to this question (45) the average number of prior runs was 3.0 ($SD = 1.35$), with 10 youth having run five or more times. Average age at the time they first left home was 13.76 years ($SD = 2.77$) and ranged from 8 to 18 years. Of those who answered questions about distances they had run ($n = 41$), 68% ($n = 28$) had run to another city at some time.

Youth were asked to provide their impressions of themselves at earlier ages and of their family. Twenty youth (35%) reported that they remembered themselves as not happy or badly behaved at age five, and twenty four (42%) used these characterizations for themselves at age ten. Reports from 17 of the 51 (33%) who responded to questions about their family life judged their homelife to be good or normal. Thirty-three (65%) reported that homelife was not good, conflictual or substance abusing.

Participants reported their reasons for leaving home, staying away and continuing to live on the street. Reasons for first leaving home are predominantly found in parental

conflict and abuse, although many youth ($n = 19$, 33%) refused to or could not answer these questions. Of those that did, 31 youth (82%) identified parental conflict and 5 (13%) mentioned abusive homes. Only 11 youth of 43 respondents (25%) indicated that they did not have permission to leave. The reasons these youth were not currently living at home replicated these proportions, 91% (39 of 48 respondents) cited conflict and abuse in their family. Only 9 of 43 (21%) respondents wished to return to their homes. Reasons for not returning home also revealed a perception of continuing problems with conflict in the home, 36 (63%) reported that continuing conflict prevented their return, but 7 (12%) simply preferred their present life. Of some interest is the large portion who refused to answer this question ($n = 14$, 25%).

Street - Home Comparisons

As might be expected a variety of significant differences existed between youth at home and youth on the street. Results of the comparisons of means and χ^2 analyses have been tabulated and presented as Table 7 and Table 8 respectively. These analyses obtained several significant differences. Youth still at home were younger by 1.3 years. In terms of their sense of well-being youth at home felt less fearful and healthier. Resourcefulness measures indicated that youth on the street had more spending rules, could provide more solutions, were more

likely to be on social assistance, more likely to have gone a day without food. Differences between street and home youth were most dramatic throughout the various psychosocial scales in the competence and environmental relations categories. Mean scores for all subscales and total psychosocial competence favoured youth at home. School differences were evident a higher reported average grades for youth at home. Street youth were less likely to be enrolled or attending school but more likely to have been in special education at some time. Running history measures reveal that street youth had run more often and more often to another city.

Participation

Comparisons of subjects in the SC and ST groups are presented in tables 9 and 10. As can be seen in table 9, t-tests produced only one significant difference between groups and this was in the realm of well-being. Youth in the ST group identified more worries than youth in the SC group (mean worries for ST group = 2.71 SD = 1.15, mean worries for SC group = 2.04, SD = .82, $t(45) = 2.47$, $p < .05$). Chi² analysis revealed three significant differences between these groups in terms of their resourcefulness and school history. More youth in the SC group were receiving social assistance individuals in the ST group were enrolled in school and attending school than those in the SC group and more. Twenty of the twenty-eight youth in the Street Smarts

Table 7

Comparison of Street Youth with Youth at Home on Major Variables
t-test

Variable	<u>Street</u> n = 58		<u>Home</u> n = 42		t
	M	SD	M	SD	
Age	18.02	1.87	16.71	1.53	13.48***
<u>Well-Being</u>					
Health Rating	2.01	.85	1.19	.40	33.23***
Fear Rating	2.30	.99	3.29	.81	27.39***
No. worries	2.38	1.05	2.03	1.12	2.59
Hopelessness	5.74	4.58	4.78	3.80	.35
<u>Resourcefulness</u>					
Helping Places	1.81	1.19	2.22	1.06	3.02
Solutions #	2.30	1.35	1.49	1.02	9.73**
Spending Rules	1.68	.87	1.00	0.0	14.17***
<u>Competence</u>					
Psychosocial	55.00	8.27	66.90	9.36	43.59***
Behavioural	18.29	3.76	21.95	3.53	23.59***
Self Efficacy	17.87	3.38	22.05	3.58	34.44***
Self-World	18.85	3.57	22.90	2.84	36.30***
<u>Environmental</u>					
Pers. Supports	21.95	4.06	27.14	3.91	38.53***
Pers. Threats	8.00	3.12	4.93	3.24	20.75***
Phys. Supports	18.67	3.85	24.26	1.93	72.83***
Phys. Threats	5.40	2.21	2.74	1.77	38.81***
<u>School</u>					
Grade	10.60	1.77	10.80	1.05	.43
Average	3.07	1.26	4.07	.89	18.96***
<u>Running</u>					
Age First Run	13.75	2.77	13.50	3.70 (n=6)	.17
Previous Runs	2.39	1.77	.40	1.08	1.12***

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

Table 8

Comparison of Street Youth with Youth at Home on Major Variables
Chi²

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Street</u>		<u>Home</u>		<u>X²</u>
	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>	
Gender (female)	20	35%	21	50%	2.21
<u>Resourcefulness</u>					
Someone to Talk To	46	84%	40	98%	4.88*
Social Assistance	34	62%	1	3%	8.98***
Day Without Food	32	58%	3	8%	.97***
<u>School</u>					
Enrolled in School	24	44%	42	100%	34.79***
Attending School	18	33%	39	93%	24.97***
Special Education	36	65%	8	19%	19.85***
<u>Running</u>					
Run to Another City	28	65%	1	17%	4.46**
Wish to Return	9	21%	na		na
Parents Know Whereabouts	31	72%	na		na

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

Table 9

Comparison of Youth in ST group with Youth in SC Group on
Major Variables
t-test:

Variable	ST ^a n = 29		SC ^b n = 28		t
	M	SD	M	SD	
Age	17.56	1.86	18.54	1.80	1.96
<u>Well-Being</u>					
Health Rating	1.93	.72	2.11	.99	.77
Fear Rating	2.32	.94	2.29	1.05	.13
No. worries	2.71	1.15	2.04	.82	2.47*
Hopelessness	6.00	4.52	5.41	4.73	.45
<u>Resourcefulness</u>					
Helping Places	2.07	1.30	1.52	1.00	1.71
Solutions #	2.48	1.53	2.12	1.13	.87
Spending Rules	1.65	.80	1.74	.99	.31
<u>Competence</u>					
Psychosocial	55.56	6.10	54.40	10.16	.51
Behavioural	18.86	2.86	17.69	4.51	1.15
Self Efficacy	17.94	2.87	17.77	3.91	.18
Self-World	18.76	2.80	18.94	4.30	.19
<u>Environmental</u>					
Pers. Supports	22.44	3.47	21.37	4.67	.92
Pers. Threats	7.85	3.07	8.20	3.24	.38
Phys. Supports	18.89	3.27	18.40	4.53	.44
Phys. Threats	5.44	2.21	5.35	2.28	.14
<u>School</u>					
Grade	10.61	1.99	10.63	1.55	.05
Average	2.86	1.27	3.31	1.22	1.33
<u>Running</u>					
Age First Run	13.47	2.52	13.96	2.97	.58
Previous Runs	2.71	1.35	2.82	1.74	.23

Note. ^a street youth in the Street Smarts program.

^b street youth not in the Street Smarts program.

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

Table 10

Comparison of Youth in ST group with Youth in SC Group on
Major Variables
Chi²

<u>Variable</u>	<u>ST^a</u>		<u>SC^b</u>		<u>X²</u>
	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>	
Gender (female)	10	35	10	36	.01
<u>Resourcefulness</u>					
Someone to Talk To	24	85	22	81	.18
Social Assistance	13	48	21	75	4.20*
Day Without Food	15	53	17	65	.37
<u>School</u>					
Enrolled in School	20	71	4	14	17.91***
Attending School	15	53	3	11	11.26***
Special Education	16	57	20	71	1.24
<u>Running</u>					
Run to Another City	10	58	18	75	1.20
Wish to Return	5	28	4	16	.81
Parents Know Whereabouts	15	79	16	67	.79

Note. ^a street youth in the Street Smarts program.

^b street youth not in the Street Smarts program.

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

program were in school while only four of the twenty-seven youth in the SC group were enrolled ($\chi^2(4, N = 55) = 17.91, p < .001$). Similarly, 15 of 28 in ST were attending while only 3 of 27 were attending among the SC group ($\chi^2(4, N = 55) = 11.25, p < .001$). Social assistance was received by 13 of 27 in the ST group and by 21 of 28 in the SC group ($\chi^2(4, N = 55) = 4.20, p < .05$). No other differences were found between youth in the Street Smarts program and youth in the SC group on any other variable.

It is noteworthy that these groups did not significantly differ on length of time on the street ($t(44) = .146, p > .10$). Mean time on the street for youth in the ST group was 3.40 years ($SD = 3.14$, range from .08 to 11.80 years) and 3.09 years for SC ($SD = 1.96$, range from .25 to 7.17 years). Time on the streets was subsequently analyzed with the key variables using Pearson correlations. Length of time on the street was not significantly correlated with any other measure except age when last left home ($r = -.81, n = 44, p < .001$).

Treatment Effects

Standardized Measures

ST - changes over time

The paired samples t-test of pre and posttest means for the selected variables recorded for the ST group revealed no significant differences over time (see Table 11). Chi² analyses revealed no differences from pretest to posttest.

Likewise, comparisons between pre and follow up means revealed no significant changes with one exception in the area of well being and one in the area of school history (see Table 12). Results show a reduction in the number of worries reported and an increase in reported average grades respectively. The average number of worries reported in the ST group at the start was 2.58 ($SD = .90$) and fell to 1.67 ($SD = .78$) at follow up ($t(17) = 2.56, p < .05$). Average grades as reported rose from 2.75 ($SD = 1.21$) to 2.25 ($SD = 1.70$), remembering that a rating of 1 was related to highest levels of grades ($t(17) = 2.57, p < .05$). As with pre - post comparisons Chi² analyses revealed no differences from pretest to follow-up.

Scores on all measures at second and third administrations were uncorrelated to number of Street Smarts sessions attended by the participants.

Comparisons at posttest and follow-up

A t-test of posttest scores adjusted for pretest levels revealed few significant differences between ST and HC groups (see table 13). In resourcefulness, the adjusted number of solutions generated by youth in the ST group were relatively higher than those in the HC group. The competence measures self efficacy was relatively lower for street youth and the environmental relations measures personal threats and physical threats were relatively higher for youth in the HC group. On all other variables there were no significant

differences between street youth who had attended the Streets Smarts program and youth living in their own home over the same period of time. Comparisons between subjects in the ST and SC groups revealed no significant differences at posttest alone, nor when posttest scores were controlled for pretest scores.

A t-test of follow-up scores adjusted for pretest levels revealed only one significant differences between ST and HC groups (see table 14). The only significant difference found at follow-up for the ST group in comparison with HC group was in the competence measures which revealed a higher mean score on self efficacy favouring the HC group. Comparisons between ST and SC groups were not undertaken due to the lack of subjects in the SC group at posttest.

Satisfaction Measures

CSQ

A review of satisfaction measures proceeded as proposed. It must be noted that 5 participants (1 female & 4 males) of the Street Smarts program who had completed first interviews but not subsequent interviews did complete satisfaction questionnaires at the end of the series. These have been included with the 17 participants (6 females & 11 males) in the ST group who completed full second interviews, for the analyses of satisfaction measures only. The respondents who completed the CSQ ($n = 22$, 7 females & 15 males) attended an average of 4.07 sessions, $SD = 2.18$,

Table 11

Pre - Post Comparisons for Youth in Street Smarts
Paired t-test

n = 17

Variable	<u>Pretest</u>		<u>Posttest</u>		t
	M	SD	M	SD	
<u>Well-Being</u>					
Health Rating	1.88	.60	1.94	.56	.37
Fear Rating	2.50	.92	2.72	.89	.72
No. worries	2.53	1.07	2.00	1.18	1.77
Hopelessness	6.35	4.58	6.59	5.70	.30
<u>Resourcefulness</u>					
Helping Places	2.06	1.18	1.81	1.04	.70
Solutions #	1.87	1.35	2.20	1.74	.86
Spending Rules	1.50	.71	1.30	.48	.80
<u>Competence</u>					
Psychosocial	55.09	5.99	54.50	6.67	.40
Behavioural	18.59	3.26	19.00	3.62	.51
Self Efficacy	18.37	2.52	17.65	1.77	1.03
Self-World	18.13	2.68	17.85	2.85	.36
<u>Environmental</u>					
Pers. Supports	22.36	3.06	22.41	4.23	.06
Pers. Threats	7.87	3.56	8.12	2.12	.35
Phys. Supports	18.47	3.29	22.43	13.70	1.21
Phys. Threats	5.37	2.31	5.75	2.11	1.10
<u>School</u>					
Grade	10.65	1.73	10.82	1.84	1.00
Average	2.88	1.32	2.94	1.56	.44
<u>Running</u>					
Age First Run	13.36	1.69	12.45	2.11	1.63
Previous Runs	2.87	1.07	3.07	1.53	1.15

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

Table 12

Pre - Follow-up Comparisons for Youth in Street Smarts
Paired t-test

n = 13

Variable	<u>Pretest</u>		<u>Posttest</u>		t
	M	SD	M	SD	
<u>Well-Being</u>					
Health Rating	2.00	.43	2.00	.60	.00
Fear Rating	2.33	.78	2.41	.67	.27
No. worries	2.58	.90	1.67	.78	2.56*
Hopelessness	7.85	4.20	6.38	5.81	.88
<u>Resourcefulness</u>					
Helping Places	2.08	1.08	2.08	2.19	.00
Solutions #	2.33	1.43	1.66	.98	1.38
Spending Rules	1.57	.79	1.14	.69	2.12
<u>Competence</u>					
PsychoSocial	55.02	5.28	57.75	9.75	1.15
Behavioural	18.61	2.66	18.85	3.24	.27
Self Efficacy	18.54	2.70	18.69	2.08	.29
Self-World	17.87	2.85	20.21	8.99	.98
<u>Environmental</u>					
Pers. Supports	21.98	3.23	21.45	3.99	.63
Pers. Threats	7.96	3.74	8.00	2.61	.04
Phys. Supports	18.92	3.73	17.77	4.26	1.09
Phys. Threats	5.46	2.33	5.07	2.53	.50
<u>School</u>					
Grade	10.25	1.48	10.33	1.50	1.00
Average	2.75	1.21	2.25	1.48	2.57*
<u>Running</u>					
Age First Run	13.60	2.07	13.30	1.70	1.41
Previous Runs	2.50	1.35	2.60	1.43	.43

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

Table 13

Comparisons of Adjusted Mean Scores Between Youth in the ST Group and Youth in the HC Group at Posttest

<u>Variable</u>	<u>ST^a</u> <u>n = 17</u> <u>M</u>	<u>HC^c</u> <u>n = 20</u> <u>M</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Well-Being</u>			
Health Rating	1.77	1.48	2.43
Fear Rating	2.91	2.96	.02
Number of worries	2.11	1.99	.12
Hopelessness	5.58	4.00	.61
<u>Resourcefulness</u>			
Places to Get Help	1.81	2.26	1.74
Number of Solutions	2.14	1.06	6.18*
Spending Rules	1.27	1.02	2.13
<u>Competence</u>			
Total PsychoSocial	62.02	63.43	.26
Behavioural	20.80	21.45	.35
Self Efficacy	19.05	22.39	12.41***
Self-World	19.85	21.90	2.32
<u>Environmental</u>			
Personal Supports	25.89	25.22	.22
Personal Threats	7.44	5.24	9.87**
Physical Supports	26.92	19.81	2.61
Physical Threats	4.83	3.62	4.91*
<u>School</u>			
Grade	na		
Average	na		
<u>Running</u>			
Age of First Run	na		
Previous Runs	na		

Note. ^a street youth in the Street Smarts program.
^c youth at home.

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

Table 14

Comparisons of Adjusted Mean Scores Between Youth in the ST Group and Youth in the HC Group at Follow-up

Variable	ST ^a n = 13 M	HC ^c n = 10 M	F
<u>Well-Being</u>			
Health Rating	1.74	1.56	.49
Fear Rating	2.52	3.09	3.34
Number of worries	2.20	2.14	.00
Hopelessness	5.59	4.46	.09
<u>Resourcefulness</u>			
Places to Get Help	2.05	2.70	.61
Number of Solutions	1.64	1.27	.73
Spending Rules	.95	1.18	.52
<u>Competence</u>			
Total PsychoSocial	65.25	62.99	.24
Behavioural	20.71	21.04	.05
Self Efficacy	20.31	22.18	7.15*
Self-World	20.09	20.98	.18
<u>Environmental</u>			
Personal Supports	24.99	24.46	.07
Personal Threats	7.50	5.49	4.13
Physical Supports	19.69	21.48	1.10
Physical Threats	4.70	2.78	4.02
<u>School</u>			
Grade	na		
Average	na		
<u>Running</u>			
Age of First Run	na		
Previous Runs	na		

Note. ^a street youth in the Street Smarts program.
^c youth at home.

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

range 1 to 8. This is comparable to the attendance of all Street Smarts participants. The impact of the number of sessions attended was examined using Pearson correlations and no significant correlations were found with the global satisfaction score or items on that scale.

Mean global satisfaction score was 24.5 ($n = 22$, $SD = 5.6$, range 9 to 32) out of a maximum score of 32. Seventy percent (16 of 22) of scores were in the medium and high range. Mean scores for individual questions in the global satisfaction scale in descending order were as follows: "a wish to return" (3.4, $n = 21$, $SD = .97$), "would recommend to a friend" (3.1, $n=21$, $SD = 1.06$), "satisfied with service" (3.1, $n = 21$, $SD = .79$), "satisfied with help" (3.1, $n = 21$, $SD = .91$), "program helped", (3.0, $n = 21$, $SD = .78$), "kind of service wanted" (2.9, $n = 21$, $SD = .74$), "overall quality" (2.9, $n = 20$, $SD = .79$), and "met my needs" (2.8, $n = 2.8$, $SD = .93$). Grand mean for individual questions was 3.04, $n = 22$, $SD = .87$.

No significant differences were obtained between genders on the global satisfaction scale or any of its component questions. Correlations between present age, psychosocial competence, the number of sessions attended, and the global satisfaction scale and its component questions were uniformly non-significant.

Answers to the remaining questions in the CSQ provided some insight into the operation of the Street Smarts

program. When asked to identify what they liked best 10 respondents mentioned food, 8 liked the information and topics, and 3 liked the people and sharing. When asked what they liked least, lack of discussion time was mentioned most often ($n = 6$), while guests and topics were mentioned 4 times, and lengthiness was identified 2 times. Leaders and guests received positive judgements for the most part. Only one youth did not like the leaders or guests (this youth provided mostly negative answers throughout, but was unable to identify why she continued to come to group when asked). Topics received mixed reviews, 9 youth had negative comments while 11 complimented the selection. When asked to identify the sessions that had influenced them, all participants but 3 had a favourite topic (substance abuse was the most popular, $n = 5$). When asked what they would add most suggested other topics, however, 4 suggested more and varied activities. Half of the respondents would eliminate nothing from the existing program. Those that made suggestions would like some topics dropped ($n = 6$) or change something about the way group was run ($n = 5$).

Youth were asked to provide some personal insight into the impact of the group through questions about changes in themselves as a result of their participation in the group. Thirteen were able to identify at least one behavioural change and nine were able to link the change to a particular aspect of group. Only 3 of 22 youth were unable to identify

one useful personal outcome of the group. Youth were asked their opinions about the usefulness of the group for others. Only one youth said it would help no one, most felt that it would help people in crisis ($n = 8$), street people ($n = 5$), or that everyone would benefit ($n = 4$). When asked to explain further, about half felt the information was useful ($n = 8$), and 9 felt the experience was useful. Twelve youth added general comments and all but one of these encouraged continuation or expansion of the program.

CSQ-st

Feedback on specific sessions was collected from 84 participants after 14 different sessions using the short version of the CSQ (CSQ-ST). Three questions rated (a) overall quality from 1 (poor) to 4 (excellent), (b) personal satisfaction from 1 (quite dissatisfied) to 4 (very satisfied), and (c) desire to return from 1 (no definitely not) to 4 (yes definitely). Overall, mean rating on the first item was 3.32, $SD = .72$, $n = 74$, range 1 to 4. Mean personal satisfaction rating was 3.28, $SD = .84$, $n = 80$, range 1 to 4, while mean rating of desire to return was 3.53, $SD = .66$, $n = 80$, range 1 to 4.

The remaining questions in the CSQ-ST were reviewed and summarized. When asked to identify something they liked about the groups: guests and leaders were named 7 times, group discussions were cited 18 times, food was mentioned 6 times, content was noted 16 times, and 13 liked the

atmosphere. When asked what they liked least 39 participants had nothing to say. The remaining comments most frequently made were that a session was long or boring ($n = 9$), short and intense ($n = 10$), and 10 complained that the group was disruptive or unruly. When asked what they "got" out of session 17 had no response, most of the remainder ($n = 44$) identified some piece of information conveyed in the session, while 10 mentioned some activity they found helpful (role play, art, games, etc). Suggestions were made by 56 participants and included: larger groups ($n = 6$), other topics ($n = 3$), various suggestions on the running of the group ($n = 16$), and more groups ($n = 14$). Thirty-eight had general comments to make. Twenty-six of these were appreciative or congratulatory, one asked that the groups be kept small, three wanted other topics to be presented, five wanted to have more food and drink, one wished Street Smarts had been offered in their school, and two wanted specific topics or guests to be brought back.

Several comments provided by the respondents are indicative of the impact of the sessions. One wrote about a session on finances; "no one ever spent time telling me - I never tried it so didn't" (sic). Another commented "racism and violence - learned a lot more about pieces of the puzzle - skinheads not the only racist ones". Sessions on abuse were conducted in several series and tended to be emotionally charged, but were acknowledged by participants

to provide many with a deeper appreciation of their lives. One youth wrote that the discussion made them more understanding of their brother.

Unobtrusive measures

Evaluation sessions were held at the conclusion of each series. Several important messages were communicated by the youth who took part. Attendance in the final group was often lower than average and in one instance participants completely avoided the last session. Leaders discovered afterwards that the participants were uncomfortable with concluding the group and its relationships. Reports came back that youth were unwilling to be part of a final experience that they perceived to be painful. In other evaluation sessions that did take place the youth reported that they liked the social aspects of the group, enjoyed those guests that treated them as equals, preferred discussion to being "talked to", and liked the food especially when they helped to prepare it. When asked to expand on the last comment, several youth answered that they liked having a role to play in the groups and would like more opportunities to help out. This resulted in the development of additional but optional responsibilities for the participants and may have been instrumental in having several youth return for a second series. Throughout the eight series, feedback from the group was used to modify

schedules and procedures, while remaining true to the intent and values upon which Street Smarts is based.

Several interesting comments were made regarding the method of collecting information through feedback forms and interviews. Most indicated a mild resentment to completing forms or answering questions, although a few seemed to enjoy the opportunity to discuss themselves and may even have found the experience beneficial. Clearly the inducement of money, and the charm of the interviewers and leaders, often made the difference in a youth's decision to participate. One group of six youth had strong objections to the notion that they came to group to be "helped". In other instances, questions using this word were sometimes ignored or scratched out, and discussions became mildly hostile on two occasions when this phrasing was used in the focus group. Explanations from the youth indicated that it was acceptable to be a part of experiences that could be conceived as a group discussion, a social opportunity, or an interesting presentation. Being helped implied a treatment group. One participant spoke for several others claiming "that the group was there for everyone to be together and to support one another, and not out of a weakness for which they needed help".

Comments from workers and leaders also validated the approach. Four guests liked the group and commented on how challenging the experience had been for them personally. One

guest who presented several times found the groups to be dramatically different, ranging from difficult to control to remarkably involving. One leader, who volunteered her time, conducted three separate Street Smarts series, returning because she found the groups challenging, rewarding, and productive. Another leader, who worked in the drop-in centre where the groups were offered, felt that the type of involvement possible through Street Smarts complemented the work in the centre. She stated that typical drop-in involvement was often one to one and problem based with few opportunities to discuss a wider range of concerns in a positive group atmosphere.

Discussion

This study contributes to a small, but vital and growing, body of knowledge. Information about the street youth population is scarce and imprecise, often because studying them is so difficult. One of the most salient features of the population under review is the absence of predictability or routine in their lives. This is evident in the literature, consistent with experiential information, and borne out by this study. Consequently, it must be noted at the outset that there are practical limitations to the findings of this study and to the conclusions. Data collection proved to be erratic in spite of strong efforts to encourage and maintain participation, and the findings indicate an unpredictable, shifting group of individuals. With this caveat in mind the results of the analyses nonetheless provide valuable information about youth on the street and insight into their lives.

Preliminary analyses of age and gender influences were conducted for all subjects. Females were found to have higher fear rating and better knowledge of where to get help. This would seem to be a healthy difference under the circumstances in this society. Females on the street and elsewhere are typically more open to exploitation and assault of various sorts. Males were more likely to have a history of attending special education. This finding has been reported elsewhere (Schramm et al., 1991), but must be

remembered in light of the higher proportion of males in the street sample.

The various correlations with age are consistent with other findings but must be accounted for in those findings. In the category of well-being age is negatively correlated with fear rating, indicating that for this sample the older youth have fewer worries. Within resourcefulness, the number of spending rules increase with age. This is consistent with the growth of more adult responsibilities found with age. All competence measures are inversely proportional to age a finding not reported by Tyler et al. (1991). However, these results provides some consensual validity for the scales, as youth become older their levels of competence and mastery increase. Among the environmental relations the distinctive results for supports versus threats is noteworthy. This would indicate that as youth age they have fewer supports, which would be consistent with a growing independence throughout adolescence. Positive age correlates with grade and number of runs can be explained as normal advancement through the school system and accumulated experience.

The absence of a general impact of gender and age elsewhere in the data is unexpected. It is generally believed that age has a determining effect on the level of social development displayed, yet such difference were not found to be significant. Several possible explanations exist. There may be a lack of variability across subjects

that constrains differences between groups. There may be a lack of sensitivity among the measures that is exacerbated by the relatively small number of subjects. Another possible explanation is that there are in fact age differences that are overshadowed by differences in maturity. The street youth, who are significantly older, also perform more poorly than the youth at home. If this is the case the lack of significant differences between street youth (older but possibly less skilled for their age) and the younger subjects at home results from a confounding of the variables.

From clinical observation we know that female street youth experience the street environment in ways that are profoundly different from males. Here too, results are more homogenous than expected. The only differences were that generally females knew where to get help and felt more afraid than males, which are logically consistent. Other significant results may have been obtained from larger samples but were absent in these samples.

Street Youth

The analyses of the data from the total sample of street youth provided results that, for the most part, bear out the picture of street youth documented elsewhere. The under-representation of females in this study is at some odds with the samples found in other studies. Proportions of females in samples reported in the literature were found to

range typically between 40% and 60%, while this sampling presented only 35% females. However, one Canadian study reported similar percentages. Smart et al. (1990) surveyed a sample that was composed of 36% females. The most recent study in Ottawa (Community Task Force on Homeless/Street Youth, 1992) reported a sample consisting of 43% females, however, there were high proportions of females among those under 16. The lack of street youth under 16 in this sample may explain the smaller proportion of females. No other plausible explanation can be forwarded at this time, but the analysis of the impact of gender must be reviewed with this in mind. It would be of interest to determine if this trend is replicated elsewhere in Eastern Canada.

The age of those in this sample (mean age = 18 years) was at the older limits of samples yet still within the range of mean age estimates reported in the literature. For example, the sample studied by Wurzbacher et al. (1991) had a mean age of 15.9 years, Schramm et al. (1991) studied a sample whose mean age was 17.8 years, while Smart et al. (1990) found the mean age for their subjects in Toronto to be 19 years. Several researchers have suggested that age estimates in most samples tend to be skewed upwards, the result of the common practice of exaggerating one's age for personal or protective reasons (Community Task Force on Homeless/Street Youth, 1992). Nonetheless seven youth admitted to ages under 16 (the legal limit for

independence), only one said they were 14 and another 13 years old.

Family composition (70% from two parent families) was consistent with other reports (Michaud, 1988). The linguistic breakdown is proportional to the languages in Ottawa-Carleton and consistent with reports of street youth in this region (Community Task Force on Homeless/Street Youth, 1992). Few other demographic distinctions were found confirming the observation of Wurzbacher et al. (1991) that the street youth population is, in many ways, featureless.

Well-being was indicated by ratings of health and fear, number of worries, and general hopelessness. Health ratings were predominantly in the average to good range. These reports were more positive than would be expected based on previous research (Hersch, 1988; Feder, 1991; Reuler, 1991; Smart, 1991), but these studies were conducted in health clinics for street youth and, consequently, would be expected to report higher incidences of health problems. Reasons for being unhealthy included smoking, poor eating and illnesses. Although not specifically addressed, smoking is common among street youth and their concern was valid. For a small proportion of street youth finding adequate food was difficult, but for most there were ample opportunities to eat a meal.

Sexual practises were not a major focus of this study as they have been documented elsewhere. However, findings

did support the contention that knowledge about condom use and its importance was not reflected in adequate use of condoms. Only half the sample used condoms faithfully. This exemplifies the myth of invulnerability found among youth. This behaviour has been documented elsewhere (Youth Services Bureau, 1991; Reuler, 1991) and, combined with unsafe drug behaviour, contributes to the dire concerns for an imminent epidemic of AIDS among street youth (Hersch, 1988).

Most youth were fearful while on the streets and most could name two or more of their fears. Most frequently cited fears were identical to those reported by subjects in the study conducted by the Community Task Force on Homeless/Street Youth (1992). In both cases the main identified fears were of uncertainty about the future, victimization, and loneliness. Among the street youth in this sample the predominant concern was for their future. Youth identifying this fear were focussing beyond their immediate circumstances and may be more anxious about their prospects than previously thought. The systems currently in place tend to focus on the immediate problems facing street youth and indeed there is a call for more of these kinds of services (Kennedy, 1991; Yates et al., 1991). Many of these services have assumed that street youth exhibit a lack of future orientation and are engrossed with their present conditions. The results of this study suggest that this viewpoint may be overstated for some street youth and not as

universal as previously thought. Smart (1991) suggested that systems should include transition services which would capitalize on the motivation to address future concerns. Indeed the foundation of Street Smarts is that youth are and can be encouraged to be more future oriented. The remaining 70% of respondents did fear more immediate issues, loneliness and security being the most reported.

The street youth did speak of dangers on the street, mentioning those that might be expected. As with the street youth surveyed by the Community Task Force on Homeless/Street Youth (1992) violence, the elements, hunger, loneliness, and no money were identified most frequently. The positive aspect of street life noted most often was the freedom they found living on the streets. These reports taken together also suggest that street youth, while recognizing the dangers they face, are living their lives as positively as they can, enjoying what they can.

Resourcefulness was measured by the having someone to talk to, number of solutions generated, budgeting rules, receiving social assistance, and going a day without food. The fact that fully 80% reported they had someone to talk to seems to belie the reality of loneliness reported above. However, having someone to talk to may not necessarily indicate a companion. What is likely is that there are periods of loneliness during the lives of street youth. From the perspective of street youth, in an unfriendly

environment the lack of a supportive friend can be dangerous. While there is clearly a romanticising of the "concrete jungle" by many of the street youth, the dangers are real. Violent death and injury occurred among the street youth during the time of this study and had a profound effect on the lives and attitudes of those in the group. These were individuals known to the youth and all the street youth felt that with a lack of foresight and caution on their part, or a little bad luck, they might have been the victims. These events likely influenced the impressions recorded in the study and certainly became topics of presentations during the group. But the events were typical and their influence was as would be expected. As a consequence, the impact was not confounding for this study, but rather was essential to it.

The reports of how street youth support themselves are somewhat vague. About 60% indicated they were on some form of social assistance and receiving various amounts. Thirty per cent reportedly were working but wages were low. Street youth in this study did not report any involvement with panhandling, prostitution, drugs or crime as a source of funds, but this information was not specifically requested nor expected under the circumstances. A lack of money was a concern for most and most responded by saying they had some budgeting plans. This information must be treated skeptically. From observation little financial planning was

in evidence when money was at hand. Situations were such that Street Smarts sessions which were scheduled around the time social assistance cheques arrived were cancelled or delayed. Leaders found from experience that most participants who would normally attend treated themselves to some form of entertainment with the funds and would stay away from group. Some would treat cash as a luxury to be enjoyed and enjoyed quickly before it disappears. Money, it seems, is not the essential part of everyday life for street youth as it is for most of society, it is possible to survive on the street and not have much money.

The situation for finding a place to sleep was much the same as for finding a meal. Most had no trouble getting a bed but between a third and a quarter of the sample did not have a single stable place to sleep at the time of the interview. Shelters were clearly not seen as reliable sites to find a bed. The fact that street youth have simply come to dismiss shelters as of possible use simply underscores the inadequate number of beds available. This is reflective of the state of shelters in Ottawa-Carleton and elsewhere for youth, the number of beds is insufficient to meet the number who could use them (Children's Aid Society, 1992; Hersch, 1988; Yates et al., 1991).

Of most concern is the small number of street youth who do not know where to find food or lodging. These youth were directed to counsellors on site or, if this was not

possible, informed by the interviewer where they might find help. In the study by the Community Task Force on Homeless/Street Youth (1992), 10% of the street youth in their Ottawa sample had slept in parks or abandoned buildings. As noted by Whitbeck and Simons (1990) the more unseasoned youth are the most vulnerable and exploitable on the street.

One third of the youth felt that the street was good or O.K. in general. About half the respondents felt that their experience of the street had not been negative. These questions called for somewhat of an overview and responses may have been cursory and simplistic, but their answers suggest that more youth are coping with their lives than might be imagined. As reported, Williams (1930) estimates that nearly three quarters of all youth will suffer no negative effects of street life. In this study street youth are not simply running scared, they may be in a difficult situation but are reporting that their life is not overly negative.

Few studies have examined the street youth in terms of their resourcefulness and survival skills. In this study most street youth were found to be relatively adept. Most knew where to get help if needed, would help others and help effectively, could identify an overdose and respond appropriately, and knew some suicidal indicators and where to get help. Problem solving skills were evident in nearly

three quarters of street youth in the sample. However, in some instances there were youth who did not demonstrate resourcefulness and others that showed a lack of sophistication and maturity in their responses. This was revealed through probing questions that discovered that some responses were ineffectual and others counterproductive. This was to be expected, given the age of the respondents, but clearly shows that for many, some abilities are simply not adequately developed for adult responsibilities even though there may be a need and willingness to take on adult responsibilities. Williams (1993) relates this situation to one of "assumed adulthood", wherein a street youth takes on responsibilities unusually advanced for their age. However, he notes that such precocious behaviour is in contrast to the reality of their age and does not deny the latent childhood of the street youth.

Consistent with their concerns for their future reported above, most street youth in the sample indicated that they did have plans for the future and for their careers. Most of the youth with goals could identify an appropriate next step to achieve their goals. This information was compatible with other findings: both the Youth Services Bureau (1990) and the Community Task Force on Homeless/Street Youth (1992) identified substantial proportions of street youth that wanted to develop their careers through school.

School history regarding current and past school involvement reflect the pattern of school problems identified elsewhere (Kurtz et al., 1991). For most of these youth, involvement with school was low, few were enrolled and fewer attending. At this stage in their lives most are dropping behind their age cohort in grade. These results are comparable to the data reported by Kufeldt and Nimmo (1987) wherein street youth were an average of two years behind their age cohort. Most report average grades in the 60% to 70% range. This level of performance does not indicate profound problems with school success, however, some distortion of marks reported by individuals is likely to result in an shift to higher than actual grade average. The large proportion of street youth that had attended Special Education classes (64%) is noteworthy and larger, for example, than the proportion reported by Kufeldt and Nimmo (1987). For these youth attendance in special education classes might provide a truer measure of academic success than reported marks. It may be less ego damaging to admit to attending special education than to admit failing marks. As well, it is unlikely that subjects would exaggerate their attendance at special education classes, consequently any distortion is likely to be an underestimating of the proportion of street youth attending special education. If this is so, then two thirds of the street youth in this sample had experienced some disfunction or disruption in

their school progress to the extent that the educational system sought to take fairly serious corrective action. The lack of school success that this indicates may be the trigger for many of these youth that initiates a final family conflict, as suggested by Palenski and Launer (1987). While it may be over reaching the available data, these results certainly bring to question the ability of special education services to provide for the student in broader terms. The high proportion of street youth who have attended special education suggests that further study of their current practices may be warranted.

Running history generally supported findings in other studies. Many street youth reported that they started to run young and had run often. Subjects reported running as early as 8 years of age, as did youth in other studies, such as Yates et al. (1991). The number of runs was comparable to the information provided by Kufeldt and Nimmo (1987) who reported that 27% of the street youth in their sample had run more than five times. Only four youth in this study were on the street for the first time.

The length of time these youth were currently on the street reflects a skewing towards longer time on the street not found elsewhere in the literature. By comparison, none of the youth interviewed by Kufeldt and Nimmo (1987) had been on the street of Calgary for more than six months and Hartmann et al. (1987) found that only 26% of their sample

had been on the street for more than one year. The reason for the extensive mean time on the street in this sample may be found in the sampling and recruitment procedure.

Participants were recruited from the drop-in centres where the groups were conducted. Possibly older and more entrenched street youth access these drop-in centres. This conclusion remains speculative as the information required has not been collected by these centres.

The extreme length of time on the street indicates that there is much more exposure to the street among this sample. Many of these youth have presumably developed mechanisms and resources necessary to live on the street for such extended time. However, the findings of Whitbeck and Simons (1990) suggest that these youth, by virtue of the length of time they have spent on the street, have become more involved in deviancy and are at greater risk to be victimized. Kufeldt and Nimmo (1991) identified that length of time on the street was a major factor increasing the risk that a youth will be drawn into illegal activity. While time spent in a threatening environment allows adaptation, the chances that the individual will suffer some harm increase with time. Being on the street never stops being a risk. The second major factor identified by Kufeldt and Nimmo was distance run from home. While street youth were not asked to indicate the location of their familial home, 65% of the street youth in this sample had run at one time or another to another

city. The mobility of these youth was consistent with the findings of the Community Task Force on Homeless/Street Youth (1992), which found that 50% of their sample was from another city.

Two thirds of the street youth in this sample provided their reasons for leaving home and for staying away. Eighty-two percent of the street youth who answered reportedly left because of parental conflict or abuse. This finding agrees with the consistent report of familial conflict and abuse as a factor or precursor of running. Farber et al. (1984) reported 75% of runaways ran from negative experiences at home and 63% of those on the street interviewed by the Community Task Force on Homeless/Street Youth (1992) ran from abusive homes.

One third of respondents did not provide the reasons they had left their home. While it is difficult to imagine that some rationale has not been developed by these youth, their refusal to answer may indicate a lack of concern, embarrassment or lack of understanding. Their reluctance to share this with the interviewer may be indicative of the sensitivity they still feel about their departure from the family. Palenski and Launer (1987) have suggested that in the aftermath of running the youth has the task of managing the residuals; rationalizing and understanding the ordeal of leaving their family. The street youth in this study may simply be in the midst of resolving their experience. This

mechanism might also account for the underestimation of prevalence of abuse based on initial interviews noted by Powers et al. (1988) and reported above.

Street youth were asked to remember themselves at five and ten years of age. The proportions that recall themselves as problematic were 35% and 42% respectively. About a third described their family life as normal, but the remainder reported family problems of various sorts. For most of the street youth there was a history of problems in most, but not all, cases. That one third of the street youth reported a normal family life might suggest that for these youth there were no prior problems with their family, a conclusion that is at odds with information reported elsewhere and findings reviewed above that indicate much greater prevalence of conflict and abuse. This difference may be the result of the more historical perspective required of this set of questions, respondents may be remembering a much simpler time or simply distorting their personal history into a more positive framework.

Among the results of this section can be found indications that street youth in this sample possess many of the attributes commonly ascribed to the resilient individual (Rutter, 1987). These youth demonstrate moderate social competence, the capacity for cognitive (if not actual) problem-solving, and a sense of their future. Their autonomy is somewhat proscribed by their decision to leave home.

While some of these skills and attitudes may be in small or ineffectual amounts, the fact that they exist to some degree is reason to be optimistic.

In summary, the street youth in the present sample are generally comparable to street youth described elsewhere. With the exception of longer time spent on the street, reported levels of variables were within the ranges reported elsewhere. The results provide support for Hypothesis 1 regarding the similarity of this sample to others. The findings also indicate a history of family conflict, negative street experiences, and difficulty coping on the street and maintain Hypothesis 2 as well.

Street - Home Comparisons

Few studies regarding services to street youth have included comparison or control groups. This study involved youth living at home which enabled a systematic comparison to be made between street youth and youth in their familial home. Few variables reviewed above gave any indication of severe problems among street youth, however, a greater degree of deficits emerged when scores from street youth were compared to those obtained from the sample of youth living at home. On most variables under consideration youth living at home presented a healthier picture than youth on the street.

Significant differences were reported on two measures of well-being; fear rating and health rating. Street youth

were found to be significantly more fearful than youth living at home. Their fears were reported above and were found to be related to uncertainty about their future, victimization and loneliness. These findings validate the conclusions made elsewhere but unsubstantiated by comparisons to youth at home (Community Task Force on Homeless/Street Youth, 1992). The fears of street youth are simply greater than youth not on the streets.

Youth at home reported feeling healthier than youth on the street. This supports the findings in the literature that street youth suffer from a variety of serious and/or chronic ailments. However, it is possible that self reported health has a more wholistic interpretation for youth. Mechanic and Hansell (1987) suggest that, for adolescents, self reported health often goes beyond simple physical health. They speculate that adolescents, who normally suffer fewer physical ailments than adults, tend to make self reports based on information from a variety of sources. Using a comparable scale to that used in the present study they found significant correlations between good health and feelings of competence, school achievement, exercise and socializing. If this is in fact the case, as appears likely from corroborating information, the health ratings provide a measure of the individual's sense of well being.

In terms of resourcefulness, street youth demonstrated superior scores in several areas. The mean number of

solutions in their problem solving and the mean number of budgetary rules for street youth exceeded mean scores for youth at home. However it must be remembered that information reported above revealed that street youth in this sample do not necessarily hold constructive or appropriate solutions or rules. Hartmann et al. (1987) have indicated that misinformation and mis-attributions are common among street youth. While the discrepancies in these areas may be accounted for by the younger age observed for youth at home, it does show a belief among youth on the street in essential skills. Street youth were more likely to be receiving social assistance than youth at home, but were also more likely to have gone a day without food in the two weeks preceding their interview. The former result is not indicative of comparative levels of resourcefulness as youth at home have no need to secure their own social assistance. But this too underscores the adult-like demands placed on street youth noted by Williams (1993) and others. The lack of proper eating among the street youth has been reported by street youth to be a source of poor health and is consistent with the lower health ratings for street youth reported above.

All psychosocial measures of competence and environmental relations yielded very significant differences between youth on the street and youth in their own home. Invariably these differences favoured the home group.

Assuming that the sample of youth at home is representative (an assumption discussed below) then the magnitude of separation between the two groups is dramatic evidence of the personal hurdles faced by street youth. Street youth are faced with clear deficits in the personal attributes most identified as necessary for successful survival of stressful events (Benard, 1991; Garmezy, 1989; Rutter, 1987). The fact that these inadequacies are evident in the realm of competence provides a focus for intervention efforts. This is the area where street youth suffer the most profound challenges in regaining control over their lives and reaching their goals in life and where intervention may be the most productive. If, as Rutter (1991) suggests, resiliency can be fostered in one environment, in this case within the Street Smarts program, it will create protection in other environments, namely the street.

Differences uncovered in the environmental relations typify the situation faced on the street and underline the personal impact of the street. Street youth felt significantly more threatened, personally and physically, and significantly less supported, personally and physically, when compared to youth at home. These measures reflect the sense of stress and pressure felt street youth, at the same time indicating that they feel abandoned.

The discriminatory precision evident in the psychosocial scales suggests further investigation of all

psychosocial scales; competence and environmental relations alike. There may be a significant benefit from a predictive ability, if it exists.

Differences on school measures likewise favour those living at home. Younger by about 18 months, youth at home were nonetheless at the same grade level as their older counterparts on the street. This is somewhat less than the two year lag found by Kufeldt and Nimmo (1987). Youth at home reported a higher level of academic success as judged by reported grades and lack of special education. As well, a larger proportion of youth at home were enrolled and attending school when compared to those on the street. Kurtz et al. (1991), in their comparison of street youth and youth at home, also found a significant difference in the prevalence of school problems. It is likely that decreased school performance and less connection to school are antecedents to leaving home and exacerbated by life on the streets. Several street youth had stopped attending school about the time they had arrived on the streets. As noted in the previous section and elsewhere in the literature (Roberts, 1982; Williams, 1993), youth often suffer poor school performance coincidentally with home problems and the decision to leave the family home. They then find themselves living on their own without adequate incentive or the necessary stability to attend school. Living in an unstable environment, leading lives that are often chaotic, they have

little opportunity to attend school and face great hurdles to succeed. Such compounding of problems is symptomatic of life for street youth and part of the destructive downward spiral noted by Rutter (1987).

Running history reflects the reality that runners run. Street youth by virtue of their greater times on the street and the greater distances they are likely to travel are indicative of the risks facing the street youth in this sample. As noted by Kufeldt and Nimmo (1987) distance and time on the run are factors in growing involvement in criminal activity and other risks. Youth at home, are less likely to run and are less likely to be exposed to the stresses of the street. As a consequence they are better able to focus on the challenges of adolescence without concern for food and shelter.

One over-arching consideration for the comparisons with youth at home is that this sample was recruited primarily from recreational facilities. On the face of it this seems like a reasonably good source of typical youth for comparison purposes. However, by virtue of their participation in such programs, we may assume that many of these youth are active in their community, in sports and social activities, and likely to a greater extent than the average youth that would have been found in a more universal location such as a school. We have seen from the review of protective factors that developing skills and competencies,

open participation and caring supportive environments are protective factors that promote resilience and adaptability. These factors directly influence many of the measures used in this study, indeed that is why most of the measures were chosen. However, the resulting effect is a disproportionately and systematically higher level of performance for the at home sample and, as a consequence, a comparatively low performance by street youth. While the exact distortion is not discernable, it would be safe to assume that differences between street and home youth in general would not likely be any greater than those observed on the basis of this dynamic.

The results of the analyses comparing street youth and home youth found many of the expected differences. In summary significant differences were obtained in well-being favouring youth at home; measures of resourcefulness revealed significant differences on three measures favouring youth on the street and one favouring youth at home; and measures of competence and environmental relations clearly favoured youth at home. Consequently, analyses revealed support for Hypothesis 3 in three of four parameters and equivocal contradiction in the fourth. School and running experience revealed significantly more problems for youth on the street in four and two indicators respectively. This agrees with the statement of Hypothesis 4.

Participation

Results of comparisons of pretest scores between street youth in the Street Smarts program (ST) and those not attending (SC) revealed few significant differences. These were limited to one measure of well-being (number of worries), one measure of resourcefulness (receiving social assistance), and two school items (enrollment and attendance).

Street youth choosing to attend had on average 35% more worries than those declining the invitation to the program. This is consistent with other indicators that youth in the ST group were more concerned and wary in their lives than non-attenders.

ST youth tend to maintain some connection to their schools through enrollment or actual attendance. Together these suggest that, (1) ST subjects may be more stable in their everyday lives, (2) ST subjects may be more comfortable with an educational experience such as Street Smarts and, (3) that ST subjects may be less entrenched in street life. Further indication of this possibility is found in the greater number of street youth in the SC group who are receiving some form of social assistance. SC youth may have less desire to participate in the group with a relatively secure form of income, drifting away from the school system and possibly less comfortable with programs like Street Smarts.

The lack of significant differences between the SC and ST groups in terms of their length of time on the street is somewhat surprising. Although this may be accounted for by the much larger variability of timelengths among the ST group, which would serve to minimize observed differences. The meagre differences between those choosing to participate and those refusing prohibit far reaching conclusions. However, from the differences that were obtained it would seem that youth with less attachment or more recent involvement with the street might more readily take part and benefit from the Street Smarts program. It is generally assumed that the first contacts with street life are when youth are the most vulnerable to exploitation (Kufeldt and Nimmo, 1987). After they have been on their own for a while most youth adapt and acquire basic survival skills. This adaptation is evidence of the self-righting evolution suggested in the resiliency model (Benard, 1991). If such is the case, an intervention that provides effective assistance at these early stages may provide much needed support and skills for successfully surviving the street for those that need it the most.

These results provide few indications of who might attend. No differences were found in competence and environmental relations as suggested by the fifth hypothesis. This combined with only two differences found in measures of well-being and in resourcefulness are poor

evidence of support for this hypothesis. Consequently Hypothesis 5 cannot be accepted.

Similarly, no differences were apparent between youth participating and youth declining in time on the street or number of times on the street. Hypothesis 6 must be rejected.

Differences were found to exist between the groups in school experiences. Youth participating in Street Smarts were more likely to be enrolled and attending school, evidence of more positive experiences. Therefore Hypothesis 7 can be accepted.

Treatment Effects

Information about the outcome of the Streets Smarts program is available from three sources. This study obtained (1) information in the form of standardized measures from three categories of youth, including those in the Street Smarts program, (2) feedback, in several forms, from participants in the Street Smarts program, and (3) indirect and unobtrusive observations and conclusions drawn from the experience and reports of group leaders, guests and professionals on the periphery of the group.

Standardized Measures

ST - changes over time

Results of the analysis of the key psychometric variables obtained from the pre, post and follow up scores among the ST group reveal little significant information

about the development of the youth in the Street Smarts program. The main exception is the decrease in number of worries noted over the four month interval. Remembering that comparisons between groups revealed that the ST group had the most worries of the three groups at the outset, there is a possibility that a regression to the mean effect is taking place. An alternative explanation may be that youth in this group, apprehensive about their lives at the start, sought out a service like Street Smarts to alleviate their concerns. The deduction that the participants in the ST group were more timid or frightened is borne out by information obtained regarding initial differences between the groups. Leaders report that some of the youth in Street Smarts were less street-wise than they expected. For youth in these instances Street Smarts provides a safe haven.

A second significant change was noted during the four month interval, reported average grades rose by .5 (corresponding to a 5% increase in average grades). It seems unlikely that the Street Smarts program with little or no academic information should be credited with this change. Three possibilities exist: the finding is spurious, youth feel better for attending and respond by exaggerating average grades, or enhanced confidence and maturity have created better academic habits. The truth of reported average grades has been questioned above and such reports are very susceptible to demand characteristics. There is no

indication of improvement among street youth in the Street Smarts program as detected by these measures. There is relatively insufficient indication of changes over the four month interval although two measures did reveal modest improvement in well-being and school. Consequently there is little evidence to support Hypothesis 8 which must be rejected.

Comparisons at posttest and follow-up

Few significant differences were obtained from comparisons between Youth in the ST group and those in the HC group of posttest or follow-up scores adjusted for prescores. In well-being measures, number of solutions had been higher and remained higher still at posttest. This result can be attributed to the Street Smarts program or to life on the street. This is a clear inadequacy of comparisons of youth at home with youth on the street who are additionally in Street Smarts and a consistent caveat to conclusions based on these comparisons.

The self-efficacy subscale continues to significantly favour youth at home at posttest. As well, it was in this measure that the sole remaining difference was recorded at follow-up. The scores for the youth at home indicate a stronger sense of active, self-direction. Rutter (1991) suggests that a feature of self-efficacy is a personal enjoyment in actively creating one's future. The evidence

here suggests that youth on the street do not exhibit the same level of enjoyment.

Environmental relations in terms of personal and physical threats had and continue to favour youth at home at posttest. Street youth in the Street Smarts program continue to express feelings of peril unalleviated by attending Street Smarts.

The lack of significant differences on the key variables between ST and HC at time 2 when controlling for pre scores indicates no clear advantage to group participation when compared with youth living in their own homes. However, it can be argued that, although there is a lack of obvious improvement, there is also no clear deterioration among the ST group on the variables measured. If the experience of being on the street is detrimental in some cumulative fashion (that is the longer time spent on the street the more harm to the individual) then the lack of a measurable decline in the condition of street youth is a constructive outcome. In terms of protective mechanisms the Street Smarts program may have attenuated or stopped the destructive chain reaction of events that has often been identified among street youth. Until there can be a comparison made with comparable street youth which this study was unable to accomplish then this remains speculation.

The unfortunate lack of youth in the SC group provides a serious limitation to the estimate of treatment effect based on comparisons with other youth. Comparisons between street youth in Street Smarts and youth at home is confounded. Conclusions based on these comparisons are therefore tentative at best. However, the comparative evidence as such does not indicate any benefit for attending Street Smarts. As a result Hypothesis 9 must be rejected.

Satisfaction Measures

CSQ and CSQ-st

The results and conclusions from both client satisfaction measures are comparable and therefore will be discussed at the same time. It should be remembered that there were an additional five respondents whose responses have been included in the CSQ information that had not otherwise participated in the study. Also, information collected through the CSQ-st was obtained from 84 respondents with no attempt to connect their responses together or to identify subjects who were in the study.

The absence of significant improvement among the ST group over time on the psychometric measures is at odds with the positive and appreciative response evident in the global satisfaction measure. Mean ratings were average to high in most instances (70%). An initial interpretation about this level of satisfaction may be skeptical. Satisfaction ratings generally tend to be skewed towards the positive (Larsen et

al., 1979), in most situations this is expected from recipients of service who are grateful and obliging, and reflect this in their comments. Criticism, regardless of how constructive it may be, can be difficult for many individuals to deliver. However, this mechanism may be less evident among street youth. In their world it is acceptable and even beneficial to be critical and suspicious. These may counteract the positive influences and lead to a more balanced and believable indicator. The top rated response within the global satisfaction measure was the wish to return followed by recommended to friends. These provide some indication of the attachment felt for the group experience. It is unlikely that such attachment could be developed for any one person within the group in such a relatively short time. Street youth have been reported to be skeptical and reluctant to become involved in services (Yates et al., 1985).

The more popular aspects of the group were the food, the leaders and guests, and the social milieu. Topics and content received mixed reviews. Taken together these results would indicate that getting together and participating in the group was more important than what was discussed in group. Clearly most youth liked some sessions but the topics were not their primary reason for attending. Consistent with suggestions by Benard (1991), Offord (1987); Rutter (1987) and others, youth want to participate and in fact find a

source of protective strength in participating in these services.

Youth liked the food. It was often the feature of the group first mentioned when discussed among the youth. Originally intended as simply an incentive for participants, the snack took on an importance within the group that was unexpected. It became a ritualized entrance into the evening, a source of nurturance, and a rallying point for the participants. In some groups it was a portion of the program that was truly theirs to conduct, for others it was a source of warmth in the group ambience, while other groups simply appreciated the opportunity to fill up. The importance of the meal went beyond the simple craving for food and insatiable appetites of youth, but became synonymous with the group experience. In several of the venues there was no lack of food elsewhere in the building, yet, the meal/snack had more importance when served in the group. In two groups individuals who came only for the snack were resented by the participants and eventually ostracised from the group. Through the snacks leaders were able to provide yet another avenue for meaningful participation for these youth in their own environment.

A personal benefit of some sort was reported by 19 of 22 participants, which they connected either to the experience of being in the group or to some piece of information gained in a presentation. However, a distinction

is often found in outcome studies between acquiring information and actually putting that knowledge into action (and has been reported in this study and elsewhere in terms of condom usage). "Benefit" to some participants might not translate into substantive changes in the way they function. Yet, a behavioural effect was reported and described by the majority of participants. Youth identified changes in the way they resolved their disagreements, handled their money, related to friends and family, and spent their time. Further, most of these individuals were also able to provide some evidence of insight into the changes they experienced. They could identify specific sessions, individuals or circumstances in the group that allowed and provoked these changes. These youth reported changes in behaviour, cognition, emotion, and comprehension. These changes were seen as constructive by the youth themselves and socially validated. In addition, there were corroborative reports from other workers in the field. Offord (1987) identifies the building of competencies as building block for resiliency. He suggests that programs which promote such development represent the protective environments that allow individuals to overcome their challenges.

Unobtrusive measures

Positive satisfaction is also evident in the level of participation in the groups. Experience has shown that street youth are less restrained in their show of

displeasure and have few reservations about discontinuing involvement in any activity they view as worthless to them (Yates et al., 1985). Quite simply if they did not like the Street Smarts program they would "vote with their feet". In fact, youth did leave sessions that they found uninteresting or painful. In these instances they were supported, their reaction considered and respected, and in most instances returned they to the group at some point. Another circumstantial piece of evidence of the popularity of the program can be found in the positive view "on the street". Street Smarts relied heavily on word of mouth to advertise the program and inform street youth of times, dates and locations, as well as promote participation. A negative general opinion among the youth would have been a death sentence for the program and precluded any degree of participation. All but one youth believed that the group would be beneficial to others and most felt that the utility would be widespread.

The instance in which the participants boycotted the final group was originally difficult to reconcile with other positive indicators. This was explained when other workers reported that youth in the group were saying that the group had become too personal to some of them and that they had evaded the disturbing experience of separating from the group by simply avoiding the final meeting. A less powerful attachment would not likely have produced such a response.

Yet a personal attachment has been identified as key in overcoming personal challenges (Benard, 1991), or in leaving the streets (Rutter, 1987; Williams, 1993).

The group succeeded best when it provided youth with the opportunity to participate as full partners in the experience. This is reflected in the opinions of the leaders and in the responses from the youth. Youth viewed the topics and content of the sessions with equanimity. Comments from many youth indicate that they really did not care what topics were presented, but rather enjoyed the discussion and the opportunity to express their opinions. Several expressed a preference for more controversial topics, indicating a desire to debate, and clarify their opinions and attitudes.

Participants were more consistent in their opinions about the structure of the group and the people involved. Most of the feelings towards the leaders and guests were positive and contrary opinions could be traced to instances of conflict with the leaders, often over group rules. Youth would perceive these situations as authoritarian and controlling if they were the focus of the situation. Others in the group who witnessed the exchanges were relatively neutral about the occurrences. Guests who were boring were disliked, but those who were controversial were generally appreciated, as were those who were entertaining.

It was evident that the youth wanted to exercise some power within the group and to make some decisions about its

operation. Resentment was obvious whenever they felt that something was being done to them as opposed to with them. This is clearest in the hostile response of some youth to the mere use of the term "help". At various times youth commented on the opportunity to discuss in issues in a mature and reasonable fashion. Most wanted a fair opportunity to voice their opinions and individuals who dominated the discussions were censured and unpopular. Conflicting opinions were surprisingly tolerated. An example of this can be found in one particular group which was composed of a skinhead, a black male prostitute and a highly tolerant heterosexual couple in a group of seven that were on hand for a presentation on racism and aggression (remember that topics were chosen by the group at an earlier date). While the leaders expected open conflict when they realized the combination they would be dealing with that night, the experience turned out to be one of the best sessions of the series for everyone concerned. The guest that night, an anti-racism educator, was likewise surprised and reported that this group was one of the best in which he had ever taken part.

The fact that street youth enjoyed the sessions for the most part is an essential feature of the program, in terms of enlisting participation, but also in terms of treatment effectiveness, attachment, and the protective factors of caring and support (Benard, 1991). These youth need to be

attracted to such services, need to enjoy the experience and need to feel good about their participation. However, there is a political backlash to such endeavours that must be noted. From a distance, some parents and civic leaders might feel that the service is attracting youth to it and away from home where they belong, by supporting youth on the street we are in fact encouraging them to be on the street. In some instances this is tantamount to saying that prescription drugs cause the illnesses they are intended to treat. While an unrealistic and dangerous notion at its extreme there is a portent of truth in their concern. A service that reinforced irresponsible or destructive behaviour would be unethical, conversely so would those that sat idly while these behaviours occurred. Services to street youth must be forward looking, positive and optimistic. In this way they can avoid the disservice of low expectations for these youth.

At a basic level, the continued participation of more than half of the youth from the ST group in the study itself provides an indication of some improved relationship or attraction. Although maintaining contact was sporadic and haphazard for some youth in the ST group, it proved to be an impossibility for the SC group. Since efforts and methods of contact for interviews were identical for all groups, by and large, the attrition for the SC group is reflective of the lives and experiences of the youth on the street and not an

artifact of treatment condition. Maintaining contact requires and indicates a certain degree of stability in otherwise chaotic lives. Such stability may have been produced by the Street Smarts program. In a related observation, staff at various centres report increased participation in their services by those who were in Street Smarts. This may be the cause of continued participation in Street Smarts, an effect of the program, or the result of a third factor. If it is a cause for the increase then the Street Smarts program is indeed a positive influence. If either of the other two possibilities exist then Street Smarts represents a complementary or desirable service. In one mechanism Street Smarts provides the gateway to needed services and in the other it is part of a consistent and responsive network of services.

In summary, while the more standardized measures indicated little or no indication of a positive benefit for attending group, client satisfaction, assessed from several vantages, provided a generally positive and appreciative evidence. Hypothesis 10 can be accepted based on these findings. Participants were able to readily identify benefits they had received and were further able to indicate an understanding of the changes and reasons behind the changes. These results provide the basis for accepting Hypothesis 11.

Conclusions

The results of this study provide insights into the lives of youth on the street. A picture of street youth is obtained that is more detailed than previously presented and in some instances contradicts or questions the current beliefs about these youth. Information regarding the Street Smarts program provides support for this approach and indicates improvements that can be made to refine the program. As well the research strategies and tools employed were tested under typical conditions for this population and conclusions about the suitability of these methods can lead to improvements in the collection and quality of information regarding street youth.

Of the eleven hypotheses tested in this study, seven were confirmed and four were rejected. The sample of street youth was comparable with samples of street youth reported elsewhere (Hypothesis 1 & 2, confirmed). Street youth in this sample were found to be less healthy, less happy, and less capable than youth in this sample who were living at home (Hypotheses 3 & 4, confirmed). At odds with the hypotheses as stated, street youth choosing to participate in Street Smarts were not found to be more in need of support, nor more at ease on the street, than street youth declining to participate (Hypotheses 5 & 6, rejected). However, as predicted, Street Smarts participants did exhibit better connection to the school system (Hypothesis

7, confirmed). Results did not demonstrate that participants in Street Smarts improved over time or that they improved relative to a comparison group (Hypotheses 8 & 9, rejected). Finally, participants did express general satisfaction with the Street Smarts program and were able identify personal benefits (Hypotheses 10 & 11, confirmed).

At the core of this study was the evaluation of the outcome of involvement by street youth in the Street Smarts program. The results from this segment of the analyses reveal no quantifiable changes among participants in spite of the generous criteria for statistical significance in the analytical procedures. The absence of differences for Street Smarts participants over time and in comparison to other groups has several possible explanations, not the least of which is the conclusion that the Street Smarts program was not beneficial nor successful in achieving its objectives. The population is admittedly difficult to serve and a short-term, weekly group may be insufficient to produce measurable or significant changes. Under this circumstance it would not be possible to estimate the performance of the measures.

It is conceivable that benefits were achieved in Street Smarts, but these may have been varied, far-ranging, and different across individuals. In this instance no single measure would likely suffice and a battery of measures would need to be powerful and sensitive. Given the wide range of individual needs and experiences exhibited by this

population it is conceivable that a successful intervention would produce a variety of results. While it was hoped that the measures used would detect such diffuse changes, this has not occurred, possibly due to inappropriateness or insensitivity. It might also be that dimensions other than those expected or sought were effected by the Street Smarts program and the measures selected would then be unsuited for this assessment purpose.

Several other mechanisms can be suggested that would indicate that the measures used were not adequate to the task at hand. Changes that could occur might be difficult to assess, involving subtle perceptual and attitudinal developments beyond the sensitivity of the instruments used. The population itself may prove to be unique, uncooperative, difficult, or recalcitrant, and to be beyond the capacity of these measures to assess. The measures might also assess dimensions other than those intended. In such a circumstance a program could successfully achieve its objectives and the measures would fail to detect the appropriate changes.

There are several methodological limitations to this study that influence these findings. However, several recommendations can be made to alleviate some of these concerns. The measures employed to assess the youth were found to be long and unwieldy. This would have produced far greater problems had the interviewers not been as personable and conscientious. The simplest suggestion to be made is to

reduce the length of the structured interview. This would require reducing the information requested but, on the basis of this and other studies, some selectivity is possible. Information could be solicited through questions of a more global perspective, service evaluation could employ direct client feedback, and more unobtrusive measures could be taken.

The difficulty in maintaining contact with youth on the street created problems of high attrition rates and a lack of continuity in the interview process. It may be possible to better assess street youth over time through services that are more reliably attended. However, this strategy reduces the representativeness of the street youth population by assessing only the most reliable or well-connected of the youth on the street. Increasing the financial compensation would likely ensure a greater willingness to participate.

The inability to reliably involve street youth in the study made it difficult to control many variables, such as age and gender, through design. Simpler, single-assessment designs would eliminate the problem of maintaining reliable involvement by not requiring repeated measures.

The sampling processes that were used to recruit both street youth and youth at home may have influenced generalizability. Street youth were contacted through drop-in centres for street youth, younger or more recently

arrived street youth may not be accessing these services to the same extent as older more street-wise youth. Recruiting and interviewing youth directly on the street might provide a fairer sampling, although it would likely erode the capacity to assess youth over time. Youth at home were recruited from recreation centres and, as has been suggested above, they may represent youth more involved in protective community environments. Youth at home might be better represented by recruiting them through schools; possibly a more representative source of subjects. If these sampling problems exist, both would serve to attenuate the differences between street youth and youth at home discovered in this study.

The statistical limitations found in this study were primarily the result of methodological difficulties. Foremost among these is the reliance on simple procedures such as t-tests and Chi² analyses and the potential for spurious findings that result from their overuse. Conclusions based on such analyses are suggestive rather than conclusive and require further research to validate. Data derived from participant assessments was not subject to such analyses but nonetheless require additional verification.

This study has also identified several aspects of the Street Smarts program that should be maintained and some that might be improved. Recommendations for future programs

would include maintaining the emphasis on a open, constructive, flexible, and participatory environment. Groups should be self-directing and continue to use leaders and guests that are caring and charismatic in much the same manner as currently specified. Although no analyses of leader qualities and their impact on the outcome of the program was undertaken because of insufficient numbers of subjects, such analyses would allow more comprehensive statements about leader attributes. Food should be an integral part of all groups. Group content that has been developed to date is suitable but needs to be ever expanding to meet the requests of the youth. The lack of significant relationship between number of sessions attended and outcome suggest that small exposure to Street Smarts might provide adequate levels of benefit. Future groups could be offered in shorter series and concentrate of topics in more depth. Possibly four-session series on specific themes would better capture the interest of street youth. Alternative sites can be used as the groups are relatively small and the participants relatively mobile.

Throughout the literature reviewed above, the sessions conducted through Street Smarts, and this study, it is abundantly clear that the lives and experiences of street youth are difficult to assess. Street youth live largely invisible existences, seen occasionally on the street, but seldom encountered in any meaningful way. However, their

lives are important, some may be in danger, but all are deserving of our support and assistance. The body of knowledge about their lives is uncertain but expanding. The conclusions drawn from this study are limited by the ability to study this population with any methodological rigour, but nonetheless several valid observations can be drawn.

Based on the results of this study the experience of being young and living on the street is potentially as risky as it would seem, popular misconceptions notwithstanding. For most the experience is not particularly enjoyable, sometimes boring, and possibly painful in the extreme. Most youth run from threatening, restrictive or unhealthy environments only to find themselves in worse predicaments. Most tend to make the best of a bad situation, and most survive unscathed. However a significant proportion face risky and traumatic experiences regularly.

There are few indicators of who will survive and who will suffer. We have seen that personal and situational attributes contribute to the likelihood of safe conduct through street life. Children and youth who are competent, autonomous, able to solve problems and possess a sense of purpose are more resistant to stress and risks. Results indicate that many street youth exhibit these traits. Other researchers have suggested that these can be developed and encouraged in other settings, through high levels of

participation with caring and supportive individuals, and subject to reasonable sets of expectations.

Not all youth suffer long term consequences from their time on the street. Street life is risky and dangerous at all times but some youth avoid tragic results. Some even benefit from meeting the challenges of adult-like responsibilities and developing their cognitive skills and sense of self-reliance. Hines (quoted in Williams, 1993) reports that the outcome of life on the street is violent for 3%, negative for 20%, neutral for 52%, and positive for 25% of street youth. Why some flourish on the street and others succumb is critically important, but only vaguely understood at this time. Several possible factors effect the outcome of the street experience. These include supportive, mature and personal relationships with significant others, the opportunity to take part, and a sense of competence and self worth.

The answers to the question of who survives the street may be alluded to in the rich and creative body of thought that deals with the resilient child. The circumstances of the youth on the street may exceed the situations normally reviewed in this literature. Youth are typically older, situations are more advanced, and services provided are not normally construed as preventative. However, there is some commonality and a shared history with street youth literature. By extending these theories we can provide a

positive framework for the experience and society's responses.

Researchers such as Norman Garmezy, Michael Rutter and David Offord and their teams have proposed that there exists a set of immunizing mechanisms by which individuals can counteract threatening influences that would otherwise lead to negative outcomes. The focus of their research has been to discover why some individuals, when exposed to substantial stressors react positively, while others under identical circumstances react in quite the opposite manner. Starting from several different vantage points researchers have approached the resilient child phenomena, exploring why some children of schizophrenics lead normal lives (Garmezy, 1989), why some children living in poverty escape their fate (Jones and Offord, 1989; Offord, 1987), or why children in some schools function better than in other schools (Rutter, 1987).

Theories of resiliency have a foundation in the transactional-ecological model "...in which the human personality is viewed as a self righting mechanism that is engaged in active, ongoing adaptation to its environment" (Benard, 1991). In this sense the harmful situation of being on the street can be reframed as an evolutionary challenge to be mastered: "that which does not kill me, makes me stronger". While the conception of a trial by ordeal may be an exaggerated image, it illustrates a healthy shift in the

service paradigm. These threats, or stressors as they are currently labelled, are evident in the traumatic experiences of life (death, high school entrance, natural disasters, etc.). Situational risks, marked by intrinsic and extrinsic properties (gender, SES, environment, etc.), can also induce negative outcomes. Poverty, family breakup, mental or physical illness, accidents, natural disasters, and other stressors and risks provide challenges to the individual, but the impact or power of the stressor must be assessed in terms of its long range impact or threat (Rutter & Sandberg, 1987). Furthermore, research has found that risks and stressors operate in a cumulative fashion with increasingly powerful effects (Garmezy, 1987). Individuals can often manage to overcome a single stressful event or survive a single risk factor, but the ability to overcome multiple, simultaneous hurdles becomes increasingly difficult and less likely. What often results is a destructive chain reaction of negative outcomes and stressors, in increasingly debilitating cycles (Rutter, 1987). An example of this type of mechanism has been described by Williams (1993) as degenerative estrangement, "a largely self-irreversible array of catch-22's, which regressively alienates individuals and groups from family, support and socialization networks, and eventually themselves" (p. 839). In relation to street youth, Roberts (1982) found that, among his sample of 30 runaways the mean number of stressful

life events was 4.33 while non-runaways averaged 2.53 stressful events. In our context, the precipitating event, the run, and experiences on the street can be conceptualized as stressors. There are abundant examples of the self destructive spiral among street youth in literature and practise.

The features of the resilient individual have been distilled into a picture of one who, in the face of adversity, shows social competence, problem solving abilities, autonomy, and a sense of purpose. Social competence can be described as the ability to interact with others in positive and constructive ways. There are obvious benefits to this skill in terms of adaptability in the continual social challenges of life. Yet others (Offord, 1989) believe that competencies of various sorts are valuable. They suggest that youth with skills develop a sense of competence which leads to a sense of accomplishment, self worth and increased self esteem, and that simple skills can be readily taught. Problem solving abilities provide the means for well formulated responses to novel situations and are the essence of adaptability. Autonomy describes a situation in which the individual operates independently of others, but also comprises self discipline, impulse control and self efficacy. This level of personal control over one's life has also been related to issues of an internal locus of control (Hartmann et al.,

1987). It may further be compared to the concept of adaptive distancing formulated in therapeutic disciplines to describe the healthy separation of the family member from the family problem (Benard, 1991). A sense of purpose is reflected in a determination to win, strong commitments and ambitions, and a desire to beat the streets.

Much of the initial descriptions noted above emerged from research with street kids in other cultures and times. Under the most adverse conditions, these children, often as young as six or seven, lived and matured, and told their stories of life on the streets of Bogata, Mexico City, Cairo, and 18th century London, Paris and New York (Felsman, 1989). Those that survived testified, not only to their personal strengths, but to factors around them, in their lives, that provided some essential ingredient that allowed them to overcome their lot in life. These protective factors were most often caring and support from family members or some other person, the opportunity to participate in their environment, and high expectations from those around them for their success. Benard (1991) provides compelling evidence for the positive impact of these factors and for their availability within schools and the community at large, as well as from within the family.

One of the cornerstones of resiliency theory is that protective factors in one arena of life can overcome negative stresses in other areas. It is this feature which

is most germane to the study at hand. It is clear that street youth face one, two, or more stressors. Leaving home and separating from parents and family, no matter how destructive the parents or family might be, is traumatic. Often there are underlying issues of conflict, failure, or loss that have provoked the departure and which themselves carry a stressful punch. The final abuse is to find one's self in the hostile environment of the street unprepared and afraid. Youth on the street face the dilemma that they cannot access protective factors in any of the usual environments. They are cut off from their families (whether protection can be found there or not), often disassociated from school, and suspicious and rejecting of social services. They are left to rely on their friends, and their friends may not be in any position to provide support for another. The isolation can produce lasting consequences. An environment and services that provide the protective features noted above and are accessed by the youth may be the only means to counteract the threats to survival and healthy growth these youth face.

The principles of protection found in resilient child theory may be applied to services for street youth to great advantage. Although much of the historical perspectives are based on the experiences of street youth, the principles have seldom been espoused, employed or tested beyond preventative services except as secondary prevention

(Offord, 1987). There is reason to believe that protective environments could be created in treatment and rehabilitative services and prove valuable. Such a sharing of basic principles between prevention and treatment would be mutually beneficial to practices that are often overly discrete and mutually exclusive in their approaches.

Conceivably, by providing an environment that encourages the development of protective skills and attitudes, services for street youth could prevent further or more devastating outcomes, and attenuate the destructive spiral of life on the street.

Contrary to common belief, and in contrast to the potential liability of being on the street, the reality is that many youth emerge healthy and productive because they are stronger, more resilient, and more capable than they are expected. Services that can expand and capitalize on these strengths will shift the balance towards positive outcomes. Services of many kinds are needed. In existing systems, a better reflection of the values of respect, optimism and participatory services, will likely result in better outcomes for these youth. Additionally, services that can be developed to take advantage of the considerable potential within these youth will complement the existing systems.

Street Smarts was created to provide such a complementary service. It represents an attempt to take the essential features of a protective environment usually

ascribed as a preventive mechanism and apply these to street youth. It sought to value the participant, encourage their participation, and raise their expectations. It succeeded best when it was reflective of those principles and failed when it did not.

The effects of participating in Street Smarts were not readily evident from the standardized instruments. Based on these alone it would be difficult to conclude that there was any benefit for participation. However, less psychometric measures and simple observation indicated otherwise. The problem may be found in terms of the standardized nature of some of the instruments. Typical questions may not work in atypical situations such as that under study, youth may respond better and more fully to more inviting forms of questions and their responses may be difficult to represent in numerical terms. The exception was found in the psychosocial competence scales which were able to effectively discriminate between youth at home and those on the street. Future investigation of other potential uses for these scales, such as predictive applications, is warranted.

Client satisfaction scores were adequate and systematic feedback provided corroborating evidence for that opinion. Feedback through informal channels was also supportive. The success of the Street Smarts program was evident in the level of participation by street youth. The capacity to maintain contact with these youth was of major benefit.

Whether these youth stayed in touch as result of Street Smarts or they wanted to stay in touch with someone and therefore showed up for both interviews and sessions is moot.

Services for street youth must pass the "value added" test. While no rigorous analysis of cost-effectiveness of Street Smarts was conducted, one of its principle advantages is its apparent economy. Resources required were minimal. Financial support amounted to less than \$5,000 and most was used for the research portion. Personnel were gladly seconded or volunteered, attesting to the support and goodwill for the project. Space and materials were donated or at hand. Simply put, Street Smarts is economical, efficient and easy to implement.

Street youth services are but a small part of a complex social network. Certainly broad social reform could address the fundamental problems symptomized by a growing and endangered youth population on the street or otherwise disenfranchised. Preventive services for children and families would allow the community based programs to provide the maximum protection for vulnerable youth. An educational system that better promotes learning, attracts youth, and meets their widely varying needs, might reduce the high drop out rate and provide a more optimistic future for its students. With all of these improvements there will likely always be youth who choose to be on the street. A

diversified system of services for street youth is needed that meets many different needs presented by street youth. Shelter, clothing, and food are absolutely essential, as are proper health care, counselling, and emergency services. Just as necessary, though, are services like Street Smarts that allow participation, personal growth, and optimism to flourish.

References

- Adams, G.R. & Munroe, G. (1979). Portrait of the North American runaway: A critical review. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 8 (3), 359-373.
- Beck, A.T., Weissman, A., Lester, D. & Trexler, L. (1974). The measurement of pessimism: The hopelessness scale. The Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42, (6) 861-865.
- Belcher, J.R., Scholler-Jacquish, A. & Drummond, M. (1991). Three stages of homelessness: A conceptual model for social workers in health care. Health and Social Work, 16 (2), 87-93.
- Benard, B. (1991). Fostering Resiliency in Kids: Protective Factors in the Family, School, and Community. Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.
- Bender, S. (1992). From Reflection to Action. Ottawa, Canada: Youth Services Bureau of Ottawa-Carleton.
- Brennan, T. (1980). Mapping the diversity among runaways. Journal of Family Issues, 1, 189-209.
- Boyle, M.H. & Offord, D.R. (1991). Psychiatric disordered and substance abuse in adolescence. The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 36 (10), 699-705.
- Boyle, M.H., Offord, D.R., Hofman, H.G., Catlin, G.P., Byles, J.A., Cadman, D.T., Crawford, J.W., Links, P.S.,

- Rae-Grant, N.I., & Szatmari, P. (1987). Ontario child health study. Archives of General Psychiatry, 44, 826-836.
- Carson, V.B., Soeken, K.L., Shanty, J., & Terry, L. (1990). Hope and spiritual well-being: Essentials for living with AIDS. Perspectives in Psychiatric Care, 26 (2), 28-34.
- Children's Aid Society of Ottawa-Carleton. (1992). Children Under 16 Who Run Away: A Task Force Report Addressing the Basic requirements of Children on the Streets. Ottawa, Ont.: Author.
- Cohen, E., MacKenzie, R.G., & Yates, G.L. (1991). HEADSS, a psychosocial risk assessment instrument: Implications for designing effective intervention programs for runaway youth. Journal of Adolescent Health, 12, 539-544.
- Collins, P. (Singer, Writer). (1989). Phil Collins...But Seriously. Scarborough, Ontario: Atlantic Recording Corp.
- Community Task Force for Homeless/Street Youth. (1992). Support services to homeless/street youth in Ottawa - Carleton: A needs assessment and plan for action. Ottawa, Ontario: Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton Social Services Dept.
- Denoff, M.S. (1987). Irrational beliefs as predictors of adolescent drug abuse and running away. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 43, 412-423.
- Farber, E.D., Kinast, C., McCoard, W.D. & Falkner, D. (1984). Violence in families of adolescent runaways. Child Abuse and Neglect, 8 (3), 295-299.

- Feder, S.H. (1991). Overview of runaway youth: Role of family physician. Canadian Family Physician, 37, 1211-1218.
- Garnezy, N. (1987). Stress, competence, and development: Continuities in the study of schizophrenic adults, children vulnerable to psychopathology, and the search for stress-resistant children. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 57, 159-174.
- Gordon, J.S. (1979). Running away: Reaction or revolution. Adolescent Psychiatry, 7, 54-70.
- Guthrie, G.P. & Guthrie, L.F. (1991). Streamling interagency collaboration for youth at risk. Educational Leadership, 9, 17-23.
- Hagan, J. & McCarthy, B. (1992). Streetlife and Delinquency. British Journal of Sociology, 43 (4), 531-561.
- Hartman C.R. Burgess, A.W., & McCormack (1987). Pathways and cycles of runaways: A model of understanding repetitive runaway behaviour. Hospital and Community Psychiatry, 38, 292-299.
- Hersch, P. (1988). Coming of age on city streets. Psychology Today, 22 (1), 28-37.
- Hier, S.J., Korboot, P.J. & Schweitzer, R.D. (1990). Social adjustment and symptomology in two types of homeless adolescents: Runaways and throwaways. Adolescence, 25 (100), 761-771.
- Johnson, P. & Carter, M.M. (1980). Flight of the young: Why

- children run away from their homes. Adolescence, 15 (58), 483-489.
- Jones, J.M., Levine, I.S., & Rosenberg, A.A. (1991). Homelessness research, services and social policy: Introduction to the special issue. American Psychologist, 46, 1109-1111.
- Jones, M.B. & Offord, D.R. (1989). Reduction of antisocial behaviour in poor children by non-school skill development. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 30 (5), 737-750.
- Kennedy, M.R. (1991). Homeless and runaway youth mental health issues: No access to the system. Journal of Adolescent Health, 12, 576-579.
- Kufeldt, K. & Nimmo, M. (1987). Youth on the street: Abuse and neglect in the eighties. Child Abuse and Neglect, 11 (4), 531-543.
- Kurtz, P.D., Jarvis, S.V. & Kurtz, G.L. (1991). Problems of homeless youth: Empirical findings and human service issues. Social Work, 36 (4), 309-314.
- Kurtz, P.D., Kurtz, G.L. & Jarvis, S.V. (1991). Problems of maltreated runaway youth. Adolescence, 26 (103), 543-555.
- Larsen, D.L., Attkinson, C.C., Hargreaves, W.A. & Nguyen, T.D. (1979). Assessment of client/patient satisfaction: Development of a general scale. Evaluation and Program Planning, 2, 197-207.
- McCormack, D. & Gooding, B.A. (1993). Homeless persons

- communicate their meaning of health. Canadian Journal of Nursing Research, 25 (1), 33-50.
- Mechanic, D. & Hansell, S. (1987). Adolescent competence, psychological well-being, and self-assessed physical health. Journal of Health and Social Behaviour, 28, 364-374.
- Merriam, S. & Caffarel, R. (1991). Learning in Adulthood: A Comprehensive Guide. San Francisco, CA.: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Michaud, M.A. (1988). Dead End: Homeless Teenagers. A Multi-service Approach. Calgary, Alberta: Detselig Enterprises Inc.
- Offord, D.R. (1987). Prevention of behavioral and emotional disorders in children. Canadian Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 24, 9-19.
- Offer, D. & Schonert-Reichl, K.A. (1992). Debunking the myths of adolescence: Findings from recent research. American Journal of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 31 (6), 1003-1014.
- Padgett, D.K. & Struening, E.L. (1992). Vicimization and traumatic injuries among the homeless: Associations with alcohol, drug and mental problems. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 62 (4), 525-534.
- Page, R.M. (1991). Indicators of psychosocial distress among adolescent females who perceive themselves as fat. Child Study Journal, 21 (3), 203-212.

- Palenski, J.E. & Launer, H.M. (1987). The "process" of running away: A redefinition. Adolescence, 28, 347-362.
- Powers, J.L., Eckenrode, J. & Jaklitsch, B. (1990). Maltreatment among runaway and homeless youth. Child Abuse and Neglect, 14 (1), 87-98.
- Reuler, J.R. (1991). Outreach health services for street youth. Journal of Adolescent Health, 12, 561-566.
- Roberts, A.R. (1982). Stress and coping patterns among adolescent runaways. Journal of Social Science Research, 5, 15-27.
- Rothman, J. (1989). Intervention research: Application to runaway and homeless youths. Social Work Research and Abstracts, 25 (1), 13-18.
- Rutter, M. (1987). Psychosocial resilience and protective mechanisms. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 57 (3), 316-331.
- Schram, D.D. & Giovengo, M.A. (1991). Evaluation of Threshold: An independent living program for homeless adolescents. Journal of Adolescent Health, 12, 567-572.
- Shane, P.G. (1989). Changing patterns among homeless and runaway youth. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 59 (2), 208-214.
- Simonds, J.F., McMahon, T. & Armstrong, D. (1991). Young suicide attempters compared with a control group: Psychological, affective, and attitudinal variables. Suicide and Life Threatening Behaviour, 21 (2), 134-151.

- Smart, D.H. (1991). Homeless youth in Seattle. Journal of Adolescent Health, 12, 519-527.
- Smart, R.G. & Adlaf, E.M. (1991). Substance use and problems among Toronto street youth. British Journal of Addiction, 86 (8), 999-1010.
- Smart, R.G., Adlaf, E.M., Porterfield, K.M., & Canale (1990). Drugs, Youth and the Street. Ontario: Addiction Research Foundation.
- Smart, R.G. & Walsh, G.W. (1993). Predictors of depression in street youth. Adolescence, 28 (109), 41-53.
- Speck, N.B., Ginther, D.W. & Helton, J.R. (1988). Runaways: Who will run again? Adolescence, 23 (92), 881-888.
- Spillane-Grieco, E. (1984). Feelings and perceptions of parents of runaways. Child Welfare, 63 (2), 159-166.
- Tyler, F.B. (1978). Individual psychosocial competence: A personality configuration. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 38, 309-323.
- Tyler, F.B., Tyler, S.L., Echeverry, J.J., & Zea, M.C. (1991). Making it on the Streets of Bogota: A psychological study of street youth. Psychology Abstracts, 117, 397-417.
- Tyler, F.B., Tyler, S.L., Tomasello, A., & Zhang, Y. (1992). Psychosocial characteristics of marginal immigrant Latino youth. Youth and Society, 24, 92-115.
- Whitbeck, L.B. & Simons, R.L. (1990). Life on the streets: The victimization of runaway and homeless adolescents.

Youth and Society, 22 (1), 108-125.

Williams, C. (1993). Who are street children? A hierarchy of street use and appropriate responses. Child Abuse and Neglect, 17, 831-841.

Williams, J.M. (1986). Differences in reasons for taking overdose in high and low hopelessness groups. British Journal of Medical Psychology, 59 (3), 269-277.

Wurzbacher, K.V., Evans, E.D., & Moore, E.J. (1991). effects of alternative street school on youth involved in prostitution. Journal of Adolescent Health, 12, 549-554.

Yates, G.L., MacKenzie, R.G., & Goldenring, J.M. (1985). A multidisciplinary program for high risk youth: A potential model for third world nations. International Journal of Adolescent Medicine and Health, 1, (1-2), 225-234.

Yates, G.L., MacKenzie, R.G., Pennbridge, J., & Cohen, E. (1988). A risk profile comparison of runaway and non runaway youth. American Journal of Public Health, 78, 820-821.

Yates, G.L., Pennbridge, J., Swofford, A., & MacKenzie, R.G., (1988). The Los Angeles system of care for runaway/homeless youth. Journal of Adolescent health, 12, 555-560.

Young, R.L., Godfrey, W., Matthews, B., & Adams (1983). Runaways: A review of negative consequences. Family Relations, 32, 275-281.

- Youth in Conflict with the Law Committee. (1989). An Inventory of Some of the Services Available for Youth At-Risk and/or in Conflict with the Law in the Ottawa-Carleton Region. Ottawa, Ont.: Ottawa YM-YWCA.
- Youth Services Bureau. (1991). Ottawa Street Prostitutes: A Survey (May, 1991). Ottawa, Ontario: Author.
- Zastrow, C. & Navarre, R. (1975). Help for runaways and their parents. Social Casework, 56 (2), 74-78.

Appendix 1

**STREET SMARTS
MENU OF TOPICS**

Street Survival Skills: What you need to know about life on the streets but nobody ever talks about.

Exploitation: How to not be used!

Finding your Castle: Where to live, what to look for, and who to look for.

"At Least You've got Your Health": How to get healthy and stay healthy.

Colour your World: Expressing yourself through art and drawing.

to be decided.

Mediation: How to hear and be heard.

The Colour of Your World: Racism and prejudice and how to deal with these.

Safe Sexual Hobbies: Sexuality, safe sex, AIDS and other STDs.

Toxic Intoxicants: Drugs and drug use survival.

Burn Out, Fade Away, or Keep on Glowing: Stress and coping.

How to Get Out of the Way of a Punch in the Face: Violence and how to deal with it. to be decided.

Money: Where it comes from and Where it Goes: Realistic budgetting and reasonable jobs you can get.

Sometimes I Feel Like a Motherless Child: Suicide: How it effects you and others.

I want to be: Careers and the education you need to get.

It Happened to Someone I Know: Physical, emotional and sexual abuse; what it causes, how to help and be helped.

Friendships: Trusting, Trusted and Trustworthy. "Stand by Me".

Fair Fighting for Fun and Profit: How to resolve conflict quickly and feel good about it.

Losing It: Grieving and loss; how it effects people and how to handle it.

Love, and Other Funny Topics: How to get into a relationship, survive and feel good.

A Life in Progress "Talk 16"

PLEASE FEEL FREE TO ADD OTHER TOPICS TO THIS LIST

Appendix 2

SESSION FORMAT

Topic: _____

Date: _____ Time: _____

Costs: _____

Trainers: _____

Purpose: 1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

Materials: _____

Equipment: _____

Procedures: _____

Specific Knowledge to be Acquired:

SESSION ONE

Topic: Introduction

Date: _____ Time: _____

Costs: Juice and donuts

Guests: none

Purpose: 1. Provoke interest in the groups
2. Open discussions
3. Increase awareness in benefits of expressing
4. develop commitments to group

Materials: menu of topics

Procedures:

1. introduce selves and tell a bit about selves
2. explain purpose of group
"to give participants some of the information they need to survive", not to get them off the street, that is their decision
3. describe format and topics
 - once a week, start (5:30) and end (7:30)
 - format
 - checking in - meet and greet, discuss day, how everyone is feeling
 - information - presentation for the evening, sometimes just with group and leaders here today sometimes with guest experts to help out
 - housekeeping - any remaining discussion, explain next weeks topic, what they want emphasized
4. discuss value of the group, suggestions for topics, answer questions about Street Smarts
5. select from list of topics, name some presenters
group discusses each topic and what may be involved, what they would like to see, then they select nine that will be presented when they can be arranged
6. serve snack
7. solicit commitment to the group and process
 - set their objectives, get promises from each person
8. research - explain interviews, purpose, voluntary nature, pay(\$5,\$10,\$15), confidentiality
 - Karen Hicks will be conducting and she will contact people in the next few days
9. close the group, hang around as needed

Specific Knowledge to be Acquired:

1. Most problems can be solved by working on them (commitment)
2. expressing feelings constructively helps.
3. this group of people can help make my life better

SESSION TWO

Topic: Rapport and commitment building

Date: _____ Time: _____

Costs: donuts and drinks _____

Trainers: no guests

Purpose:

1. to allow a broad discussion of participants concerns, suggestions for topics
2. to set the atmosphere for the group (open, accepting, confidential, provocative, fun, personal, important, respectful)
3. get personal commitment to get something from the group

Materials:

Equipment:

Procedures:

1. Welcome
2. Check-in
3. guided discussion around what concerns them the most, a list of provocative/controversial topics can be suggested by the leader and used
4. brainstorm and prioritize list of hot topics
5. discuss how they would like sessions run, develop groundrules (listen, respect, talk, no taboos, privacy, plus others of their choosing)
6. decide on types of snacks
7. brainstorm and list what the sessions can be good for
8. each person decides about participating and names one thing they will work at getting from the group
9. SNACK, debrief session and suggest issues for discussion at the next group on street survival
10. close

Specific Knowledge to be Acquired:

1. participants can identify their concerns more fully
2. participants see committing to work on their issues as part of the solution
- 3.

SESSION THREE

Topic: Street Survival Skills

Date: _____ Time: _____

Costs: donuts and drinks _____

Trainers:

Purpose: 1. immediate help for everyday life as presently experienced
2. how to avoid trouble from peers, authority, etc.
3. begin to think, problem solve
4. dealing with violence, other major concerns
5. identify friends and dangers

Materials: _____

Equipment: _____

Procedures:

1. Welcome
2. Check-in
3. Introduce guest
4. get youth recounting their first days on the street
5. list the types of problems they encountered, review list from last session and add as needed
6. brainstorm answers/solutions to the most common and the trickiest
7. what troubles do they currently face, group brainstorms ways to handle these
8. outline a problem solving method; (identify, brainstorm, select, review) and take the participants through their real examples
9. SNACK, debrief session, solicit comments
10. introduce next topic (housing), brainstorm any specific information they may want, talk about guest
11. close

Specific Knowledge to be Acquired:

1. individuals can start to handle their most immediate problem.
2. individuals know some of the problems they may have yet to face.
3. individuals can problem solve.
4. can identify what makes a friend

SESSION FOUR

Topic: Housing

Date: _____ Time: _____

Costs: donuts and drinks

Guests:

Purpose: 1. provide info on long term housing
2. how to find a place
3. how to find a roommate

Materials: "housing survival game", pamphlets/cards of
housing agencies

Equipment: _____

Procedures:

1. Welcome
2. Check in.
3. discussion about housing problems conducted by leader with assistance from guests for specific information.
4. Divide into groups of four or five and play the Housing Survival game
5. return to large group and review answers/solutions
6. open discussion about specific problems and brainstorm solutions
7. discuss costs, lead into next topic (budgetting and jobs)
8. SNACK, get suggestions for next session, issues they want reviewed
9. close

Specific Knowledge to be Acquired:

1. Participants will know three sources of accomodation and how to access these.
2. know the top five priorities for getting accomodation.
3. know what they want in a roommate.

SESSION FIVE

Topic: Budgetting and Jobs

Date: _____ Time: _____

Costs: donuts and drinks _____

Trainers: Sharon Baxter (OGH) (Half hour)

Purpose: 1. How to get welfare, etc.
2. How to get a job, where to go.
3. Budgetting, realistic expectations
4. How to get by without money

Materiels: blank budget sheets, pamphlets on welfare, UI,
job banks, etc.

Equipment:

Procedures:

1. welcome
2. check-in
3. introduce presenter
4. welfare - how to get money/income when you don't have any other supports, where are the offices, how do you find a welfare office, what do they require, what they will ask, what to expect. Same for U.I.
5. Employment - how to get a job now, whats available, where are the employment offices, who will help you get a job
6. Budgetting - rules, what income can you expect, develop a list of expenses, prioritize, work with actual numbers, handout sheets
7. No money Miracles - food, clothing, shelter. Where to find it, who provides it, what can be expected
8. SNACK, introduce next session (self-help/art therapy) get suggestions, have them think about how they help themselves
9. close

Specific Knowledge to be Acquired:

1. Know where to get money, food, clothing, shelter.
2. have a budget, guidelines for money.
3. realistic idea of costs and income.

SESSION SIX

Topic: Self Help

Date: _____ Time: _____

Costs: donuts and drinks _____, Art materials? _____

Trainers:

Purpose: 1. Benefits of expression
2. When to express
3. How to express

Materials: markers, paper, table space

Equipment: tape recorder, tapes

Procedures:

1. Welcome
2. Check-in
3. Introduce presenters
4. Discuss how we express emotions
5. what emotions are there
6. present art therapy - have youth try it, discuss as happens, debrief outcome
7. brainstorm and discuss other forms of expressing
8. discuss when problems get too big, what to do next, i.e. talk with others, professionals
9. SNACK, introduce next session (health and nutrition) and presenter
10. develop list of common health concerns
11. close

Specific Knowledge to be Acquired:

1. have at least one constructive/expressive way of dealing with hurt
2. can identify when their issues are too big and they need the help of others
3. can suggest several different ways of expressing to others
4. can name one person they would go to for help

SESSION SEVEN

Topic: Health and Nutrition

Date: _____ Time: _____

Costs: donuts and drinks _____

Trainers:

Purpose:

1. Provide information on health practises, Simple ways to stay healthy
2. basic nutrition, hygiene
3. where to go for medical treatment

Materials: pamphlets on clinics

Equipment: audio-visual aids?

Procedures:

1. welcome
2. check-in
3. review medical concerns
4. introduce guest
5. presentation by guest on th body as a protective shell (an easy to grasp model of the immune system and how to keep it healthy)
6. discuss nutrition and its role/purpose from this model
7. discuss need for balanced diet, what this means, where to get it
8. open discussion of how they eat, what can be improved
9. open discussion of how their health has suffered, or is suffering
10. where can they get help, what is expected of them
11. SNACK, introduce next topic (sex) and solicit participants suggestions
12. close

Specific Knowledge to be Acquired:

1. know what the immune system does and what keeps it working.
2. be able to get medical help if required
3. know what constitutes balanced diet

SESSION EIGHT

Topic: Sex

Date: _____ Time: _____

Costs: donuts and drinks _____

Guests:

Purpose: 1. safe sex practices
2. sexuality
3. STD's identification, treatment, protection

Materials: ??

Equipment: ??

Procedures:

1. welcome
2. check-in
3. introduce topic review questions/suggestions from last session
4. introduce guest
5. SNACK, introduce next session (drugs) and the guest what do they want to know?
6. close

Specific Knowledge to be Acquired:

1. can identify STDs and know where, when to get treatment
2. know and use safe sex practices (condoms)
3. ??

3

OF/DE

3

PM-1 3 1/2" x 4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

SESSION NINE

Topic: Drugs

Date: _____ Time: _____

Costs: donuts and drinks _____

Trainers:

Purpose: 1. identification of drugs, risks
2. identification of OD's, health problems
3. know where to get help if they need it

Materials:

Equipment:

Procedures:

1. welcome
2. check-in
3. introduce guest and explain role
4. reiterate confidentiality
5. guest explains about himself
6. participants discuss the drugs most common
7. list the problems they have seen
8. list health, emotional, addiction problems
9. what can be done to deal with these
10. where to go for help; emergency and treatment
11. SNACK, introduce next topic (school and careers)
12. explain session, brainstorm issues they wish to cover
13. close

Specific Knowledge to be Acquired:

1. can identify a drug overdose and know where to get help
2. know where to go to get assessment/treatment
3. can identify drugs they may come in contact with and their dangers

SESSION TEN

Topic: School and careers

Date: _____ Time: _____

Costs: donuts and drinks _____

Trainers: no guests

Purpose:

1. a look forward to goals and aspirations and develop a plan to achieve (start, first step)
2. know what is required for their chosen profession
3. where to go, what is expected to get training
4. trouble shoot school problems from the past

Materiels: pamphlets/cards for school options

Equipment:

Procedures:

1. welcome
2. check-in
3. what do they want to be/do, their aspirations - list
4. what do they need (skills, qualifications) to get there
5. working in small groups, develop an individual plan for each participant, set out what the first step would be
6. what is available, resources, where to go, what is expected
7. discussion about their school experiences, what made them leave, what did they like/dislike,
8. discussion of alternatives, what would have made it better
9. what they would do this time
10. SNACK, introduce next topic (managing stress), brainstorm what they want covered
11. close

Specific Knowledge to be Acquired:

1. can specify a career and qualifications
2. can identify what went 'wrong' in their last school
3. know where to go for schooling help

SESSION ELEVEN

Topic: Managing Stress

Date: _____ Time: _____

Costs: donuts and drinks _____

Trainers: no guests

Purpose:

1. to be able to identify stress in self and others
2. to know how to respond, where to go for help
3. to understand stress, how it works how it can lead to other problems

Materials:

Equipment:

Procedures:

1. welcome
2. check-in
3. guided discussion; what bothers you?
4. how do people react when they are bothered or upset
5. what works; expressing, talking, solving, relaxing, exerting, etc., what can be done on the street?
6. how to tell when stress is getting to be too much
7. what to do to help others, yourself
8. relate to what bothers you, make a plan for responding next time, (emphasize everyone's different need for individualized plan)
9. stress can lead to depression etc.
10. SNACK, introduce next topic (suicide)
11. brainstorm issues they wish to raise
12. close

Specific Knowledge to be Acquired:

1. participants can identify stressors in their lives
2. can identify a plan to deal with stress
3. know what they would suggest to help a friend

SESSION TWELVE

Topic: Suicide

Date: _____ Time: _____

Costs: donuts and drinks _____

Trainers: no guests

Purpose:

1. can identify suicidal thought in selves and others
2. have a plan to give, get and seek help

Materials:

Equipment:

Procedures:

1. welcome
2. check-in
3. review last session and issues suggested
4. demonstrate prevalence of suicide
5. discuss seriousness, risks
6. identify signs (Alberta model of suicide assessment)
7. what can be done for self, others
8. where to get help, what to expect
9. SNACK, introduce next session (abuse) and how it will run (male, female small groups)
10. brainstorm issues they wish discussed
11. close

Specific Knowledge to be Acquired:

1. know what the risk signs are for suicide
2. know where to get help

SESSION THIRTEEN

Topic: Abuse

Date: _____ Time: _____

Costs: donuts and drinks _____

Trainers: no guests

Purpose:

1. understanding of how common it is, different types
2. identify differential effect on genders
3. understanding of impact of abuse and healing processes
4. where to get help

Materiels: pamphlets/cards of helping professionals

Equipment:

Procedures:

1. welcome
2. check-in
3. identify issues raised last session
4. discuss various types of abuse, commonalities and differences
5. discuss gender differences
6. split into small groups (male, female)
7. females - concentrate on victim side:
prevalence, discuss effect of abuse, how it can happen in present relationships, what to do, where to get help, what to expect, discuss healing process
- males - discuss victim and perpetrator role: (victim side as above), perpetrator side; how males can dominate, how to develop equal relationship, benefits, how to relate to female victims
8. recombine, groups share discussions, brainstorm suggestions
9. SNACK, present final session, brainstorm any unanswered issues, decide on celebratory meal
10. close
11. remain available for individuals who wish to discuss privately

Specific Knowledge to be Acquired:

1. know where to get help
2. can identify the effects of abuse

SESSION FOURTEEN

Topic: Wrap up

Date: _____ Time: _____

Costs: meal _____

Trainers: no guests

Purpose:

1. clarify/answer any remaining questions or concerns
2. celebrate/reward the end of a job well done
3. review initial goals and assess success
4. get feedback on the process

Materials: pins, tokens

Equipment:

Procedures:

1. welcome
2. check-in
3. brainstorm unresolved issues
4. group problem solves issues
5. review personal learning objectives and discuss success
6. discuss need to reward self for efforts, ways to reward yourself
7. MEAL
8. discuss the sessions, how they would describe them, what they liked, disliked, how they would improve them
9. last review of where to get help, names, numbers

Specific Knowledge to be Acquired:

1. participants know what they can do to reward themselves
2. can express pride in their accomplishments

DAILY ATTENDANCE AND LOG

Date _____ Session Topic _____
Guest(s) _____ Number of Attendees _____
Names of Attendees _____

_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

.....
.....

LOG

Completed by

CONSENT FORM
STREET SMARTS STUDY

Hi my name is _____. I'm interested in asking you some questions about yourself, your opinions and your experiences, and to see how those change as time goes by I'd like you to answer my questions at two other times, two and four months from now. It will take about an hour to answer my questions. You don't have to do this but you will be paid for your time. You'll get 5\$ for this interview, 10\$ for the next time you answer our questions and 15\$ for any time after that. No one will know how you answered the questions because we will use a number instead of your name on the sheets where we write your answers and we will keep the information private.

Do you have any questions? (note)

Its important that I can show people that I explained all this and I'd ask you to put your mark in the space below if you want to go ahead and answer my questions. Remember your name will not be on any of your answers.

_____ date _____.

STREET SMARTS
Personal Information Form
 Respondent # _____

- Date _____ Interviewer name _____
- Initial interview ☐ 1st followup ☐ 2nd followup ☐
1. Gender _____ 2. DOB _____
3. What language did you normally speak at home while you were growing up? ☐ English ☐ French ☐ Other _____
4. How would you describe your ethnic background or race? _____
5. Where are you currently living? Are you living at...
☐ home with your parents?
☐ home with one parent? ☐ father ☐ mother
☐ in your own place? Type of place? _____
☐ with relatives?
☐ with friends?
☐ with friend(s) you met while living on the street?
☐ a group home or other supervised residence?
☐ a detention home or institution?
☐ place of temporary residence (shelter, Y, etc)?
☐ another type of place? describe _____
6. If you are not currently living at home; (otherwise omit)
 (a) why? _____
 (b) Do your parents/guardians know where you are?
 no _____, yes _____,
 don't know _____, no response _____.
 (c) Do other family members know where you are?
 no _____, yes _____,
 don't know _____, no response _____.
 (d) Did you have your parents/guardians' permission to leave?
 no _____, yes _____,
 don't know _____, no response _____.
 (e) do you wish you could return home?
 If yes, what is stopping you? _____
 If no, why not? _____
- (f) How old were you when left home this time? _____
7. Have you ever before decided to leave home, left and lived elsewhere? no _____, yes _____,
 (a) if yes, how many times?
 1x _____, 2x's _____, 3-5x's _____, 6-10x's _____, >10x's _____
 (b) if yes, where did you go to live?
☐ in your own place? Type of place? _____
☐ with relatives?
☐ with friends?
☐ with friend(s) you met while living on the street?
☐ a place of temporary residence (shelter, Y, etc)?
☐ another type of place? describe _____

(c) if yes, what were your reasons for leaving then?

(d) if yes, have you ever gone to another city?

no __, yes __.

(e) if yes, How old were you when you first spent a night on the street?

8. Do you personally know anyone your age who has run away from home? siblings __, parents __, other relatives __, friends __, other (specify) _____.

9. What (is / would be) the best thing about living on the street?

10. What (is / would be) the worst thing about living on the street?

11. what is it like to live on the street?

12. Where else have you lived?

13. Where have you slept in the past 14 nights?

place	# of nights
your own place	_____
your parents place	_____
a friends	_____
an emergency shelter	_____
a group home / residence	_____
on the street	_____
other (specify) _____	_____

total

14 nights

14. What is it like for you living as you do?

15. In the last fourteen days have you ever gone a whole day without eating? [] yes [] no

16. Where have you eaten in the last fourteen days?

place	number of times
parent's home	_____
your home (if different)	_____
friend's home	_____
school	_____
soup kitchen	_____
drop-in centre	_____
salvation army	_____
other (specify) _____	_____

17. Do you ever feel afraid?

[] often [] sometimes [] seldom [] never

18. What makes you feel afraid?

19. How would you describe your health?

- ☐ very healthy ☐ somewhat healthy
☐ not very healthy ☐ very unhealthy

20. Why did you say your health was this way?

21. How would you describe yourself when you were younger?
at five

at ten

22. How would you describe your family life?

23. what are the ages, gender and residences of your immediate family?

M/F	Age	Residence
mother	_____	_____
father	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

21. Are you currently enrolled in school? ☐ yes

☐ no, if no, when were you last enrolled _____

22. Are you currently attending school? ☐ yes

☐ no, if no, when did you last attend _____

23. What grade are/were you in? _____

24. What was your average grade at the end of your last full year of school? ☐ less than 50% ☐ 50 - 59%

☐ 60 - 69% ☐ 70 - 79% ☐ 80-100%

25. Have you ever taken special education class?

☐ yes ☐ no

26. Have you ever had a job? ☐ yes ☐ no

27. What types of jobs? (check all that apply)

☐ fulltime ☐ parttime ☐ casual

28. Are you working now? ☐ yes ☐ no

29. What type of job?

☐ fulltime ☐ parttime ☐ casual

30. How much do you make in a week (take home)? _____

31. Do you receive some form of social assistance?

☐ yes ☐ no

32. If so, what type of assistance?

☐ unemployment insurance ☐ family benefits

☐ general welfare ☐ don't know

33. If so, how much do you get in a month? _____

34. Where (else) do you get your money? and how much in a week? source amount

parents

friends

panhandling

other

STREET SMARTS

Attitude & Perception Survey

In these questions I'll ask you to rate your answers based on your values from 1 (least) to 5 (most). I want you to think about these questions in two ways, first, answer "in general" and then I'll ask you to tell me how you'd answer if you were in different places. For example the first question is...

	least		middle		most
	1	2	3	4	5
1. How happy are you generally?	-	-	-	-	-
How happy do you feel in each of these places?					
Home	-	-	-	-	-
street	-	-	-	-	-
school	-	-	-	-	-
social agencies	-	-	-	-	-
(social agencies are places designed to help people, they may be places where you lived, like a group home, or places where you have gone, like a drop in centre)					
2. How much respect do you have for yourself?					-
How much respect do you have for yourself in each of these places?					
Home	-	-	-	-	-
street	-	-	-	-	-
school	-	-	-	-	-
social agencies	-	-	-	-	-
3. How well do you fit in with other people?					-
How well do you fit in with other people in each of these places?					
Home	-	-	-	-	-
street	-	-	-	-	-
school	-	-	-	-	-
social agencies	-	-	-	-	-
4. How much do you care about what happens to people you know?	-	-	-	-	-
How much do you care about what happens to people you know in each of these places?					
Home	-	-	-	-	-
street	-	-	-	-	-
school	-	-	-	-	-
social agencies	-	-	-	-	-

	least		middle		most
	1	2	3	4	5
5. How good are you at coming up with ways to solve problems?					
How good are you at coming up with ways to solve problems in each of these places?					
Home	-	-	-	-	-
street	-	-	-	-	-
school	-	-	-	-	-
social agencies	-	-	-	-	-
6. How much do you plan or organize the things that you do?					
How much do you plan or organize the things that you do in each of these places?					
Home	-	-	-	-	-
street	-	-	-	-	-
school	-	-	-	-	-
social agencies	-	-	-	-	-
7. How much do you like to do things your own way?					
How much do you like to do things your own way in each of these places?					
Home	-	-	-	-	-
street	-	-	-	-	-
school	-	-	-	-	-
social agencies	-	-	-	-	-
8. How much can you make things happen the way you want?					
How much can you make things happen the way you want in each of these places?					
Home	-	-	-	-	-
street	-	-	-	-	-
school	-	-	-	-	-
social agencies	-	-	-	-	-
9. How honest are you with other people?					
How honest are you with other people in each of these places?					
Home	-	-	-	-	-
street	-	-	-	-	-
school	-	-	-	-	-
social agencies	-	-	-	-	-

	least		middle		most
	1	2	3	4	5
10. How honest do you think your friends are with other people?					
How honest do you think your friends are with other people in each of these places?					
Home	-	-	-	-	-
street	-	-	-	-	-
school	-	-	-	-	-
social agencies	-	-	-	-	-
11. How hard do you usually work at jobs or assignments?					
How hard do you usually work at jobs or assignments in each of these places?					
Home	-	-	-	-	-
street	-	-	-	-	-
school	-	-	-	-	-
social agencies	-	-	-	-	-
12. How much do you trust other people?					
How much do you trust other people in each of these places?					
Home	-	-	-	-	-
street	-	-	-	-	-
school	-	-	-	-	-
social agencies	-	-	-	-	-
13. How much do your friends trust other people?					
How much do your friends trust other people in each of these places?					
Home	-	-	-	-	-
street	-	-	-	-	-
school	-	-	-	-	-
social agencies	-	-	-	-	-
14. How much respect do you have for people in authority?					
How much respect do you have for people in authority in each of these places?					
Home	-	-	-	-	-
street	-	-	-	-	-
school	-	-	-	-	-
social agencies	-	-	-	-	-
15. How much of a leader are you?					
How much of a leader are you in each of these places?					
Home	-	-	-	-	-
street	-	-	-	-	-
school	-	-	-	-	-
social agencies	-	-	-	-	-

	least		middle		most
	1	2	3	4	5
16. How much do you usually cooperate with other people?	-	-	-	-	-
How much do you usually cooperate with other people in each of these places?					
Home	-	-	-	-	-
street	-	-	-	-	-
school	-	-	-	-	-
social agencies	-	-	-	-	-
17. How much do you usually share your things with others?	-	-	-	-	-
How much do you usually share your things with others in each of these places?					
Home	-	-	-	-	-
street	-	-	-	-	-
school	-	-	-	-	-
social agencies	-	-	-	-	-
18. How much affection do people give you?	-	-	-	-	-
How much affection do people give you in each of these places?					
Home	-	-	-	-	-
street	-	-	-	-	-
school	-	-	-	-	-
social agencies	-	-	-	-	-
19. How much are people willing to help you?	-	-	-	-	-
How much are people willing to help you in each of these places?					
Home	-	-	-	-	-
street	-	-	-	-	-
school	-	-	-	-	-
social agencies	-	-	-	-	-
20. If you are in trouble how much do you think people are willing to protect you?	-	-	-	-	-
If you are in trouble how much do you think people are willing to protect you in each of these places?					
Home	-	-	-	-	-
street	-	-	-	-	-
school	-	-	-	-	-
social agencies	-	-	-	-	-

Street Smarts 196

	least		middle		most
	1	2	3	4	5
21. How much companionship do you get from other people?	-	-	-	-	-
How much companionship do you get from other people in each of these places?					
Home	-	-	-	-	-
street	-	-	-	-	-
school	-	-	-	-	-
social agencies	-	-	-	-	-
22. How much respect do you get from other people?	-	-	-	-	-
How much respect do you get from other people in each of these places?					
Home	-	-	-	-	-
street	-	-	-	-	-
school	-	-	-	-	-
social agencies	-	-	-	-	-
23. How much danger are you in THREATS)	-	-	-	-	(D.
from other people?	-	-	-	-	-
How much danger are you in from other people in each of these places?					
Home	-	-	-	-	-
street	-	-	-	-	-
school	-	-	-	-	-
social agencies	-	-	-	-	-
24. How much danger are you in from authorities?	-	-	-	-	-
How much danger are you in from authorities in each of these places?					
Home	-	-	-	-	-
street	-	-	-	-	-
school	-	-	-	-	-
social agencies	-	-	-	-	-
25. How much chance is there that you'll be hurt?	-	-	-	-	-
How much chance is there that you'll be hurt in each of these places?					
Home	-	-	-	-	-
street	-	-	-	-	-
school	-	-	-	-	-
social agencies	-	-	-	-	-

	least		middle		most
	1	2	3	4	5
26. If you steal, hurt, or take advantage of someone how likely are they to get back at you?					
If you steal, hurt, or take advantage of someone how likely are they to get back at you in each of these places?					
Home	-	-	-	-	-
street	-	-	-	-	-
school	-	-	-	-	-
social agencies	-	-	-	-	-
27. How much are you in danger of getting sick?					
How much are you in danger of getting sick in each of these places?					
Home	-	-	-	-	-
street	-	-	-	-	-
school	-	-	-	-	-
social agencies	-	-	-	-	-
28. How available are drugs/alcohol?					
How available are drugs/alcohol in each of these places?					
Home	-	-	-	-	-
street	-	-	-	-	-
school	-	-	-	-	-
social agencies	-	-	-	-	-
29. How likely are you to overuse drugs/alcohol?					
How likely are you to overuse drugs/alcohol in each of these places?					
Home	-	-	-	-	-
street	-	-	-	-	-
school	-	-	-	-	-
social agencies	-	-	-	-	-
30. How good is your living situation?					
How good is your living situation in each of these places?					
Home	-	-	-	-	-
street	-	-	-	-	-
school	-	-	-	-	-
social agencies	-	-	-	-	-

	least		middle		most
	1	2	3	4	5
31. How well do you eat ?	-	-	-	-	-
How well do you eat					
in each of these places?					
Home	-	-	-	-	-
street	-	-	-	-	-
school	-	-	-	-	-
social agencies	-	-	-	-	-
32. How good are the clothes					
you have?					
How good are the clothes you have			-	-	-
in each of these places?					
Home	-	-	-	-	-
street	-	-	-	-	-
school	-	-	-	-	-
social agencies	-	-	-	-	-
33. How good is the health					
care you receive?					
How good is the health care		-	-	-	-
in each of these places?					
Home	-	-	-	-	-
street	-	-	-	-	-
school	-	-	-	-	-
social agencies	-	-	-	-	-
34. How good are the facilities					
for keeping clean?					
How good are the facilities		-	-	-	-
for keeping clean					
in each of these places?					
Home	-	-	-	-	-
street	-	-	-	-	-
school	-	-	-	-	-
social agencies	-	-	-	-	-

Street Smarts Appendix 7
Basic Information and Attitudes Questionnaire

I. What things upset or worry you? (#) ...any others...

II. Tell me about a problem you have solved. How? (# steps)

III. What do you look for in a friend? (#)

IV. Where do you go to look for a place to stay? Which have you gone to? place (#) check if used (#)

V. What is important when looking for a place to stay? (#)

VI. Do you have rules for yourself for spending? []yes[]no What are they? (#)

VII. How do you show you are upset? (1, 0, -1) (#)

VIII. What would you suggest to a friend who was upset? (#)

IX. Do you have someone you can trust, talk to?

[] yes, [] no

X. Why can you trust them? (#)

XI. If you were sick where would you go? (#)

XII. Do you try to eat any particular foods? [] yes, [] no

XIII. How often do you use a condom (or insist on a condom)
during sex? _____

why? (#)

XIV. How would you know if someone had taken a drug
overdose? (#) _____

XV. What would you do if you saw a friend like that? (#)

XVI. If a friend had a drug problem and asked for your
suggestions, what would you say? (#)

XVII. What do you want to be? (1,0)

XVIII. How would you start to get what you want? (1,0,-1)

XIX. How would you know a friend was suicidal? (#)

XX. What would you do? (#)

XXI. Where can a person who has been abused go for help?
(#)

H.S.

This questionnaire consists of a list of twenty statements (sentences). Please read the statements carefully one by one. If the statements describe your attitude for the past week, including today, write down TRUE next to it. If the statement is false for you write FALSE next to it. You may simply write T for TRUE or F for FALSE. Please be sure to read each sentence.

T or F

- ___ A. I look forward to the future with hope and enthusiasm.
- ___ B. I might as well give up because there's nothing I can do about making things better for myself.
- ___ C. When things are going badly, I am helped by knowing that they can't stay that way forever.
- ___ D. I can't imagine what my life would be like in 10 years.
- ___ E. I have enough time to accomplish the things I want.
- ___ F. In the Future I expect to succeed in what concerns me most.
- ___ G. My future seems dark to me.
- ___ H. I happen to be particularly lucky and I expect to get more of the good things in life than the average person.
- ___ I. I just don't get the breaks, and there's no reason to believe I will in the future.
- ___ J. My past experiences have prepared me well for my future.
- ___ K. All I can see ahead of me is unpleasantness rather than pleasantness.
- ___ L. I don't expect to get what I really want.
- ___ M. When I look ahead to the future I expect I will be happier than I am now.
- ___ N. Things just won't work out the way I want them to.
- ___ O. I have great faith in the future.
- ___ P. I never get what I want so it's foolish to want anything.
- ___ Q. It is very unlikely that I will get any real satisfaction in the future.
- ___ R. The future seems vague and uncertain to me.
- ___ S. I can look forward to more good times than bad.
- ___ T. There's no use in really trying to get something I want because I probably won't get it.

Coding: True(1), False(0), DK(8), NR(9)

Where can you be reached to set up the next interview?

(If Applicable)

How many sessions of 'Street smarts' did you go to? _____

Client Satisfaction Questionnaire

Please help us improve the Street Smarts Program by answering some questions about your experience. Please answer all questions. We are interested in negative comments as well as positive.

1. Who were the leaders of the group you attended?

2. How many sessions did you attend?

3. How would you rate the overall quality of Street Smarts?

4 3 2 1
excellent good fair poor

4. What did you like best about Street Smarts?

5. What did you like least about Street Smarts?

6. Did you get the kind of service you wanted with Street Smarts?

1 2 3 4
no, no, not yes, yes,
definitely not really generally definitely

7. To what extent has Street Smarts met your needs?

4 3 2 1
Almost all Most of my only a few none of my
of my needs needs have of my needs needs have
have been met been met were met been met

8. What did you think of the session on;
topic didn't liked didn't comments
 attend session like

introduction	_____	_____	_____	_____
survival	_____	_____	_____	_____
housing	_____	_____	_____	_____
budgetting & jobs	_____	_____	_____	_____
art therapy	_____	_____	_____	_____
health & nutrition	_____	_____	_____	_____
sexuality & safe sex	_____	_____	_____	_____
substance abuse	_____	_____	_____	_____
schools & careers	_____	_____	_____	_____
stress	_____	_____	_____	_____
suicide	_____	_____	_____	_____
conflict resolution	_____	_____	_____	_____
abuse	_____	_____	_____	_____
violence	_____	_____	_____	_____
psychodrama	_____	_____	_____	_____

9. Which parts worked for you? _____

10. What did you get out of the sessions?

11. What would you eliminate from the Street Smarts program?

12. What would you want to see more of in Street Smarts?

13. What would you like to see added to street Smarts?

14. If a friend were in need of similar help, would you recommend Street Smarts to them?

1	2	3	4
no,	no, I don't	yes, I	yes,
definitely not	think so	think so	definitely

15. What would you tell them about Street Smarts?

16. What type of person would Street Smarts help?

17. Why would it help those people?

18. How satisfied are you with the amount of help you received?

1	2	3	4
Quite	mildly	mostly	very
dissatisfied	dissatisfied	satisfied	satisfied

19. Have the services you received helped you deal more effectively with your problems?

4	3	2	1
yes, they	yes, they	no, they	no, they seemed
helped a	helped	didn't	to make things
great deal	somewhat	really help	worse

20. What do you do differently having been in the Street Smarts program?

21. Why did it work that way for you?

22. In an overall, general sense, how satisfied are you with the service you received?

1	2	3	4
Quite	mildly	mostly	very
dissatisfied	dissatisfied	satisfied	satisfied

23. If you were to seek help again, would you come back to the Street Smarts program?

1	2	3	4
no,	no, I don't	yes, I	yes,
definitely not	think so	think so	definitely

24. What did you think of the leaders? _____

25. What did you think of the guests? _____

26. What did you think of the topics? _____

27. What other comments do you have about the Street Smarts program?

Appendix 10

Client Satisfaction Questionnaire - ST

Please help us improve the Street Smarts Program by answering some questions about your experience. Please answer all questions. We are interested in negative comments as well as positive.

Date: _____, Session _____

1. How would you rate the overall quality of Street Smarts?

4	3	2	1
excellent	good	fair	poor

2. What did you like best about Street Smarts?

3. What did you like least about Street Smarts?

4. What did you get out of the sessions?

5. What would you want to see more of in Street Smarts?

6. In an overall, general sense, how satisfied are you with the service you received?

1	2	3	4
Quite	mildly	mostly	very
dissatisfied	dissatisfied	satisfied	satisfied

7. If you were to seek help again, would you come back to the Street Smarts program?

1	2	3	4
no,	no, I don't	yes, I	yes,
definitely not	think so	think so	definitely

8. What other comments do you have about the Street Smarts program?

END

3 1 - 0 5 - 9 | 6

FIN